

We should not even think about cutting child nutrition programs, like school lunches by \$6 billion.

We should not cut student loans by \$5 billion.

And we should not increase the taxes on working families by \$32 billion. But, today my Republican colleagues probably will.

Now maybe someone can think of a reason to cut these critical programs, but I cannot. I think it is horrible to even consider these cuts in order to give more money to the people who do not need it.

But it is true, Mr. Speaker, these cuts are to lower the taxes on the very rich, and to lower the taxes on big corporations. And that is wrong.

This bill takes from the mouths of babes, from the health care of seniors, from the education of students, and gives to the pockets of the rich.

What makes this whole idea even worse is that my Republican colleagues, the people responsible for writing this bill, cannot even tell us exactly what is in this bill.

So we asked for more debate time, more time to ask questions, but they said no.

They said no to finding out the details. They said no to Medicare recipients. They said no to children who need school lunches and they said no to students needing loans.

The only people who are getting a yes these days are the richest Americans and the biggest corporations.

Mr. Speaker, this is a horrible rule for a horrible bill, and I urge my colleagues to defeat it.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, this is an unusual situation going on around here in Washington. Employees are furloughed, Government is shut down. I am a Democrat that is not against cutting taxes. I voted to cut taxes.

In fact, I voted for the last continuing resolution. I believe the Republican continuing resolution was better than the motion to recommit by the Democrats. The Democrats had a line-item veto in it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask, do my colleagues want to protect Medicare and Social Security? It is not done by passing a line-item veto. There may be a President some day that just might target it.

Let me say this. I want to cut taxes. I do not demean the motives of the Republican Party. The Republican Party is courageous, they have outfoxed us. The major difference in this House is five votes on a gun ban and the biggest tax increase in American history, and we are being suckered in once again. Their courage may cost them, the majority, next year.

Mr. Speaker, I want a tax cut. I am a Democrat that wants a tax cut. I support a tax cut. I do not believe that where it is coming from is in the best interests of the country.

I voted for that 7-year continuing resolution, 7 years the Democrats offered so that the President could sit down and say, look, maybe let us bring it down for more working families, let us set Medicare aside, treat it better, but let us work together.

The truth is, both parties are in lock-step. This is Presidential politics. And beware, Democrats. No one is talking about the trade issue, and without Democrats, there would be no GATT, there would be no NAFTA, and now Democrats are going to give the President a line-item veto.

The President will spend every damn dime. There is no program. There is no program. I admire your courage, but I do not believe it is going to work, and I will not support it.

I am saying to the Democrats, we do not have a program. I am going to vote no on this rule; I am going to vote no on this reconciliation.

Let me say this, while everybody is lockstepping with these party leaders, we were not set here to be lemmings. Think for your damn self.

Our country screwed up. Mr. Speaker, 43,000 Americans have lost their jobs since 1941. We have men trying to get jobs in Hooters Restaurant, for God's sake.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to balance the budget, we will not balance it the way we are going. Let us take a look at these unrealistic trade programs. Let us take a look at the loss of jobs going overseas, good-paying jobs, and the Republicans are not dealing with that yet.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will make one last statement. The country would not be in the condition it is in today if it were not for Democrats, GATT, and NAFTA. The Democratic Party supports line-item veto, yet does not support American workers.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would advise Members that the use of profanity is against the House rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process of the Committee on Rules, who as chairman of the subcommittee understands what it is going to take for us to balance the budget.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, Congress has been working long days and late hours to find a positive solution to the budget crisis. We have moved appropriations bills, put together the Balanced Budget Act conference report, and passed two continuing resolutions to reopen the Government. The latest one is under a veto threat because it contains a simple statement of commitment to balance the budget in 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is in this context that the President said, when asked why he was refusing to negotiate with Congress, that, quote, "Somebody has to do the right thing," end quote. It surprises me, and it will surprise many Americans, that the President seems to have an exclusive take on the right thing, one that leads him to refuse steps to reopen the Government. Only President Clinton knows what is right, so says President Clinton. Wrong. Given the \$5 trillion debt we have built up and will leave to our children and grandchildren, I think that a commitment to a balanced budget in 7 years is the right thing. Even better is a specific outline to eliminate the deficit and get us there.

Saving Medicare from bankruptcy is the right thing. Allowing Americans to keep more of the money in their paychecks, that is the right thing. The child tax credit, that is the right thing. Phase out of the marriage penalty, the right thing. And a reduction in the capital gains rate is the right thing.

This rule provides for ample time to debate this historic balanced budget; it allows us to send the President the balanced budget the American people have demanded.

It is up to us to pass this rule, support the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, and once again urge the President to do the right thing.

We will not be playing any golf this weekend. I hope the President will not be either. The right thing to do is to sit down and sign the Balanced Budget Act.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a good rule because it does not allow for a motion to recommit and debate over a serious and real alternative. The question is not whether we should move toward a balanced budget; the question is how we should move toward a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, the economic reality in this country today is that the richest people are becoming richer, the middle class is shrinking, and today, with great shame, we have by far the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world.

Given that reality, how in God's name can anyone talk about moving toward a balanced budget by giving huge tax breaks to the rich, by creating a situation in which the largest corporations will pay no taxes, by building more B-2 bombers that the Pentagon does not want at \$1.5 billion a plane, by putting more money into star wars, by spending \$100 billion a year defending Europe and Asia against a nonexistent enemy?

How do we talk about balancing a budget when we continue to spend \$125 billion a year on corporate welfare, but we are going to slash Medicare, slash

Medicaid, slash veterans' programs, eliminate LIHEAP, and do devastation to middle-income working people and the poor?

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues, if they want to balance the budget, what about going after foreign corporations with subsidiaries in America like Toyota and Nissan, which underpay their U.S. taxes by \$25 billion?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Columbus, OH [Ms. PRYCE], my very good friend and a hard-working member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the nay-sayers said it could not be done, but they told Lindberg the same thing.

Well, nobody is saying it was easy, but through the years of hard work and dedication of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and many others on both sides of the aisle, we have done it. We have produced a balanced budget in 7 years.

So, Mr. Speaker, as the old saying goes, "the proof is in the pudding," and the proof is in the conference report which we are about to consider under the terms of this rule.

Today, as the national debt soars to nearly \$5 trillion, we have learned a painful lesson that our short-term fixes have become long-term burdens for our children and grandchildren.

I would ask my colleagues who might be thinking of voting against this rule and the underlying legislation to consider the children of our country.

They are the Nation's most precious resource, and without a balanced budget, we will surely be robbing them of the kind of prosperous, productive, and financially secure future which we have enjoyed and which surely they deserve.

Unfortunately, the nay-sayers will be at it again, telling us that we are going too far, too fast.

But this conference report offers solutions no more complicated or profound than those used every day by hardworking taxpayers and their families who play by the rules, who work to pay the bills, and who watch their spending in order to make ends meet.

We cannot go on blaming others for the fiscal mess we face when we have the golden opportunity today to vote for a plan that will make the American dream a reality for so many.

The choice is ours, Mr. Speaker. We can either vote "yes" for the dream of a brighter future, or "no" for a long, painful slide into third world economic status.

Adopt this rule for our kids.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this sensible and completely appropriate rule so that we may begin to build a better future for the children and grandchildren of this great country.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the budget reconciliation and the conference report.

Today we are considering a bill with all of the wrong priorities. It includes cuts in education, investment in our future, deep cuts in programs for seniors, especially Medicare. The Republican majority cuts \$270 billion in Medicare, while enacting a \$245 billion tax cut.

We can balance the budget and make Medicare solvent without deep cuts in senior citizen health care and without these tax breaks.

The Republicans' \$270 billion cut is three times larger than what the Medicare trustees requested. In fact, there is a \$36 billion hole in this budget that is a line item that just says fail-safe. That is the amount that will be cut from hospitals and providers if these other reforms do not work.

□ 1045

If the Republicans left out their tax cuts, they would not need the budget gimmicks like this fail-safe to make their numbers up. We need to oppose the rule, the conference committee report and let us balance the budget, whether it is in 7 years or not, without cuts in Medicare, and without cuts in taxes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to say that over 80 percent of this tax cut goes to people who are earning less than \$100,000 a year.

With that I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Harrisburg, PA [Mr. GEKAS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law.

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule which is the first step towards the balanced budget for which we all yearn.

Mr. Speaker, if we do nothing more throughout the balance of the 7 years that we are discussing here today, we will be spending \$13 trillion. If we arrive at the balanced budget which we seek, we will be spending only \$12 trillion. So the balanced budget would save us \$1 trillion throughout the course of the 7 years.

Is this important? One thousand billion dollars which we would have to borrow because we do not have a balanced budget, to borrow more, to pay more interest on the debt, to pay nothing on the principal of a multitrillion-dollar national debt.

Is that what the country wants? Or does it want us to reach that balanced budget and start taking the money that we would be paying for interest on the debt, paying that back to our citizens by way of development and community work?

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we are going to debate a 7-year balanced budget for the United States of America in 3 hours. We spent 4 hours on shrimp-turtle excluder devices, yet they cannot give us another hour or two to debate a balanced budget for the United States of America.

I am a balanced budget Democrat, but this party would have us believe there is only one path. They do not allow any alternative. They are giving us a bigger and better business-as-usual budget. More money for the Pentagon, more weapons we do not need, B-2 bombers that do not work, more tax cuts for the wealthy.

There is another way to balance the budget, but you are going to go after the Pentagon, get rid of cold war weapons that we do not need, that do not work, challenge corporations to give up welfare, do away with agriculture subsidies, even cut back on foreign aid, and maybe charge royalties for mining on Federal land.

But that takes on the rich and the powerful who have been running this city for a quarter of a century, and that party does not have the guts to do it, and they will not even let us offer one alternative. Not even one alternative on the floor of the House.

A balanced budget, yes. Seven years, yes. Let us have an alternative. Let us have a balanced budget.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, we will consider the rule that is a bad rule. Why is it a bad rule? It is a rule that does not allow for the full opportunity nor opportunity to perfect this bad bill that is coming before us.

Why is it bad? It is bad because it has gotten worse as the Republican conferees have looked at it. To give an example, in the Committee on Agriculture as we were considering food stamps for the poor, we are now requiring them to work 20 hours a month below the minimum wage, just for food stamps. An amendment offered by me in the Committee on Agriculture, a bipartisan amendment, approved, taken out in the rule. Because why? You want to make people suffer.

Why do you need to balance the budget on the backs of the poor? Why do you today balance the budget on the backs of senior citizens? Why do you need to balance the budget on the backs of children? Taking food from them in school lunches, making this extreme budget.

We say you are going too far. It is too far to expect that you should be compassionate? It is extreme to deny poor people an opportunity live? This is a bad rule, a bad bill. We should reject it because we want to reject it for America.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, it is 11 a.m., almost, on November 17, 1995, and the American people are confronted with the last dirty details of a barbaric plot to murder Medicaid. Medicaid and Medicare are 30 years old. The plot is on to destroy 30 years of compassionate policy which promotes the general welfare.

Yes, there is some phony, used car salesman language in the bill which talks about eligibility for pregnant women and children, but why trade an entitlement for Medicaid for some phony talk about eligibility administered by the States? It was the States that gave us the sick and ill with no protection before, and now we cannot trust the States to take it up after the entitlement is gone.

American voters, put your common sense to work. Do not trade an entitlement for some used car salesman language about maybe the States will enforce some kind of eligibility and keep health care. We do not want to go backward 30 years. We have Medicaid entitlement now. Let us keep the Medicaid entitlement.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Egan, IL [Mr. MANZULLO], chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business Procurement, Exports, and Business Opportunities.

(Mr. MANZULLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, we have heard incredible words today. Cruel, inhumane, barbaric.

I will tell you what is cruel, I will tell you what is inhumane. If we look at the President's budget last year, there was a chapter called Generational Forecasts. That states because of the \$5 trillion debt, that children born after 1993, if there are no policy changes, by the time they enter the work force, will have an effective local, State and Federal tax rate of between 84 and 94 percent. This country is going to collapse under the tremendous burden of debt. That is cruel. That is inhumane. That leaves our children no future.

If you want to give our children a future, pass the rule, pass the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, and allow our children not to live under a system that takes away all of the money they want to earn.

Mr. Speaker, the American dream is at stake today. This is an opportunity to balance the budget. Let us do it for our children.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule. The Republicans met in secret the last few weeks and they hammered out this budget deal without Democratic participation, and what happened is that a bad budget bill got even worse.

The Gingrich Republican budget reconciliation conference report cuts Medicare by \$270 billion in order to pay for a \$245 billion tax break for the wealthy, despite the fact that the Medicare cuts are 3 times greater than what the trustees recommended in order to make Medicare solvent.

The Medicare premiums for seniors are doubled. At the same time the wealthy are being given huge tax breaks, working Americans will get a tax increase, that is a tax increase for working Americans, of \$32.2 billion cut in the earned income tax credit, \$9 billion more than the House-passed bill. And upon the date of enactment of this legislation, Medicaid is repealed and 36 million Americans will lose guaranteed health insurance and long-term care.

The worst part of it in my opinion is this Republican bill repeals the current law guarantee of payment for those widows. They will not have their Medicare part B premiums paid.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Morris, IL [Mr. WELLER], a very eloquent new Member of Congress.

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the rule. Is this not why we are here? Is this not why we were sent to the Congress, to balance the budget, just like every American family? Republicans and moderate and conservative Democrats agree. Only the tax-and-spend liberals stand in the way.

We have a plan to balance the budget in 7 years. We increase spending for Medicare 50 percent over the next 7 years, we reform welfare, we provide tax relief for working families, and the calls and letters that are coming in are overwhelmingly in favor of the Republican plan.

My calls and my letters are 5 to 1 in favor of balancing the budget. Let me share the following:

Bill Lincoln, Morris, IL, says "There are many interest groups that will resist any changes. They speak for a select group but our decision must be based on what's best for America."

Thirty-one employees of a shopping center, a retailer in Calumet City, River Oaks Shopping Center, point out that each of us now carries an \$18,000 responsibility for the national debt and pay hundreds of dollars in additional taxes every year just to finance that interest.

The people ask us to balance the budget. Let us do what our job is. We have a plan. Let us adopt it.

Mr. Speaker, I include the letter from Mr. Lincoln for the RECORD:

OCTOBER 30, 1995.

Hon. JERRY WELLER,  
Longworth Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WELLER: I hope that Congress continues to pursue and is able to pass a balanced budget agreement. We cannot continue to take in more money each year and then increase the deficit by spend-

ing more than we take in. There are many expenses that must be investigated including foreign aid, farm subsidies, non-profit organizations, welfare etc. There are many interest groups that will resist any changes, they speak for a select group, but our decision must be based on what's best for America.

I'm glad to see that Medicare reform is underway. Many seniors, including myself, recognize that something must be done. There is no way the program can support itself with the low premiums being paid into the system. There is nothing available anywhere with the coverage provided at these rates. You can't secure anything worthwhile for nothing, and those receiving the benefits can't expect someone else to pick up the tab. And that seems to be what is happening.

The present Congress has or is in the process of passing much needed legislation and I hope will continue with the reform process and get things back where they belong.

Thank you for allowing me to express my concerns.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM P. LINCOLN.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Rules is right, Republicans have been waiting for this day for a very, very long time. This bill is precisely what the Gingrich Republicans are all about.

What it does, the Gingrich plan provides a massive tax break for big corporations and rich people, paid for at the expense of seniors' health, education for our children and protection of our environment. The Gingrich budget plan is an unconscionable assault on the future of middle-class Americans.

It raids \$270 billion from Medicare to finance a lavish \$245 billion tax break for people who do not need it. It slashes investments in education, guts environmental protection, exposes pension funds to corporate raiders, and raises taxes on working families, and it pays off Gingrich Republicans' high roller political supporters. They will talk to you today and will make pious speeches about this budget for our children. This is the worst assault on this Nation's children probably in the history of this country.

Vote against the rule, vote against this awful bill.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY].

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise against this rule and against the bill. Against the rule because it unnecessarily restricts the amount of time on this debate and it unnecessarily restricts our ability to deal with it in a responsible manner, to propose an alternative. It is a bad rule for those reasons.

Why? Why are they doing that? They are doing that simply because they do not want the American people to understand what is in this bill. How it will take away from those who need it and give to those who do not need it?

First of all, it cuts Medicare by \$270 billion, doubles the premiums of Medicare to senior citizens, at the same time giving a tax cut of \$245 billion. Most of it will go to people who do not need it and for the most part have the good sense not to want it.

We have a responsibility in this House to provide for the best economic conditions possible for the American people, to provide for a growing economy and for growing economic opportunity. This bill does precisely the opposite. It will shrink the economy and will shrink economic opportunity. It slashes away at student loans, making it much more difficult for children to get a decent education and for families to better themselves.

This is a bad bill. It is a bad bill for all of those reasons. It is bad for the economy, it is bad for opportunity, it is bad for health care. It will have a major impact on the Nation's hospitals, forcing perhaps 25 percent of them to close. Furthermore, it will transfer spending responsibility from the Federal Government to the local governments.

So while Members of Congress can brag about cutting people's taxes, local taxes will go up, State taxes will increase, and real property taxes will increase to make up for the deficit that is being created by this bad piece of legislation.

□ 1100

So once again, those who can least afford it will be asked to bear a larger burden of the responsibility of this society to care for the needs at the local level. That means higher real property taxes, and it is a retrogressive piece of legislation.

Vote against the rule, vote against the bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Scottsdale, AZ [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the House, we have a simple choice today: Do we want to continue to shackle the American public with ever-rising taxes, with suffocating regulation, with more and more taken from their paychecks? Do we want to continue to enslave future generations to a debt that is simply unconscionable? Or are we willing to vote yes on the rule, yes to a balanced budget?

I do it for all the children of the Sixth District of Arizona, for all the children of America, and especially for John Micah, who in 2 weeks will be 2 years of age and who, if we do nothing to stop this unconscionable, continual slide into the abyss, will pay over \$185,000 in taxes during the course of his lifetime just to service this gross national debt, which basically is a crime against future generations.

My colleagues, vote for the rule, precisely for the people you champion. Vote for the rule to empower those who need better economic opportunities. Vote for the rule to empower future generations and current American citi-

zens. Vote yes on the rule and yes on a balanced budget.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is a bad rule supporting a bad bill. The Republicans tell you that the balanced budget is the most important thing before Congress today. So I ask you, why do they only give us 2 hours to debate it? They said when they talked about the continuing resolution, if you want to debate the balanced budget, we will have that debate. Some debate, 2 hours.

Now, look, I am willing to buy into a balanced budget. I voted for the continuing resolution, so I am on record, but not their balanced budget. Their balanced budget does grave harm to our country.

I cannot accept giving \$245 billion to the wealthy people in this country. I cannot accept cutting \$270 billion out of Medicare that serves our seniors. I cannot accept cutting funds in education, and I cannot accept cutting student loans.

We can have a balanced budget. Let us end corporate welfare. Let us end unnecessary spending. We do not need all of those B-2 bombers. The Defense Department did not ask for them.

We can have a balanced budget. We cannot have their balanced budget.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Winter Park, FL [Mr. MICA], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I am really appalled at what we hear here on the floor about what we are doing.

When all else fails, I always say read the bill. I rise in support of the rule. The rule and the bill, in fact, provide student loans, which are currently at \$24 billion to go to \$36 billion in 2002; Medicaid to go from \$89 billion currently to \$124 billion, Medicare from \$178 billion to \$273 billion. And they call these cuts?

It does not matter in education if students cannot read. It does not matter if in Medicaid we force, in my State, the institutionalization of senior citizens with no alternatives. And it does not matter in Medicare, in Florida, if we have a billion dollars' worth of waste, fraud, and abuse, and we give seniors no other choice.

I urge the passage of this rule.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

(Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise today to oppose the rule and the bill, and I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that we in the Coalition, as you know, strongly support balancing the budget in 7 years. We have done it. We have put a budget together that gets to

balance in 7 years, borrowing less money than you do. We do it in a different way, we think, in a more sustainable and humane way.

I think the most encouraging thing that has happened is we heard the Speaker say a day or two ago that everything is on the table. And we just want to say to you that we are ready, willing, and able to work with you to get this job done. We voted with you the other night on the continuing resolution, and once this veto is over with and we get down to negotiating, we are looking forward to sitting down with you and working this out.

We are disturbed that we were frozen out of things such as the agriculture changes and some of these other areas. We are hoping we can get past this current situation and sit down and work out a balanced budget that will be good for the American people.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our very able colleague, the gentleman from Tupelo, MS [Mr. WICKER], the president of the historic freshman Republican class of the 104th Congress.

(Mr. WICKER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a momentous day for this House of Representatives.

For the first time in 26 years we are going to do what Congress should have done every year—pass a balanced budget.

I know the debate is going to focus on some shared sacrifice, and certainly Americans have always been willing to do their part. But I also hope during the 2 hours of general debate we will talk about the benefits to every American of balancing the Federal budget.

The Federal Reserve Chairman has made it clear that interest rates will drop significantly if we will just come to grips with the budget deficit. That means lower house payments, lower car payments, and reduced tuition loan costs for families all across America. That translates into more disposable incomes in the pocketbooks of every American.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in bipartisanship, and I am thankful for the 72 Democrats who earlier this year voted for a balanced budget amendment. I thank heaven for the 48 Democrats who voted for a balanced budget using CBO scoring on the continuing resolution.

I call on my colleagues to debate this bill today as Americans. Let's do it for the future of our country. Let's do it for every child in America. Let's balance the budget.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans say that this bill is the culmination of a revolution. I agree. But let me tell you what I know about a revolution. A revolution kills, and this bill kills old people and

those on Medicare. It kills poor people and the middle class. It kills young people. It kills sick people. It kills students, and it kills the priorities of this Nation. That is what this revolution does.

The second thing I know about a revolution is that you never have a debate about it, and this rule gives us no opportunity to debate it; 2 hours and we are out of here.

We have spent more time yesterday talking about who would take us to lunch than we are talking about this revolution today. This is an abomination, and we ought to be ashamed of ourselves.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from him Albuquerque, NM [Mr. SCHIFF], who was a conferee on this historic balanced budget and conference committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of the bill.

But I want to say right now that, given the fact that the President of the United States has already threatened to veto this bill if it arrives on his desk, that I am willing to negotiate every specific detail in it with the President of the United States on only one condition, and that is that the President of the United States also offer a budget in the same framework, meaning using Congressional Budget Office figures for Government income projections and on a 7-year time basis.

The President of the United States has previously agreed to both of those terms. But without those terms, then there is no way to do a side-by-side comparison.

If the President or anyone else is going to suggest that we raise spending in any of these categories, they should show where that spending is going to come from.

That is why I urge the President to sign the continuing resolution, agree to a 7 year balanced budget, and put his spending priorities before us so we can do a specific side-by-side comparison.

Mr. BEILSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a long, complicated, detailed explanation of this budget at the beginning of this discussion just today. But let me tell you why you will hear all of these mind-numbing details. You will hear that for one simple reason: to take attention away from the bottom line of this budget, and the bottom line of this budget is \$245 billion in tax breaks, over half of which goes to the top 12 percent of income earners in America, a budget which, in fact, increases tax payments for the lowest-income people in America.

Let me repeat that: Over half of the tax breaks go to the top 12 percent of American income earners; at the same time there are increases in tax payments because of the earned income

tax credit, something that is very hard to explain but it is a fact.

What that causes is increased tax payments by the lowest of our income earners. That is why you hear all of these details: to avoid the real issue.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the first time 1 minute to the gentleman from Thibodaux, LA [Mr. TAUZIN], my friend who has joined the party with which he has been in agreement for many, many years.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

I want to pose a hypothesis for you. Suppose today banks in America were lending money to parents who want to spend more than their income to have a good time tonight, and they were lending it to them with a mortgage on their children's income, children yet unborn. You and I would rush to the floor with a bill to make that illegal. We would not allow the banks in America to loan money to parents based upon a mortgage on their children's income.

Yet your country does it day in and day out every time we pass a budget, and that ought to be made illegal.

This rule begins the process of saying it is illegal for America to spend our children's money in advance of them even earning it for us to have a good time today.

It is a good rule. We need to pass it. For those of you who oppose it because you are afraid of a tax cut for Americans in this bill, the blue dog Democrats offered us an alternative budget earlier this year with no tax cut. It got only 60-something votes. That calls into question the commitment of people in this House.

Are we intent on making that practice illegal or not?

Mr. BEILSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, for his generous allocation of time.

Two minutes is not much time when you are getting up to talk about \$1 trillion. This, my friends, is \$1 trillion stacked up right here on unnumbered pages in very small print, smaller than usual, and held together by rubber bands.

Now, I have seen in my 33 years here some pretty atrocious legislating, but this tops it all by unforeseen margins or unmeasurable margins.

I last saw this last night stacked up in the Committee on Rules at about 9 o'clock at night. Nobody, no human being, has ever read all of this. Let me repeat that. If anybody can challenge me, get some time from the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] and you can answer me. No human being has ever read all of this.

I do not know exactly what is in it. Nobody knows exactly what is in it. We can only suspicion what is in all of this.

The question is not about what we are doing or when we are doing it, but how we are doing it.

□ 1115

All of us agree the budget ought to be balanced. All of us agree that it ought to be balanced as soon as possible without damaging the economy. The question is how do you do it?

The Republican strategy has been to balance it on the backs of the sick, let me repeat that, the sick, whether you are young or old, whether you are middle age, but balance it on the back of the sick, the old, infants and children, and the working poor, and to give a handout to those who do not need it of a \$250 billion tax cut. That is the wrong way to do it. That is what is wrong with all of this.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mount Holly, NJ [Mr. SAXTON].

(Mr. SAXTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, in light of significant changes that were made to this provision in the conference, I am able to rise in strong support today of this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of this rule and of the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. This historic legislation will place this Government on a path to a balanced budget in 7 years. If passed this bill will cut taxes for every middle-class working family. In fact it will remove 3.5 million working families from today's tax rolls altogether. This bill also ensures that Medicare and Medicaid will be secure for many years to come.

Over the last 4 weeks I have cast votes to show my concern on how the Medicare legislation in this bill treated Medicare dependent hospitals. I am happy to say, that after many days of discussions, the bill has been modified so Medicare dependent hospitals are not longer treated unfairly. This development has allowed me to vote for passage of this landmark bill.

Let me touch for a minute on why the passage of this legislation is paramount to all Americans.

The boost to our economy when we pass this balanced budget bill will be extraordinary. I know this from my work on the legislation. Over the last year I have been one of the architects of the historic economic growth provisions in this bill. Along with the majority whip, TOM DELAY, I co-chaired the task force on economic growth and regulation reforms. If passed, this bill will energize our economy. Mortgage and car interest rates will be lower, hundreds-of-thousands of jobs will be created and income will increase for all working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to send a message to future generations. When the time came for tough choices and leadership, we in Congress stepped forward and did the right thing.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to my good friend, the gentleman from Windsor, CA [Mr. RIGGS], a valued member of the Committee on the Budget and vice chairman of the California delegation.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to correct a misimpression left by my good friend from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] earlier, who I know has a very clear regard for the truth. The fact is the President's budget, when put to a vote in the Senate, lost 96 to 0. Sixty-eight Democrats out of 199 voted for their own version of a balanced budget plan on this floor. Forty-eight Democrats voted for the continuing resolution, committing all of us to work toward a balanced budget in 7 years.

Unfortunately, I would say to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], the Democrat Party seems to be more interested in passing along to America more debt, rather than the American dream to our children.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from California, I have not made any such assertions. I think his remarks were referred to someone else.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Bentonville, AR [Mr. HUTCHINSON], a member who came from the State of Arkansas and plans to keep his promise.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, families are important, and this Balanced Budget Act recognizes that. The \$500-per-child tax credit for middle income Americans is a deserved dividend from our budget balancing effort. Families deserve a rebate on that huge 1993 tax increase that we imposed upon them, and this bill gives it to them.

If it is a family with two children making \$30,000 a year, this Balanced Budget Act will cut their Federal tax liability in half. If they are a family with two children making \$25,000 a year, this Balanced Budget Act will eliminate their Federal tax liability.

So if you do not think families are as important as they were a generation ago, then oppose this rule and oppose this budget. But if you believe that families are the foundation of society, if you believe that middle class families are squeezed to the breaking point, if you believe that parents are better custodians of their resources than politicians, then vote for this rule and vote for this Balanced Budget Act of 1995. It is pro-family, and the families of America deserve it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pine Bluff, AR [Mr. DICKEY], another Arkansan who is going to keep his promise to balance the budget.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, a plywood worker in Bearden, AR, works 45 hours a week. He does not make enough money, so he gets a maintenance job at the same plant and works 10 hours on the weekends. His wife works, his daughter works at a 7-Eleven, and his son has a paper route. He makes \$500 a week, and he looks down when he sees what he gets. He gets \$245.

We are forgetting this person in this discussion. The balanced budget

amendment is for that person, for his incentive, for him to sit and say my tax dollars are not going to the proper use, they are going to illegal aliens, they are going to criminals, they are going to people who do not work. They are going to people who have children and get paid for having children. We are going to lose these people in the process if we do not balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I plead with my colleagues and with the American people and the voters, that we pay attention to the middle class worker.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1½ minutes.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on the other side of the aisle some of the most decent people in America have decided to register and to be active as Republicans. But even for those people, things can happen in the middle of the night that they do not know. Right here in this bill that was drafted and went before the Committee on Rules last evening, there is a provision in here that takes \$32 billion away from working poor folks.

I would hate to believe that you are so in love with balancing the budget and the \$245 billion tax cut that you got to take away \$32 billion from people who despise welfare, who reject getting on the public dole, but want to work each and every day.

The earned income tax credit was put into law by Republicans and Democrats and expanded by President Clinton, and nobody takes issue with the fact that it encourages people to work, it gives incentives for people to work, and allows them to say that not on my watch would my family have to go on welfare.

This bill goes beyond that. It makes an appeal to the senior citizens who have to work that make under \$9,000, for the young people that are just starting out, and these people have to be under the poverty line.

What more can we ask if you are talking about keeping kids out of drugs, out of crime, keeping them working, except to give them the incentive. Turn back the rule, turn back this, and let these people work without having to think about going on welfare. Shame on you.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, we are hoping very much we will have the opportunity to make Bill Clinton a better President. I would respond to my pal, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CHARLES RANGEL], by saying if you

look at the EITC, we have an increase from \$19 to \$28 billion, and the \$32 billion to which he referred is actually less than what the General Accounting Office said was fraud in general.

But let us look at some other facts right here. Contrary to a lot of the rhetoric we have been hearing, this measure will see us spend \$12.1 trillion over the next 7 years. It increases spending in Medicare, Medicaid, school lunches and student loans, contrary to what the President has said when he claims it brings about cuts.

This package is not, is not, a massive tax cut for the rich. Eighty percent of the benefits go to people who earn less than \$100,000 a year, and we truly can in fact bring about a Government which is compassionate.

But, Mr. Speaker, the greatest compassion of all is to ensure that we are not passing onto the backs of future generations the responsibility of paying for the pattern of profligate spending.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an aye vote on this rule and the package, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 193, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 810]

YEAS—230

Allard	Chabot	Fields (TX)
Archer	Chambliss	Flanagan
Armey	Chenoweth	Foley
Bachus	Christensen	Forbes
Baker (CA)	Chryslers	Fowler
Baker (LA)	Clinger	Fox
Ballenger	Coble	Franks (CT)
Barr	Collins (GA)	Franks (NJ)
Barrett (NE)	Combest	Frelinghuysen
Bartlett	Cooley	Frisa
Barton	Cox	Funderburk
Bass	Crane	Galleghy
Bateman	Crapo	Ganske
Bereuter	Cremins	Gekas
Bilbray	Cubin	Gilchrest
Billirakis	Cunningham	Gillmor
Bliley	Davis	Gilman
Blute	Deal	Goodlatte
Boehlert	DeLay	Goodling
Boehner	Diaz-Balart	Goss
Bonilla	Dickey	Graham
Bono	Doollittle	Greenwood
Brownback	Dornan	Gunderson
Bryant (TN)	Dreier	Gutknecht
Bunn	Duncan	Hancock
Bunning	Dunn	Hansen
Burr	Ehlers	Hastert
Burton	Ehrlich	Hastings (WA)
Buyer	Emerson	Hayworth
Callahan	English	Hefley
Calvert	Ensign	Heineman
Camp	Everett	Hergert
Canady	Ewing	Hillery
Castle	Fawell	Hobson

Hoekstra	McIntosh	Seastrand
Hoke	McKeon	Sensenbrenner
Horn	Metcalf	Shadegg
Hostettler	Meyers	Shaw
Houghton	Mica	Shays
Hunter	Miller (FL)	Shuster
Hutchinson	Molinari	Skeen
Hyde	Moorhead	Smith (MI)
Inglis	Morella	Smith (NJ)
Istook	Myers	Smith (TX)
Johnson (CT)	Myrick	Smith (WA)
Johnson, Sam	Nethercutt	Solomon
Jones	Ney	Souder
Kasich	Norwood	Spence
Kelly	Nussle	Stearns
Kim	Oxley	Stockman
King	Packard	Stump
Kingston	Parker	Tate
Klug	Paxon	Tauzin
Knollenberg	Petri	Taylor (NC)
Kolbe	Pombo	Thomas
LaHood	Porter	Thornberry
Largent	Portman	Tiahrt
Latham	Pryce	Torkildsen
LaTourette	Quillen	Upton
Laughlin	Quinn	Vucanovich
Lazio	Radanovich	Radholtz
Leach	Ramstad	Walker
Lewis (CA)	Regula	Walsh
Lewis (KY)	Riggs	Wamp
Lightfoot	Roberts	Watts (OK)
Linder	Rogers	Weldon (FL)
Livingston	Rohrabacher	Weldon (PA)
LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	Weller
Longley	Roth	White
Lucas	Roukema	Whitfield
Manzullo	Royce	Wicker
Martini	Salmon	Wolf
McCollum	Sanford	Young (AK)
McCrery	Saxton	Young (FL)
McDade	Scarborough	Zeliff
McHugh	Schaefer	Zimmer
McInnis	Schiff	

## NAYS—193

Abercrombie	Filner	McCarthy
Ackerman	Flake	McHale
Andrews	Foglietta	McKinney
Baesler	Ford	McNulty
Baldacci	Frank (MA)	Meehan
Barcia	Frost	Meek
Barrett (WI)	Furse	Menendez
Beilenson	Gejdenson	Mfume
Bentsen	Gephardt	Miller (CA)
Berman	Geren	Minge
Bevill	Gibbons	Mink
Bishop	Gonzalez	Moakley
Bonior	Gordon	Mollohan
Borski	Green	Montgomery
Boucher	Gutierrez	Moran
Browder	Hall (OH)	Murtha
Brown (CA)	Hall (TX)	Nadler
Brown (FL)	Hamilton	Neal
Brown (OH)	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar
Bryant (TX)	Hayes	Obey
Cardin	Hefner	Olver
Chapman	Hilliard	Ortiz
Clay	Hinchee	Orton
Clayton	Holden	Owens
Clement	Hoyer	Pallone
Clyburn	Jackson-Lee	Pastor
Coburn	Jacobs	Payne (NJ)
Coleman	Jefferson	Payne (VA)
Collins (MI)	Johnson (SD)	Pelosi
Condit	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (FL)
Conyers	Johnston	Peterson (MN)
Costello	Kanjorski	Pickett
Coyne	Kaptur	Pomeroy
Cramer	Kennedy (MA)	Poshard
Danner	Kennedy (RI)	Rahall
de la Garza	Kennelly	Rangel
DeFazio	Kildee	Reed
DeLauro	Kleczka	Richardson
Dellums	Klink	Rivers
Deutsch	LaFalce	Roemer
Dicks	Lantos	Rose
Dingell	Levin	Roybal-Allard
Dixon	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Doggett	Lincoln	Sabo
Dooley	Lipinski	Sanders
Doyle	Lofgren	Sawyer
Durbin	Lowe	Schroeder
Edwards	Luther	Schumer
Engel	Maloney	Scott
Eshoo	Manton	Serrano
Evans	Markey	Sisisky
Farr	Martinez	Skaggs
Fattah	Mascara	Skelton
Fazio	Matsui	Slaughter

Spratt	Thurman	Watt (NC)
Stark	Torres	Waxman
Stenholm	Torricelli	Williams
Stokes	Towns	Wilson
Studds	Trafficant	Wise
Stupak	Velazquez	Woolsey
Tanner	Vento	Wyden
Taylor (MS)	Visclosky	Wynn
Tejeda	Volkmer	Yates
Thompson	Ward	
Thornton	Waters	

## NOT VOTING—9

Becerra	Fields (LA)	Neumann
Brewster	Harman	Talent
Collins (IL)	McDermott	Tucker

## □ 1143

Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. GORDON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## □ 1145

### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2491, SEVEN-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. KASICH submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996:

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of November 15, 1995, as corrected by the following:)

SEC. 3. The correction described in section 2 of this resolution is to insert between subtitles J and L of title XII a subtitle K (as depicted in the table of contents) as follows:

"Subtitle K—Miscellaneous

**"SEC. 13101. FOOD STAMP ELIGIBILITY.**

"Section 6(f) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2015(f) is amended by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: "The State agency shall, at its option, consider either all income and financial resources of the individual rendered ineligible to participate in the food stamp program under this subsection, or such income, less a pro rata share, and the financial resources of the ineligible individual, to determine the eligibility and the value of the allotment of the household of which such individual is a member."

**"SEC. 13102. REDUCTION IN BLOCK GRANTS FOR SOCIAL SERVICES.**

"Section 2003(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397b) is amended—

"(1) by striking 'and' at the end of paragraph (4); and

"(2) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

"(5) \$2,800,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1990 through 1996; and

"(6) \$2,240,000,000 for each fiscal year after fiscal year 1996."

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 272, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 15, 1995, at page H12509 and prior proceedings of the House of today.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] each will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, there comes a time for every family in America where parents pass on, leaving their children with hopefully some lessons learned, maybe a house, at least some prayers and love. Imagine, however if you could, that once you leave this Earth and your children and your grandchildren are called to the reading of the will, they are told the unimaginable news that the parents who claimed to have loved them so very much left them nothing but a mountain of bills and debt, and that in fact these children and grandchildren will have to work the rest of their lives to pay off the uncontrolled spending habits of their parents.

None of us in this Nation would ever dream to do this. Yet this is just what we have done for the last 30 years. Today we say no more, no more to a child born today having to spend close to \$200,000 over the course of their lifetime in taxes to just pay interest on the debt. Every American deserves a better future.

Mr. Speaker, a balanced budget is the right thing to do now, not after the next Presidential election.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. SABO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, may I first again congratulate my friend from Ohio in successfully bringing to this House his vision and the vision of the majority, a budget for the next several years. I know it is not easy. It involves lots of tough decisions. I do not agree with your product, but I respect your ability to bring this product before us today. However, I must say to the majority, I think the fact that we are only spending 2 hours debating a bill of this magnitude is really a disgrace to this institution.

Mr. Speaker, throughout this year, Congress has been locked in a profound debate over two competing visions of America's future and what those visions mean for American families, workers and the most vulnerable among us.

Today with this budget we have a clear statement of what the Republican vision for America is all about. This budget is their answer to complex questions about the role of Government and about the best way to balance the Federal budget.