think that the Speaker and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means did not know about this special deal is absurd.

I am about to offer once again a concurrent resolution which would take out that provision. The Speaker of this Chamber has publicly stated that he supports taking it out. I have asked the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. I have followed the rules to this Chamber to get unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up Concurrent Resolution 55, which would take out the tax provision provided for Mr. Murdoch.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Chair's guidelines, the gentleman is not recognized for that purpose. The gentleman's time as expired.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OFFER RESOLUTION REGARDING CONSTITUTIONALITY OF TARGETED TAX BENEFIT

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, under the rule IX, I rise to serve notice that I intend to offer the following resolution and read it into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Resolution: To preserve the constitutional role of the House of Representatives to originate revenue measures.

Whereas, rule IX of the Rules of the House of Representatives provides that questions of privileges shall arise whenever the rights of the House collectively are affected;

Whereas, under the precedents, customs, and traditions of the House, pursuant to rule IX, a question of privilege has arisen in cases involving the constitutional prerogatives of the House;

Whereas section 7 of article 1 of the Constitution require that revenue measures originate in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the conference report on the bill, H.R. 831, contained a targeted tax benefit which was not contained in the bill as passed by the House of Representatives and which was not contained in the amendment of the Senate; Now, therefore be it

Resolved, that the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and transmit, within 7 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, a report to the House of Representatives containing the opinion of the Comptroller General on whether the addition of a targeted tax benefit by the conferees of the conference report on the bill, H.R. 831 (A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals, to repeal the provision permitting nonrecognition of gain on sales and exchanges effectuating policies of the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes) violates the requirement of the U.S. Constitution that all revenue measures originate in the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's notice will appear in the RECORD.

TAX CUTS AND DEFICIT REDUCTION FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Mr. MARTINI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, in sitting here this morning and listening to this debate, it reminds me of a debate less than 2 years ago in my home State of New Jersey. At that time, when the then-newly elected Governor Whitman spoke about tax cuts and cutting spending at the same time, then, as now, the same naysayers rose and complained and said it could not be done.

I am pleased to report today, Mr. Speaker, that less than 2 years into her term, she has accomplished two-thirds of her tax cut, with sufficient deficit reduction, and what we have witnessed in New Jersey is an increase in revenues, jobs, and a healthy economy.

I am confident that with the passage of today's bill and rule, we will accomplish the same things here for the Federal Government, and with the linkage and language that exists today in this tax bill, the linkage which assures that we will have sufficient deficit reduction with tax relief, I am even more confident that we can accomplish that goal.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1215, CONTRACT WITH AMERICA TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 128, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 128

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1215) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to strengthen the American family and create jobs. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text and shall not exceed four hours, with two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and two hours equally divided among and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 1327, modified by the amendment printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part 2 of the report, which may be offered only by Representative Gephardt of Missouri or his designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the further amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1300

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is a rule providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1215, which is the Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995. The bill is appropriately entitled the Tax Fairness and Deficit Reduction Act of 1995 because it combines the tax relief provisions of H.R. 1215 with various spending reductions from other committees, both to offset the cost of the tax cuts and to begin us on a downward glide path toward a balanced budget. Have we not waited forever for this?

The rule provides for a Democrat substitute printed in part 2 of the Rules Committee report if offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the minority leader.

Finally, the rule provides for 1 motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, this rule represents the final major procedural hurdle to fulfilling our Contract With America and, oh, what an exciting, successful run this 100-day contract period has been. Did you ever think it would get here?

The bill this rule makes in order is certainly an appropriate closing to that contract. It addresses both the

need to give tax relief to the American people and debt relief to future generations by locking us into a downward glide path toward a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have to prove my credentials as a deficit hawk to anyone in this body. I am the only Member of this House, in the last 20 years, to actually offer a balanced budget with specifics. But, Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I have expressed concerns about enacting tax cuts without first making the necessary spending cuts to produce a balanced budget. That is very, very important to me. I would not be standing here today in support of this rule and bill if I did not think that this bill as modified by the adoption of the language that we are putting into this rule right now—which we will be voting on in a few minutes—locks us into that commitment. It does that. Make no mistake about it, a vote on this rule is a vote to balance the budget, and you better remember that.

To those on the other side who claim that this is some kind of a fig leaf, I would just urge you to first read the legislation. The Upton-Castle-Martini-Solomon amendment prohibits the tax cuts from taking effect until we first adopt a budget resolution that projects a balanced budget by the year 2002. It then—and this is the critical point—requires that pursuant to that budget resolution a reconciliation bill must be enacted into law that keeps that commitment with real spending cuts. And that is enacted into law. This is not some budget resolution that the Committee on Rules can waive the Budget Act for. If spending cuts are not done, those tax cuts do not become law. It is just as simple and as real as that.

Mr. Speaker, if we deviate, then further policy options for putting us back on track will be a part of the subsequent budget resolution and those in turn will be translated into real spending cuts in the reconciliation bill to follow, on which each and every one of us are going to be forced to vote on, on the floor of this House.

That is no fig leaf. Perhaps we should not have Members, running for higher office, running around here saying it is. Mr. Speaker, anyone who calls this a fig leaf does not know the difference between a fig leaf and a sledgehammer. Well, I do, believe you me. Reconciliation is a sledgehammer. If you have ever been here to vote on one, you ought to know, because you are going to be responsible to the voters back home whichever way you vote. It makes a real impact and it gets real results. You all, that are on this big-spender list I have here, always complain about it.

Mr. Speaker, over 40 amendments were filed with the Committee on Rules. Many of those amendments were good amendments that I could individually support. But we cannot rewrite the Internal Revenue Code on the floor of this House. We did not do it under a Democrat House, and we will not do it under a Republican House. Not only do such amendments affect other provisions in that code in ways we cannot always anticipate, but taken together they can also produce vast new revenue drains on the Treasury that we just cannot afford given our current deficit situation. You all know how serious that is.

I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to remain true to our past, our bipartisan practice of modified closed rules when we are dealing with tax and reconciliation bills. Put aside your additional individual wish lists. I have done it for now, and I want you to look at the big picture. This rule and this bill takes the fiscally responsible approach of paying for the tax cuts and putting us on that downward glide path toward a balanced budget which is so terribly, terribly important to the future generations of this country.

I urge every Member to vote ''yes'' on the rule and to vote ''yes'' on this bill. The American people want it.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

CORRECTION OF VOTES IN COMMITTEE REPORT

The Rules Committee's report, House Report 104–100 on H. Res. 128, the rule for the consideration of H.R. 1215, the ''Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995,'' contains an erroneously reported rollcall vote due to a typographical error during the printing process. The vote was correctly reported in the original report filed with the Clerk.

Below is a correct version of that vote as contained in the Rules Committee report as filed with the House. The amendment number referred to in the motion is to an amendment filed with the Rules Committee—a summary of which are contained following the listing of votes in the committee report.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 122

Date: April 4, 1995.

Measure: Rule for the consideration of H.R. 1215, Contract With America Tax Relief Act.

Motion By: Mr. Moakley.

Summary of Motion: Allow a division of the question and a separate vote on Titles II and V (H.R. 1215), the senior citizen equity provisions.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,[1] 103D CONGRESS VERSUS 104TH CONGRESS

[As of April 4, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open [2]	46	44	21	75
Modified Closed [3]	49	47	7	25
Closed [4]	9	9	0	0
Totals:	104	100	28	100

[1] This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

[2] An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

[3] A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

[4] A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of April 4, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350–71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255–172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229–100; A: 227–127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230–191; A: 229–188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282–144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252–175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253–165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of April 4, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271–151 (3/1/95).
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257–155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/6/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234–191 A: 247–181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	A: 242–190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217–211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423–1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION—BIG SPENDER OF 1993

Alabama: Rep. Tom Bevill, Rep. Robert E. Cramer, Rep. Earl F. Hilliard.

Arizona: Rep. Karan English, Rep. Ed Pastor.

Arkansas: Sen. Dale Bumpers, Sen. David Pryor, Rep. Ray Thornton.

California: Sen. Barbara Boxer, Sen. Dianne Feinstein, Rep. Xavier Becerra, Rep. Howard L. Berman, Rep. George E. Brown, Rep. Ronald V. Dellums, Rep. Julian C. Dixon, Rep. Don Edwards, Rep. Anna G. Eshoo, Rep. Sam Farr, Rep. Vic Fazio, Rep. Bob Filner, Rep. Dan Hamburg, Rep. Jane Harman, Rep. Tom Lantos, Rep. Matthew G. Martinez, Rep. Robert T. Matsui, Rep. George Miller, Rep. Norman Y. Mineta, Rep. Nancy Pelosi, Rep. Lucille Roybal-Allard, Rep. Pete Stark, Rep. Esteban E. Torres, Rep. Walter R. Tucker, Rep. Maxine Waters, Rep. Henry A. Waxman, Rep. Lynn Woolsey.

Colorado: Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Rep. David E. Skaggs.

Connecticut: Sen. Christopher J. Dodd, Rep. Rosa DeLauro, Rep. Sam Gejdenson, Rep. Barbara B. Kennelly.

Delaware: Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr.

Florida: Sen. Bob Graham, Rep. Jim Bacchus, Rep. Corrine Brown, Rep. Peter Deutsch, Rep. Sam M. Gibbons, Rep. Alcee L. Hastings, Rep. Harry A. Johnston, Rep. Carrie P. Meek, Rep. Pete Peterson, Rep. Karen L. Thurmon.

Georgia: Rep. Sanford D. Bishop, Rep. George Darden, Rep. John Lewis, Rep. Cynthia A. McKinney.

Hawaii: Sen. Daniel K. Akaka, Sen. Daniel K. Inouye, Rep. Neil Abercrombie, Rep. Patsy T. Mink.

Illinois: Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun, Sen. Paul Simon, Rep. Cardiss Collins, Rep. Richard J. Durbin, Rep. Lane Evans, Rep. Luis V. Gutierrez, Rep. Mel Reynolds, Rep. Dan Rostenkowski, Rep. Bobby L. Rush, Rep. George E. Sangmeister, Rep. Sidney R. Yates.

Indiana: Rep. Frank McCloskey, Rep. Peter J. Visclosky.

Iowa: Sen. Tom Harkin, Rep. Neal Smith.

Kansas: Rep. Dan Glickman.

Kentucky: Sen. Wendell H. Ford, Rep. Romano L. Mazzoli.

Louisiana: Sen. John B. Breaux, Sen. J. Bennett Johnston, Rep. Cleo Fields, Rep. William J. Jefferson.

Maine: Sen. George J. Mitchell, Rep. Thomas H. Andrews.

Maryland: Sen. Barbara A. Mikulski, Sen. Paul S. Sarbanes, Rep. Benjamin L. Cardin, Rep. Steny H. Hoyer, Rep. Kweisi Mfume, Rep. Albert R. Wynn.

Massachusetts: Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, Sen. John Kerry, Rep. Barney Frank, Rep. Joseph P. Kennedy, Rep. Edward J. Markey, Rep. Joe Moakley, Rep. Richard E. Neal, Rep. John W. Olver, Rep. Gerry E. Studds.

Michigan: Sen. Carl Levin, Sen. Donald W. Riegle Jr., Rep. David E. Bonior, Rep. Bob Carr, Rep. Barbara-Rose Collins, Rep. John Conyers, Rep. John D. Dingell, Rep. William D. Ford, Rep. Dale E. Kildee, Rep. Sander M. Levin.

Minnesota: Sen. Paul Wellstone, Rep. James L. Oberstar, Rep. Martin Olav Sabo, Rep. Bruce F. Vento.

Mississippi: Rep. G.V. Montgomery, Rep. Bennie Thompson, Rep. Jamie L. Whitten.

Missouri: Rep. William L. Clay, Rep. Richard A. Gephardt, Rep. Ike Skelton, Rep. Harold L. Volkmer, Rep. Alan Wheat.

Montana: Sen. Max Baucus, Rep. Pat Williams.

Nevada: Sen. Harry Reid, Rep. James Bilbray.

New Jersey: Rep. Robert Menendez, Rep. Donald M. Payne, Rep. Robert G. Torricelli.

New Mexico: Rep. Bill Richardson.

New York: Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Rep. Gary L. Ackerman, Rep. Eliot L. Engel, Rep. Floyd H. Flake, Rep. Maurice D. Hinchey, Rep. George J. Hochbrueckner, Rep. Nita M. Lowey, Rep. Thomas J. Manton, Rep. Michael R. McNulty, Rep. Jerrold Nadler, Rep. Major R. Owens, Rep. Charles B. Rangel, Rep. Charles E. Schumer, Rep. Jose E. Serrano, Rep. Louise M. Slaughter, Rep. Edolphus Towns, Rep. Nydia M. Velazquez.

North Carolina: Rep. Evan Clayton, Rep. W.G. Hefner, Rep. Stephen L. Neal, Rep. David Price, Rep. Charlie Rose, Rep. Melvin Watt.

Ohio: Sen. John Glenn, Sen. Howard M. Metzenbaum, Rep. Douglas Applegate, Rep. Sherrod Brown, Rep. Tony P. Hall, Rep. Tom Sawyer, Rep. Louis Stokes, Rep. Ted Strickland.

Oklahoma: Rep. Mike Synar.

Oregon: Rep. Elizabeth Furse, Rep. Mike Kopetski, Rep. Ron Wyden.

Pennsylvania: Sen. Harris Wofford, Rep. Lucien E. Blackwell, Rep. Robert A. Borski, Rep. William J. Coyne, Rep. Thomas M. Foglietta, Rep. Paul E. Kanjorski, Rep. John P. Murtha.

Rhode Island: Sen. Claiborne Pell, Rep. Jack Reed.

South Carolina: Sen. Ernest F. Hollings, Rep. James E. Clyburn, Rep. Butler Derrick, Rep. John M. Spratt.

South Dakota: Sen. Tom Daschle.

Tennessee: Sen. Harlan Mathews, Sen. Jim Sasser, Rep. Harold E. Ford.

Texas: Rep. Jack Brooks, Rep. John Bryant, Rep. Jim Chapman, Rep. Ronald D. Coleman, Rep. E. de la Garza, Rep. Martin Frost, Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez, Rep. Gene Green, Rep. Eddie Bernice Johnson, Rep. Solomon P. Ortiz, Rep. J.J. Pickle, Rep. Frank Tejeda, Rep. Craig Washington, Rep. Charles Wilson.

Vermont: Sen. Patrick J. Leahy, Rep. Bernard Sanders.

Virginia: Rep. Rick Boucher, Rep. Leslie L. Byrne, Rep. James P. Moran, Rep. Robert C. Scott.

Washington: Sen. Patty Murray, Rep. Norm Dicks, Rep. Mike Kreidler, Rep. Jim McDermott, Rep. Al Swift, Rep. Jolene Unsoeld.

West Virginia: Sen. Robert C. Byrd, Sen. John D. Rockefeller IV, Rep. Alan B. Mollohan, Rep. Nick J. Rahall, Rep. Bob Wise.

Wisconsin: Rep. Gerald D. Kleczka, Rep. David R. Obey.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION

Name	PA	Sta	Dist	Grade	Percent score	Rank	Percent attend.	381839 All Avg. Support 382510 Support	830962 0.45922 Eligibility 832963 Eligibility	LDR	Budget	Approp.	Region
Long J (IN)	D	IN	4	D	42	219	100.00	845	2028				2
Cox J (IL)	D	IL	16	D	42	220	100.00	843	2028				2
Stallings R (ID)	D	ID	2	D	41	221	90.53	761	1836				1
Johnston H (FL)	D	FL	14	D	41	222	98.47	826	1997				3
Mazzoli R (KY)	D	KY	3	D	41	223	100.00	838	2028	d			3
Larocco L (ID)	D	ID	1	D	41	224	99.51	831	2018				1
Visclosky P (IN)	D	IN	1	D	41	225	100.00	832	2028			1	2
Lloyd M (TN)	D	TN	3	D	41	226	97.83	810	1984				3
Lancaster H (NC)	D	NC	3	D	41	227	99.90	823	2026				3
Huckaby J (LA)	D	LA	5	D	41	228	86.09	709	1746		1		3
Peterson C (MN)	D	MN	7	D	40	229	99.46	811	2017				2
Andrews M (TX)	D	TX	25	D	40	230	99.95	815	2027				3
Schroeder P (CO)	D	CO	1	D	40	231	99.61	802	2020	d			1
Thomas L (GA)	D	GA	1	D	39	232	83.04	665	1684			1	3
Brewster B (OK)	D	OK	3	D	39	233	99.85	799	2025				3
Cramer B (AL)	D	AL	5	D	39	234	99.56	795	2019				3
Hoagland P (NE)	D	NE	2	D	39	235	99.75	796	2023				2
Beilenson A (CA)	D	CA	23	D	39	236	92.55	737	1877		1		1
Derrick B (SC)	D	SC	3	D	39	237	99.80	790	2024	d			3

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION—Continued

Name	PA	Sta	Dist	Grade	Percent score	Rank	Percent attend.	381839 All Avg. Support 382510 Support	830962 0.45922 Eligibility 832963 Eligibility	LDR	Budget	Approp.	Region
Pickett O (VA)	D	VA	2	D	39	238	99.36	786	2015				3
Spratt J (SC)	D	SC	5	D	39	239	100.00	789	2028		1		3
Early J (MA)	D	MA	3	D	39	241	90.34	707	1832			1	4
McMillen T (MD)	D	MD	4	D	38	242	100.00	778	2028				4
Kennedy J (MA)	D	MA	8	D	38	243	95.27	741	1932				4
Gordon B (TN)	D	TN	6	D	38	244	93.93	725	1905	d			3
Panetta L (CA)	D	CA	16	D	38	245	98.67	756	2001	d	1		1
Browder G (AL)	D	AL	3	D	37	246	99.11	753	2010				3
Bacchus J (FL)	D	FL	11	D	37	247	99.41	750	2016				3
Pease D (OH)	D	OH	13	D	37	247	99.41	750	2016		1		2
Bilbray J (NV)	D	NV	1	D	37	249	98.52	743	1998				1
Bruce T (IL)	D	IL	19	D	37	250	99.56	737	2019				2
Atkins C (MA)	D	MA	5	D	36	251	96.25	711	1952			1	4
Skelton I (MO)	D	MO	4	D	36	252	94.63	692	1919				2
DeFazio P (OR)	D	OR	4	D	36	253	97.24	702	1972				1
Sangmeister G (IL)	D	IL	4	D	36	254	98.22	709	1992				2
Johnson T (SD)	D	SD	0	D	36	255	99.70	719	2022				2
Staggers H (WV)	D	WV	2	D	35	256	89.45	643	1814				4
Bryant J (TX)	D	TX	5	D	35	257	95.32	685	1933		1		3
Carr B (MI)	D	MI	6	D	35	258	95.81	688	1943			1	2
Jenkins E (GA)	D	GA	9	D	35	259	95.27	684	1932				3
Darden G (GA)	D	GA	7	D	35	260	98.13	700	1990				3
Vento B (MN)	D	MN	4	D	35	261	99.61	700	2020				2
Espy M (MS)	D	MS	2	D	34	262	96.99	676	1967		1		3
Eckart D (OH)	D	OH	11	D	34	263	96.60	668	1959	d			2
Costello J (IL)	D	IL	21	D	34	264	94.23	650	1911				3
Murphy A (PA)	D	PA	22	F	33	266	93.74	633	1901				4
Hall T (OH)	D	OH	3	F	33	267	99.21	667	2012				2
Andrews R (NJ)	D	NJ	1	F	33	268	97.68	653	1981				4
Hatcher C (GA)	D	GA	2	F	33	269	62.72	419	1272				3
Volkmer H (MO)	D	MO	9	F	33	270	98.96	660	2007				2
Price D (NC)	D	NC	4	F	33	271	99.70	664	2022			1	3
McCloskey F (IN)	D	IN	8	F	33	272	98.67	656	2001				2
Stark P (CA)	D	CA	9	F	33	273	92.26	612	1871				1
Schumer C (NY)	D	NY	10	F	32	274	95.51	627	1937				4
Aucoin L (OR)	D	OR	1	F	32	275	86.19	565	1748			1	1
Peterson P (FL)	D	FL	2	F	32	276	97.14	634	1970				3
Russo M (IL)	D	IL	3	F	32	277	74.36	485	1508	d			2
Applegate (OH)	D	OH	18	F	32	278	98.22	634	1992				2
Synar M (OK)	D	OK	2	F	31	279	98.42	626	1996	d			3
Wilson C (TX)	D	TX	2	F	31	280	95.61	608	1939			1	3
Wyden R (OR)	D	OR	3	F	31	281	99.31	631	2014				1
Pickle J (TX)	D	TX	10	F	31	282	97.78	621	1983				3
Olin J (VA)	D	VA	6	F	31	283	88.56	561	1796				3
Miller G (CA)	D	CA	7	F	31	284	93.64	592	1899	d	1		1
Studds G (MA)	D	MA	10	F	31	285	98.92	622	2006				4
Jones B (GA)	D	GA	4	F	31	286	78.16	491	1585				3
Lipinski W (IL)	D	IL	5	F	31	287	86.93	545	1763				2
Durbin R (IL)	D	IL	20	F	31	288	99.90	626	2026		1	1	2
Oberstar J (MN)	D	MN	8	F	31	289	99.95	626	2027		1		2
McDermott J (WA)	D	WA	7	F	31	290	99.95	621	2027				1
Horn J (MO)	D	MO	2	F	31	291	100.00	621	2028				2
Slaughter L (NY)	D	NY	30	F	31	292	99.16	614	2011		1		4
Conyers J (MI)	D	MI	1	F	30	293	83.43	514	1692				2
Yates S (IL)	D	IL	9	F	30	294	85.31	525	1730			1	2
Kostmayer P (PA)	D	PA	8	F	30	295	99.80	614	2024	d			4
Ford H (TN)	D	TN	9	F	30	296	84.27	518	1709				3
Gejdenson S (CT)	D	CT	2	F	30	297	99.56	611	2019	d			4
Andrews T (ME)	D	ME	1	F	30	298	98.67	603	2001				4
Hayes C (IL)	D	IL	1	F	30	299	98.32	598	1994				2
Williams P (MT)	D	MT	1	F	30	300	92.70	556	1880	d			1
Chapman J (TX)	D	TX	1	F	30	301	98.62	590	2000			1	3
Sawyer T (OH)	D	OH	14	F	29	302	99.90	597	2026				2
Hamilton L (IN)	D	IN	9	F	29	303	100.00	597	2028				2
Levin S (MI)	D	MI	17	F	29	304	99.90	596	2026				2
Leighan E (OH)	D	OH	19	F	29	305	88.66	528	1798				2
Richardson B (NM)	D	NM	3	F	29	306	96.89	576	1965				1
Kennelly B (CT)	D	CT	1	F	29	307	99.65	590	2021	d			4
Frank B (MA)	D	MA	4	F	29	308	99.01	583	2008		1		4
Mfume K (MD)	D	MD	7	F	29	309	98.62	579	2000				4
Clay W. (MO)	D	MO	1	F	29	310	97.63	573	1980				2
SABO M (MN)	D	MN	5	F	29	311	99.21	581	2012	d	1	1	2
Owens M (NY)	D	NY	12	F	29	312	95.66	555	1940				4
Wise B (WV)	D	WV	3	F	28	313	95.41	551	1935		1		4
Tallon R (SC)	D	SC	6	F	28	314	90.24	521	1830				3
Reed J (RI)	D	RI	2	F	28	315	100.00	576	2028				4
Skaggs D (CO)	D	CO	2	F	28	316	100.00	576	2028			1	1
Kildee D (MI)	D	MI	7	F	28	317	100.00	570	2028		1		2
Laface J (NY)	D	NY	32	F	28	318	96.94	552	1966				4
Yatron G (PA)	D	PA	6	F	28	319	89.55	509	1816				4
Gibbons S (FL)	D	FL	7	F	28	320	96.65	549	1960				3
Washington C (TX)	D	TX	18	F	28	321	97.73	555	1982				3
Dellums R (CA)	D	CA	8	F	28	322	99.31	562	2014				1
Weiss T (NY)	D	NY	17	F	28	323	84.52	478	1714				4
Solarz S (NY)	D	NY	13	F	28	324	81.95	461	1662				4
Olver J (MA)	D	MA	1	F	28	325	99.41	557	2016				4
Wolpe H (MI)	D	MI	3	F	28	326	92.70	517	1880				2
Payne D (NJ)	D	NJ	10	F	27	327	94.77	527	1922				4
Lantos T (CA)	D	CA	11	F	27	328	96.45	532	1956				1
Guarini F (NJ)	D	NJ	14	F	27	329	95.07	524	1928		1		4
Ortiz S (TX)	D	TX	27	F	27	330	94.58	521	1918				3
Nowark H (NY)	D	NY	33	F	27	331	94.97	520	1926				4
Anderson G (CA)	D	CA	32	F	27	332	94.53	512	1917				1
Flake F (NY)	D	NY	6	F	27	333	90.93	491	1844				4
Serrano J (NY)	D	NY	18	F	27	334	97.14	524	1970				4
Swift A (WA)	D	WA	2	F	27	335	98.96	533	2007	d			1
Lehman R (CA)	D	CA	18	F	26	336	87.72	471	1779			1	1
Blackwell L (PA)	D	PA	2	F	26	337	97.24	516	1972				4
Markey E (MA)	D	MA	7	F	26	338	95.32	503	1933				4
Lowey N (NY)	D	NY	20	F	26	339	100.00	526	2028				4
Rangel C (NY)	D	NY	16	F	26	340	98.67	516	2001	d			4
Foglietta T (PA)	D	PA	1	F	26	341	89.50	467	1815				4
Collins B (MI)	D	MI	13	F	26	342	93.00	484	1886				2
Evans L (IL)	D	IL	17	F	26	343	99.95	519	2027				2
Edwards D (CA)	D	CA	10	F	26	344	97.53	505	1978				1
Collins C (IL)	D	IL	7	F	25	345	82.84	425	1680				2
Wheat A (MO)	D	MO	5	F	25	346	99.65	511	2021	d			2
Savage G (IL)	D	IL	2	F	25	347	82.79	423	1679				2

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION—Continued

Name	PA	Sta	Dist	Grade	Percent score	Rank	Percent attend.	381839 All Avg. Support 382510 Support	830962 0.45922 Eligibility 832963 Eligibility	LDR	Budget	Approp.	Region
Waxman H (CA)	D	CA	24	F	25	348	97.88	499	1985	.....	.....	.....	1
Scheuer J (NY)	D	NY	8	F	25	349	91.91	465	1864	.....	.....	.....	4
Moakley J (MA)	D	MA	4	F	25	350	92.85	469	1883	d	.....	.....	4
Torricelli R (NJ)	D	NJ	9	F	25	351	97.29	491	1973	.....	.....	.....	4
Unsoeld J (WA)	D	WA	3	F	25	352	92.80	468	1882	.....	.....	.....	1
Neal R (MA)	D	MA	2	F	25	353	98.13	492	1990	.....	.....	.....	4
Kanjorski P (PA)	D	PA	11	F	25	354	100.00	500	2028	.....	.....	.....	4
Hoyer S (MD)	D	MD	5	F	25	355	99.06	495	2009	d	.....	1	4
Delauro R (CT)	D	CT	3	F	25	356	100.00	499	2028	.....	.....	.....	4
Kleczka G (WI)	D	WI	4	F	25	357	98.92	493	2006	d	.....	.....	2
Matsui R (CA)	D	CA	3	F	25	358	94.92	472	1925	d	1	.....	1
Hefner W (NC)	D	NC	8	F	24	359	53.70	266	1089	d	.....	1	3
Stokes L (OH)	D	OH	21	F	24	360	98.32	485	1994	.....	.....	1	2
Pelosi N (CA)	D	CA	5	F	24	361	89.74	442	1820	.....	.....	1	1
Ford W (MI)	D	MI	15	F	24	362	94.28	464	1912	.....	.....	.....	2
Nagle D (IA)	D	IA	3	F	24	363	96.25	471	1952	.....	.....	.....	2
Berman H (CA)	D	CA	26	F	24	364	98.92	483	2006	.....	1	.....	1
Jones W (NC)	D	NC	1	F	24	365	76.97	373	1561	.....	.....	.....	3
Obey D (WI)	D	WI	7	F	24	366	99.75	481	2023	d	.....	1	2
Frost M (TX)	D	TX	24	F	24	367	96.45	463	1956	d	.....	.....	3
McHugh M (NY)	D	NY	28	F	24	368	99.06	474	2009	d	.....	1	4
Abercrombie N (HI)	D	HI	1	F	23	369	97.78	466	1983	.....	.....	.....	1
Pastor E (AZ)	D	AZ	2	F	23	370	96.60	458	1959	.....	.....	.....	1
Mavroules N (MA)	D	MA	6	F	23	371	96.84	443	1964	.....	.....	.....	4
Waters M (CA)	D	CA	29	F	22	372	94.72	432	1921	.....	.....	.....	1
De la Garza E (TX)	D	TX	15	F	22	373	93.44	423	1895	.....	.....	.....	3
Smith L (FL)	D	FL	16	F	22	374	90.19	408	1829	d	.....	1	3
Moran J (VA)	D	VA	8	F	22	375	91.67	414	1859	.....	.....	.....	3
Traficant J (OH)	D	OH	17	F	22	376	99.31	447	2014	.....	.....	.....	2
Ackerman G (NY)	D	NY	7	F	22	377	82.79	372	1679	.....	.....	.....	4
Koltr J (PA)	D	PA	4	F	22	378	74.41	331	1509	.....	.....	.....	4
Lewis J (GA)	D	GA	5	F	22	379	94.87	418	1924	d	.....	.....	3
Towns E (NY)	D	NY	11	F	22	380	83.33	365	1690	.....	.....	.....	4
Mink P (HI)	D	HI	2	F	21	381	95.32	415	1933	.....	.....	.....	1
Mrazek R (NY)	D	NY	3	F	21	382	89.64	386	1818	.....	.....	1	4
Coyne W (PA)	D	PA	14	F	21	383	99.80	429	2024	.....	.....	.....	4
Boxer B (CA)	D	CA	6	F	21	384	60.65	260	1230	.....	.....	.....	1
Downey T (NY)	D	NY	2	F	21	385	99.46	425	2017	.....	.....	.....	4
Cardin B (MD)	D	MD	3	F	21	386	95.56	407	1938	.....	.....	.....	4
Roybal E (CA)	D	CA	25	F	20	387	99.56	413	2019	.....	.....	1	1
Bevill T (AL)	D	AL	4	F	20	388	95.81	396	1943	d	.....	1	3
Whitten J (MS)	D	MS	1	F	20	389	68.34	277	1386	d	.....	1	3
Rahall N (WV)	D	WV	4	F	20	390	98.42	395	1996	.....	.....	.....	4
Natcher W (KY)	D	KY	2	F	20	391	100.00	401	2028	.....	.....	1	3
Mineta N (CA)	D	CA	13	F	20	392	99.51	398	2018	d	.....	.....	1
Boucher R (VA)	D	VA	9	F	20	393	99.31	393	2014	.....	.....	.....	3
Engel E (NY)	D	NY	19	F	19	394	94.03	366	1907	.....	.....	.....	4
Dwyer B (NJ)	D	NJ	6	F	19	395	85.06	331	1725	.....	1	1	4
Gaydos J (PA)	D	PA	20	F	19	396	79.44	309	1611	.....	.....	.....	4
Kaptur M (OH)	D	OH	9	F	19	397	96.20	373	1951	.....	.....	1	2
Kopetski M (OR)	D	OR	5	F	19	398	98.37	379	1995	.....	.....	.....	1
Martinez M (CA)	D	CA	30	F	19	399	97.19	374	1971	.....	.....	.....	1
Rostenkowski D (IL)	D	IL	8	F	19	400	89.99	344	1825	d	.....	.....	2
Dicks N (WA)	D	WA	6	F	19	401	96.01	366	1947	.....	.....	1	1
Manton T (NY)	D	NY	9	F	19	402	92.46	352	1875	d	.....	.....	4
Brown G (CA)	D	CA	36	F	18	403	89.40	333	1813	.....	.....	.....	1
Hochbrueckner G (NY)	D	NY	1	F	18	404	99.85	371	2025	.....	.....	.....	4
Dingell J (MI)	D	MI	16	F	18	405	88.66	328	1798	.....	.....	.....	2
Jefferson W (LA)	D	LA	2	F	18	406	86.88	321	1762	.....	.....	.....	3
Traxler B (MI)	D	MI	8	F	18	407	50.30	182	1020	.....	.....	1	2
McNulty M (NY)	D	NY	23	F	18	408	98.96	356	3007	.....	.....	.....	4
Perkins C (KY)	D	KY	7	F	18	409	87.92	316	1783	.....	.....	.....	3
Annunzio F (IL)	D	IL	11	F	18	410	87.38	314	1772	.....	.....	.....	4
Brooks J (TX)	D	TX	9	F	17	411	89.69	318	1819	.....	.....	.....	3
Levine M (CA)	D	CA	27	F	17	412	58.68	205	1190	.....	.....	.....	1
Bustamante A (TX)	D	TX	23	F	17	413	88.12	303	1787	d	.....	.....	3
Lehman W (FL)	D	FL	17	F	17	414	75.94	260	1540	.....	.....	.....	3
Aspin L (WI)	D	WI	1	F	17	415	97.73	329	1982	.....	.....	.....	2
Dymally M (CA)	D	CA	31	F	16	416	52.22	174	1059	.....	.....	.....	1
Rose C (NC)	D	NC	7	F	16	417	99.41	325	2016	.....	.....	.....	3
Smith N (IA)	D	IA	4	F	16	418	93.89	306	1904	.....	.....	1	3
Gephardt R (MO)	D	MO	3	F	16	419	90.73	295	1840	d	1	.....	2
Borski R (PA)	D	PA	3	F	16	420	98.62	320	2000	.....	.....	.....	4
Murtha J (PA)	D	PA	12	F	15	421	97.58	294	1979	d	.....	1	4
Bonior D (MI)	D	MI	12	F	15	422	82.30	247	1669	d	.....	.....	2
Fazio V (CA)	D	CA	4	F	15	423	98.37	292	1995	d	.....	1	1
Dixon J (CA)	D	CA	28	F	15	424	98.03	289	1988	.....	.....	1	1
Hertel D (MI)	D	MI	14	F	14	425	92.16	256	1869	.....	.....	.....	2
Mollohan A (WV)	D	WV	1	F	14	426	97.44	269	1976	.....	.....	1	4
Coleman R (TX)	D	TX	16	F	13	427	97.53	264	1978	.....	.....	.....	3
Gonzalez H (TX)	D	TX	20	F	13	428	100.00	266	2028	.....	.....	.....	3
Thornton R (AR)	D	AR	2	F	13	429	97.73	259	1982	d	.....	.....	3
Alexander B (AR)	D	AR	1	F	13	430	78.85	201	1599	.....	.....	1	3
Roe R (NJ)	D	NJ	8	F	12	431	87.23	218	1769	.....	.....	.....	4
Oakar M (OH)	D	OH	20	F	12	432	84.02	198	1704	.....	.....	.....	2

[From the National Taxpayers Union, Washington, DC]

BIGGEST SPENDERS—102D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION 1991

Alabama: Rep. Tom Bevill, Rep. Glen Browder, Rep. Bud Cramer, Rep. Claude Harris, Sen. Howell Heflin, Sen. Richard C. Shelby.

Arkansas: Rep. Bill Alexander, Rep. Beryl F. Anthony, Jr., Rep. Ray Thornton.

California: Rep. Glenn M. Anderson, Rep. Howard L. Berman, Rep. Barbara Boxer, Rep. George E. Brown, Jr., Rep. Julian C. Dixon, Rep. Calvin Dooley, Rep. Don Edwards, Rep. Vic Fazio, Rep. Tom Lantos, Rep. Richard H. Lehman, Rep. Mel Levine, Rep. Matthew G. Martinez, Rep. Robert T. Matsui, Rep. Norman Y. Mineta, Rep. Leon E. Panetta, Rep. Nancy Pelosi, Rep. Edward R. Roybal, Rep. Esteban Edward Torres, Rep. Henry A. Waxman.

Colorado: Rep. Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Rep. David E. Skaggs.

Connecticut: Rep. Rosa DeLauro, Sen. Christopher Dodd, Rep. Sam Gejdenson, Rep. Barbara B. Kennelly, Sen. Joseph Lieberman.

Florida: Rep. Jim Bacchus, Rep. Dante B. Fascell, Rep. Sam M. Gibbons, Rep. William Lehman, Rep. Douglas Peterson, Rep. Lawrence J. Smith.

Georgia: Rep. George Darden, Rep. Charles F. Hatcher, Rep. Ed Jenkins, Rep. Ben Jones, Rep. John Lewis, Rep. J. Roy Rowland, Rep. Lindsay Thomas.

Hawaii: Rep. Neil Abercrombie, Sen. Daniel Akaka, Sen. Daniel Inouye, Rep. Patsy T. Mink.

Idaho: Rep. Larry LaRocco, Rep. Richard H. Stallings.

Illinois: Rep. Frank Annunzio, Rep. John W. Cox, Jr., Rep. Dan Rostenkowski.

Indiana: Rep. Jim Jontz, Rep. Frank McCloskey.

Iowa: Rep. David R. Nagle, Rep. Neal Smith.

Kentucky: Rep. Romano L. Mazzoli, Rep. William H. Natcher, Rep. Carl C. Perkins.

Louisiana: Sen. John Breaux, Rep. William J. Jefferson.

Maryland: Rep. Benjamin L. Cardin, Rep. Steny H. Hoyer, Rep. Tom McMillen, Sen. Paul Sarbanes.

Massachusetts: Rep. Chester G. Atkins, Rep. Barney Frank, Rep. Joseph P. Kennedy II, Rep. Edward J. Markey, Rep. Nicholas Mavroules, Rep. John Joseph Moakley, Rep. Richard E. Neal, Rep. John W. Olver.

Michigan: Rep. David E. Bonior, Rep. Bob Carr, Rep. Barbara-Rose Collins, Rep. John D. Dingell, Rep. Dennis M. Hertel, Rep. Dale E. Kildee, Rep. Sander M. Levin, Rep. Bob Traxler.

Minnesota: Rep. Martin Olav Sabo, Rep. Bruce F. Vento.

Mississippi: Rep. Mike Espy, Rep. Jamie L. Whitten.

Missouri: Rep. Richard A. Gephardt, Rep. Joan Kelly Ham, Rep. Alan Wheat.

Nebraska: Rep. Peter Hoagland.

Nevada: Rep. James H. Bilbray, Sen. Richard H. Bryan, Sen. Harry Reid.

New Jersey: Rep. Bernard J. Dwyer, Rep. Robert A. Roe, Rep. Robert G. Torricelli.

New Mexico: Rep. Bill Richardson, Sen. Jeff Bingaman.

New York: Rep. Gary L. Ackerman, Rep. Sherwood L. Boehlert, Sen. Alfonse D'Amato, Rep. Thomas J. Downey, Rep. Eliot L. Engel, Rep. Benjamin A. Gilman, Rep. George J. Hochbrueckner, Rep. Frank Horton, Rep. John J. LaFalce, Rep. Nita M. Lowey, Rep. Thomas J. Manton, Rep. Matthew F. McHugh, Rep. Michael R. McNulty, Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Rep. Robert J. Mrazek, Rep. Charles B. Rangel, Rep. Charles E. Schumer, Rep. José E. Serrano, Rep. Louise M. Slaughter, Rep. Stephen J. Solarz.

North Carolina: Rep. W.G. (Bill) Hefner, Rep. Walter B. Jones, Rep. H. Martin Lancaster, Rep. David E. Price, Rep. Charlie Rose.

North Dakota: Sen. Quentin Burdick.

Ohio: Rep. Edward F. Feighan, Rep. Tony P. Hall, Rep. Mary Rose Oakar, Rep. Thomas C. Sawyer.

Oklahoma: Sen. David L. Boren, Rep. Bill Brewster.

Oregon: Rep. Les AuCoin, Rep. Mike Kopetski, Sen. Bob Packwood, Rep. Ron Wyden.

Pennsylvania: Rep. Robert A. Borski, Rep. William J. Coyne, Rep. Thomas M. Foglietta, Rep. Joseph M. Gaydos, Sen. Arlen Specter, Sen. Harris Wofford, Rep. Joe Kolter, Rep. Peter H. Kostmayer, Rep. John P. Murtha, Rep. Gus Yatron.

South Carolina: Rep. Butler Derrick, Rep. John M. Spratt, Jr.

Tennessee: Rep. Bob Clement, Rep. Harold E. Ford, Rep. Bart Gordon, Sen. Al Gore, Rep. Marilyn Lloyd.

Texas: Sen. Lloyd Bentsen, Rep. Jack Brooks, Rep. John Bryant, Rep. Albert G. Bustamante, Rep. Jim Chapman, Rep. Ronald D. Coleman, Rep. E de la Garza, Rep. Chet Edwards, Rep. Martin Frost, Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez, Rep. Solomon P. Ortiz, Rep. J.J. Pickle, Rep. Charles Wilson.

Utah: Rep. Wayne Owens.

Virginia: Rep. Rick Boucher, Rep. James P. Moran, Rep. Owen B. Pickett, Sen. Charles Robb, Rep. Norman Sisisky.

Washington: Rep. Norman D. Dicks, Rep. Jim McDermott, Rep. Al Swift, Rep. Jolene Unsoeld.

West Virginia: Rep. Alan B. Mollohan, Rep. Bob Wise.

Wisconsin: Rep. Les Aspin, Rep. Gerald D. Kleczka.

[From the National Taxpayers Union, Washington, DC]

BOMBS OF 1990

The number one congressional song for big spenders in 1990 ''Hey, Big Spender.''

Alabama: Sen. Howell T. Heflin, Sen. Richard C. Shelby, Rep. Glen Browder, Rep. Tom Bevill, Rep. Ronnie Flippo, Rep. Claude Harris.

Alaska: Sen. Ted Stevens.

Arizona: Sen. Dennis DeConcini, Rep. Morris K. Udall.

Arkansas: Rep. Bill Alexander, Rep. Beryl F. Anthony, Jr.

California: Sen. Alan Cranston, Rep. Douglas H. Bosco, Rep. Robert T. Matsui, Rep. Vic Fazio, Rep. Nancy Pelosi, Rep. Barbara Boxer, Rep. Don Edwards, Rep. Tom Lantos, Rep. Norman Y. Mineta, Rep. Leon E. Panetta, Rep. Richard H. Lehman, Rep. Henry A. Waxman, Rep. Edward R. Roybal, Rep. Howard L. Berman, Rep. Mel Levine, Rep. Julian C. Dixon, Rep. Augustus F. Hawkins, Rep. Matthew G. Martinez, Rep. Mervyn M. Dymally, Rep. Glenn M. Anderson, Rep. Esteban Edward Torres, Rep. George E. Brown, Jr.

Colorado: Rep. David E. Skaggs.

Connecticut: Rep. Barbara B. Kennelly, Rep. Sam Gejdenson.

Florida: Sen. Bob Graham, Rep. Bill Nelson, Rep. Lawrence J. Smith, Rep. William Lehman, Rep. Dante B. Fascell.

Georgia: Sen. Wyche Fowler, Jr., Rep. Lindsay Thomas, Rep. Charles F. Hatcher, Rep. Ben Jones, Rep. John Lewis, Rep. George (Buddy) Darden, Rep. J. Roy Rowland.

Hawaii: Sen. Daniel K. Inouye, Sen. Daniel K. Akaka.

Illinois: Rep. Charles A. Hayes, Rep. William O. Lipinski, Rep. Cardiss Collins, Rep. Dan Rostenkowski, Rep. Sidney R. Yates, Rep. Lane Evans, Rep. Terry L. Bruce, Rep. Richard J. Durbin, Rep. Jerry F. Costello.

Indiana: Rep. Peter J. Visclosky, Rep. Frank McCloskey.

Iowa: Rep. David R. Nagle, Rep. Neal Smith.

Kentucky: Sen. Wendell H. Ford, Rep. William H. Natcher, Rep. Romano L. Mazzoli, Rep. Carl C. Perkins.

Louisiana: Sen. John B. Breaux, Sen. J. Bennett Johnston, Rep. Lindy Boggs.

Maryland: Sen. Barbara A. Mikulski, Sen. Paul S. Sarbanes, Rep. Benjamin L. Cardin, Rep. Tom McMillen, Rep. Steny H. Hoyer.

Massachusetts: Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, Rep. Richard E. Neal, Rep. Barney Frank, Rep. Chester G. Atkins, Rep. Nicholas Mavroules, Rep. Edward J. Markey, Rep. Joseph P. Kennedy II, Rep. John Joseph Moakley, Rep. Gerry E. Studds.

Michigan: Rep. John Conyers, Jr., Rep. Howard Wolpe, Rep. Dale E. Kildee, Rep. Bob Traxler, Rep. Robert W. Davis, Rep. David E. Bonior, Rep. George W. Crockett, Jr., Rep. William D. Ford, Rep. John D. Dingell, Rep. Sander M. Levin.

Minnesota: Rep. Bruce F. Vento, Rep. Martin Olav Sabo, Rep. Gerry Sikorski, Rep. James L. Oberstar.

Mississippi: Rep. Jamie L. Whitten, Rep. Mike Espy, Rep. G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery.

Missouri: Rep. William L. (Bill) Clay, Rep. Richard A. Gephardt, Rep. Ike Skelton, Rep. Alan Wheat, Rep. Harold L. Volkmer.

Nebraska: Rep. Peter Hoagland.

Nevada: Rep. James H. Bilbray:

New Jersey: Rep. Bernard J. Dwyer, Rep. Robert A. Roe, Rep. Robert G. Torricelli, Rep. Donald Payne.

New Mexico: Sen. Jeff Bingaman, Rep. Bill Richardson.

New York: Rep. George J. Hochbrueckner, Rep. Robert J. Mrazek, Rep. Floyd H. Flake, Rep. Gary L. Ackerman, Rep. James H. Scheuer, Rep. Thomas J. Manton, Rep. Charles E. Schumer, Rep. Edolphus Towns, Rep. Major R. Owens, Rep. Stephen J. Solarz, Rep. Charles B. Rangel, Rep. Jose E. Serrano, Rep. Eliot L. Engel, Rep. Nita M. Lowey, Rep. Bejamin A. Gilman, Rep. Michael R. McNulty, Rep. Sherwood L. Boehlert, Rep. Matthew F. McHugh, Rep. Frank Horton, Rep. Louise M. Slaughter, Rep. Henry J. Nowak.

North Carolina: Sen. Terry Sanford, Rep. Walter B. Jones, Rep. H. Martin Lancaster, Rep. David E. Price, Rep. Charlie Rose, Rep. W.G. (Bill) Hefner.

North Dakota: Sen. Quentin N. Burdick.

Ohio: Sen. John Glenn, Rep. Thomas A. Luken, Rep. Marcy Kaptur, Rep. Thomas C. Sawyer, Rep. Edward F. Feighan, Rep. Mary Rose Oakar, Rep. Louis Stokes.

Oklahoma: Sen. David L. Boren, Rep. Mike Synar, Rep. Wes Watkins.

Oregon: Rep. Les AuCoin, Rep. Ron Wyden, Rep. Peter A. DeFazio.

Pennsylvania: Rep. Thoms M. Foglietta, Rep. William H. Gray III, Rep. Robert A. Borski, Rep. Peter H. Kostmayer, Rep. John P. Murtha, Rep. William J. Coyne.

South Carolina: Rep. Butler Derrick, Rep. John M. Spratt, Jr.

South Dakota: Rep. Tim Johnson.

Tennessee: Sen. Albert Gore, Jr., Rep. Marilyn Lloyd, Rep. Bob Clement, Rep. Bart Gordon, Rep. John Tanner, Rep. Harold E. Ford.

Texas: Sen. Lloyd Bentsen, Rep. Jim Chapman, Rep. Charles Wilson, Rep. Jack Brooks, Rep. J.J. Pickle, Rep. Marvin Leath, Rep. Pete Geren, Rep. E Kika de la Garza, Rep. Ronald D. Coleman, Rep. Craig A. Washington, Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez, Rep. Albert G. Bustamante, Rep. Martin Frost, Rep. Michael A. Andrews, Rep. Solomon P. Ortiz.

Vermont: Sen. Patrick J. Leahy, Rep. James M. Jeffords.

Virginia: Rep. Norman Sisisky, Rep. Lewis F. Payne, Jr., Rep. Rick Boucher.

Washington: Sen. Brock Adams, Rep. Al Swift, Rep. Jolene Unsoeld, Rep. Norman D. Dicks, Rep. Jim McDermott.

West Virginia: Rep. Alan B. Mollohan, Rep. Harley O. Staggers, Jr., Rep. Bob Wise.

Wisconsin: Rep. Les Aspin, Rep. Gerald D. Kleckzka, Rep. David Obey.

VOTE TALLY MEMBER REPORT SORTED BY NET SPENDING—SENATE

[What Members of Congress voted for in the 103d Congress (Figures in millions of dollars)]

Name, party, and state	Increases	Cuts	Net
1 Johnston, J. (D–LA)	127,123	−31,700	95,422
2 Bryan, R. (D–NV)	132,582	−44,342	88,240
3 Breaux, J. (D–LA)	130,572	−45,993	84,579
4 Daschle, T. (D–SD)	130,763	−46,354	84,409
5 Inouye, D. (D–HI)	130,702	−16,352	84,350
6 Moseley-Braun, C. (D–IL)	134,551	−50,324	84,229
7 Reid, H. (D–NV)	132,610	−48,449	84,161
8 Biden, J. (D–DE)	130,708	−46,815	83,893
9 Rockefeller, J. (D–WV)	130,488	−46,657	83,831
10 Mikulski, B. (D–MD)	128,823	−45,826	82,997
11 Akaka, D. (D–HI)	130,732	−47,884	82,848
12 Boxer, B. (D–CA)	136,389	−53,720	82,669
13 Wellstone, P. (D–MN)	135,793	−54,280	81,513
14 Riegle, D. (D–MI)	128,496	−47,037	81,459
15 Ford, W. (D–KY)	130,732	−49,714	81,018
16 Glenn, J. (D–OH)	127,262	−46,343	80,919
17 Sarbanes, P. (D–MD)	127,332	−47,571	79,761
18 Murray, P. (D–WA)	127,332	−48,003	79,329
19 Dodd, C. (D–CT)	126,256	−47,002	79,254
20 Feinstein, D. (D–CA)	127,521	−50,872	76,649
21 Kennedy, E. (D–MA)	127,256	−51,079	76,177
22 Heflin, H. (D–AL)	133,490	−57,768	75,722
23 Harkin, T. (D–IA)	140,062	−64,432	75,630
24 Campbell, B. (D–CO)	127,361	−51,818	75,543
25 Moynihan, D. (D–NY)	129,613	−54,602	75,011
26 Mitchell, G. (D–ME)	127,308	−52,668	74,640
27 Byrd, R. (D–WV)	128,325	−53,869	74,456
28 Mathews, H. (D–TN)	129,125	−56,887	72,238
29 Sasser, J. (D–TN)	132,719	−60,681	72,038
30 Wofford, H. (D–PA)	132,613	−61,662	70,951
31 Bradley, B. (D–NJ)	129,639	−59,336	70,303
32 Leahy, P. (D–VT)	134,144	−64,377	69,767
33 Bingaman, J. (D–NM)	125,602	−56,267	69,335
34 Bumpers, D. (D–AR)	133,128	−65,901	67,227

VOTE TALLY MEMBER REPORT SORTED BY NET SPENDING—SENATE—Continued

[What Members of Congress voted for in the 103d Congress (Figures in millions of dollars)]

Name, party, and state	In-creases	Cuts	Net
35 Dorgan, B. (D–ND)	132,900	−66,454	66,446
36 Levin, C. (D–MI)	127,302	−61,756	66,046
37 Kerry, J. (D–MA)	127,332	−62,446	64,886
38 Hollings, E. (D–SC)	126,315	−62,298	64,017
39 Pryor, D. (D–AR)	130,534	−66,918	63,616
40 Pell, C. (D–RI)	121,372	−58,847	62,525
41 Lautenberg, F. (D–NJ)	136,633	−74,425	62,208
42 Conrad, K. (D–ND)	131,665	−70,587	61,078
43 Nunn, S. (D–GA)	127,354	−69,730	57,624
44 Graham, B. (D–FL)	129,093	−71,883	57,210
45 Simon, P. (D–IL)	134,777	−82,337	52,440
46 Metzenbaum, H. (D–OH)	122,709	−71,661	51,048
47 Baucus, M. (D–MT)	129,869	−79,774	50,095
48 Jeffords, J. (R–VT)	127,492	−79,181	48,311
49 Feingold, R. (D–WI)	126,993	−81,812	45,121
50 Robb, C. (D–VA)	127,304	−84,096	43,208
51 DeConcini, D. (D–AZ)	137,832	−95,895	41,937
52 Exon, J. (D–NE)	130,612	−89,195	41,417
53 Kerrey, B. (D–NE)	127,183	−95,574	31,609
54 Hutchison, K. (R–TX)	112,902	−84,690	28,212
55 Lieberman, J. (D–CT)	122,816	−95,098	27,718
56 Boren, D. (D–OK)	126,528	−100,581	25,947
57 Hatfield, M. (R–OR)	112,727	−86,919	25,808
58 Shelby, R. (D–AL)	117,660	−92,487	25,173
59 Stevens, T. (R–AK)	122,046	−97,887	24,159
60 Specter, A. (R–PA)	124,538	−100,781	23,757
61 Kohl, H. (D–WI)	124,700	−103,945	20,755
62 Cochran, T. (R–MS)	117,697	−101,611	16,086
63 Gorton, S. (R–WA)	119,839	−108,973	10,866
64 Bond, C. (R–MO)	117,452	−112,300	5,152
65 McConnell, M. (R–KY)	117,608	−113,755	3,853
66 Lott, T. (R–MS)	115,558	−113,289	2,269
67 Domenici, P. (R–NM)	113,763	−113,076	687
68 Bennett, R. (R–UT)	118,656	−118,998	−342
69 Gramm, P. (R–TX)	116,963	−117,343	−380
70 Hatch, O. (R–UT)	118,376	−119,900	−1,524
71 Burns, C. (R–MT)	116,079	−118,112	−2,033
72 D'Amato, A. (R–NY)	119,056	−121,381	−2,325
73 Thurmond, S. (R–SC)	117,863	−120,618	−2,755
74 Wallop, M. (R–WY)	96,189	−100,419	−4,230
75 Lugar, R. (R–IN)	115,399	−120,289	−4,890
76 Dole, B. (R–KS)	117,684	−122,677	−4,993
77 Pressler, L. (R–SD)	113,502	−119,079	−5,577
78 Danforth, J. (R–MO)	119,264	−127,421	−8,157
79 Murkowski, F. (R–AK)	111,051	−120,295	−9,244
80 Durenberger, D. (R–MN)	113,712	−122,966	−9,254
81 Coats, D. (R–IN)	111,932	−121,410	−9,478
82 Packwood, B. (R–OR)	110,030	−121,330	−11,300
83 Kassebaum, N. (R–KS)	120,090	−133,058	−12,968
84 Chafee, J. (R–RI)	122,158	−136,007	−13,849
85 Warner, J. (R–VA)	104,460	−121,462	−17,002
86 Roth, W. (R–DE)	95,926	−114,511	−18,585
87 Helms, J. (R–NC)	91,567	−112,912	−21,345
88 Kempthorne, D. (R–ID)	115,281	−137,160	−21,879
89 Craig, L. (R–ID)	115,251	−137,160	−21,909
90 McCain, J. (R–AZ)	111,698	−139,708	−28,010
91 Cohen, W. (R–ME)	116,295	−146,117	−29,822
92 Mack, C. (R–FL)	113,043	−143,972	−30,929
93 Coverdell, P. (R–GA)	111,795	−142,899	−31,104
94 Simpson, A. (R–WY)	98,332	−130,480	−32,148
95 Nickles, D. (R–OK)	108,958	−142,761	−33,803
96 Grassley, C. (R–IA)	117,692	−152,677	−34,985
97 Faircloth, L. (R–NC)	103,531	−139,538	−36,007
98 Brown, H. (R–CO)	103,040	−140,292	−37,252
99 Gregg, J. (R–NJ)	103,600	−144,296	−40,696
100 Smith, R. (R–NH)	91,214	−136,976	−45,762

VOTE TALLY MEMBER REPORT SORTED BY NET SPENDING—HOUSE

[What Members of Congress voted for in the 103d Congress (figures in millions of dollars)]

Name	In-creases	Cuts	Net
1 Tejeda, F. (TX)—D	141,363	(47,773)	93,590
2 Murtha, J. (PA)—D	140,545	(47,492)	93,053
3 Boehlert, S. (NY)—R	136,912	(45,270)	91,642
4 Gonzalez, H. (TX)—D	140,382	(49,191)	91,191
5 Clement, B. (TN)—D	131,474	(43,068)	88,406
6 Chapman, J. (TX)—D	139,177	(51,602)	87,575
7 Wise, B. (WV)—D	133,297	(47,577)	85,720
8 Fazio, V. (CA)—D	133,278	(47,609)	85,669
9 Dicks, N. (WA)—D	133,328	(47,767)	85,561
10 Darden, G. (GA)—D	133,263	(47,811)	85,452
11 Peterson, P. (FL)—D	133,241	(47,789)	85,452
12 Bevill, T. (AL)—D	133,165	(47,841)	85,324
13 Manton, T. (NY)—D	133,056	(57,900)	85,156
14 Meek, C. (FL)—D	132,765	(47,663)	85,102
15 Ortiz, S. (TX)—D	132,218	(47,340)	84,878
16 Swift, A. (WA)—D	132,523	(48,140)	84,383
17 Hoyer, S. (MD)—D	133,222	(48,893)	84,329
18 Brown, C. (FL)—D	133,224	(49,213)	84,011
19 DeLauro, R. (CI)—D	133,097	(49,205)	83,892
20 Berman, H. (CA)—D	133,124	(49,327)	83,797
21 Kennelly, B. (CT)—D	133,256	(49,553)	83,703
22 Cramer, R. (AL)—D	131,079	(47,836)	83,243
23 Lancaster, H. (NC)—D	141,669	(59,515)	82,154
24 Roybal-Allard, L. (CA)—D	132,591	(50,597)	81,994
25 Smith, N. (IA)—D	130,221	(48,374)	81,847
26 Gephardt, R. (MO)—D	133,462	(51,699)	81,763
27 Hall, T. (OH)—D	135,102	(53,743)	81,359
28 Sawyer, T. (OH)—D	133,549	(52,280)	81,269
29 de la Garza, E (TX)—D	132,460	(51,281)	81,179
30 Gibbons, S. (FL)—D	131,598	(50,571)	81,027

VOTE TALLY MEMBER REPORT SORTED BY NET SPENDING—HOUSE—Continued

[What Members of Congress voted for in the 103d Congress (figures in millions of dollars)]

Name	In-creases	Cuts	Net
31 Glickman, D. (KS)—D	131,011	(50,128)	80,883
32 Price, D. (NC)—D	133,572	(53,450)	80,122
33 Moran, J. (VA)—D	134,094	(54,248)	79,846
34 Richardson, B. (NM)—D	132,345	(52,617)	79,728
35 Spratt, J. (SC)—D	133,556	(53,868)	79,688
36 McCloskey, F. (IN)—D	133,603	(54,139)	79,464
37 Rose, C. (NC)—D	130,222	(50,862)	79,360
38 Dixon, J. (CA)—D	135,695	(56,387)	79,308
39 Whitten, J. (MS)—D	130,260	(51,373)	78,887
40 Coleman, R. (TX)—D	134,930	(56,112)	78,818
41 Mollohan, A. (WV)—D	127,593	(48,951)	78,642
42 Reed, J. (RI)—D	133,048	(54,455)	78,593
43 Thornton, R. (AR)—D	135,134	(56,709)	78,425
44 Sabo, M. (MN)—D	129,219	(51,210)	78,009
45 Bilbray, J. (NV)—D	133,633	(55,667)	77,966
46 Levin, S. (MI)—D	133,080	(55,338)	77,742
47 Derrick, B. (SC)—D	129,552	(52,095)	77,457
48 Traficant, J. (OH)—D	132,239	(54,813)	77,426
49 Rogers, H. (KY)—R	129,359	(52,075)	77,284
50 Matsui, R. (CA)—D	134,510	(57,291)	77,219
51 Ackerman, G. (NY)—D	131,956	(54,784)	77,172
52 Volkmer, H. (MO)—D	131,029	(54,470)	76,559
53 Skelton, I. (MO)—D	130,804	(55,373)	75,431
54 Pickett, O. (VA)—D	110,525	(35,608)	74,917
55 Edwards, C. (TX)—D	129,826	(54,946)	74,880
56 Brooks, J. (TX)—D	133,173	(58,641)	74,532
57 Harman, J. (CA)—D	132,362	(57,848)	74,514
58 Clyburn, J. (SC)—D	133,732	(60,148)	73,584
59 Mineta, N. (CA)—D	131,362	(57,945)	73,417
60 Bentley, H. (MD)—R	112,601	(39,832)	72,769
61 Johnston, H. (FL)—D	130,685	(58,569)	71,116
62 Stokes, L. (OH)—D	131,023	(59,011)	72,012
63 Bishop, S. (GA)—D	133,046	(61,705)	71,341
64 Laughlin, G. (TX)—D	129,656	(58,974)	70,682
65 McNulty, M. (NY)—D	132,851	(62,223)	70,628
66 Synar, M. (OK)—D	129,921	(59,423)	70,498
67 Clayton, E. (NC)—D	130,160	(59,698)	70,462
68 Sarpalius, B. (TX)—D	136,659	(67,164)	69,495
69 Beilenson, A. (CA)—D	123,210	(54,085)	69,125
70 Olver, J. (MA)—D	136,248	(67,248)	69,000
71 Williams, P. (MI)—D	138,000	(69,030)	68,970
72 Morella, C. (MD)—R	116,854	(48,097)	68,757
73 Gejdenson, S. (CT)—D	133,578	(64,972)	68,606
74 Conyers, J. (MI)—D	126,861	(58,795)	68,066
75 Rostenkowski, D. (IL)—D	134,763	(66,907)	67,856
76 Hamilton, L. (IN)—D	133,806	(66,170)	67,636
77 Jefferson, W. (LA)—D	133,276	(65,803)	67,473
78 Torres, E. (CA)—D	133,372	(66,328)	67,044
79 Sisisky, N. (VA)—D	117,136	(50,586)	66,550
80 Cantwell, M. (WA)—D	133,291	(66,938)	66,353
81 Machtley, R. (RI)—R	117,118	(50,818)	66,300
82 Mfume, K. (MD)—D	135,916	(69,644)	66,272
83 Diaz-Balart, L. (FL)—R	105,349	(39,199)	66,150
84 Scott, R. (VA)—D	129,072	(62,932)	66,140
85 Maloney, C. (NY)—D	133,215	(67,248)	65,967
86 Lipinski, W. (IL)—D	135,707	(69,875)	65,832
87 Danner, P. (MO)—D	136,122	(70,370)	65,752
88 Hochbrueckner (NY)—D	130,549	(64,845)	65,704
89 Nadler, J. (NY)—D	132,948	(67,379)	65,569
90 Mazzoli, R. (KY)—D	133,475	(67,925)	65,550
91 Lantos, T. (CA)—D	132,565	(67,248)	65,317
92 Browder, G. (AL)—D	132,765	(67,654)	65,111
93 Klein, H. (NJ)—D	132,260	(68,715)	63,545
94 Visclosky, P. (IN)—D	133,488	(70,124)	63,364
95 Brown, G. (CA)—D	131,062	(67,969)	63,093
96 Waxman, H. (CA)—D	129,495	(66,453)	63,042
97 Reynolds, M. (IL)—D	133,322	(70,340)	62,982
98 Kildee, D. (MI)—D	133,729	(71,150)	62,579
99 LaFalce, J. (NY)—D	132,956	(70,487)	62,469
100 Fowler, T. (FL)—R	117,511	(55,120)	62,391
101 Blackwell, L. (PA)—D	133,043	(70,656)	62,387
102 English, K. (AZ)—D	131,824	(69,704)	62,120
103 Spence, F. (SC)—R	103,080	(40,981)	62,099
104 Frost, M. (TX)—D	133,070	(71,340)	61,730
105 Boucher, R. (VA)—D	134,942	(73,222)	61,720
106 Dingell, J. (MI)—D	131,236	(69,533)	61,703
107 Applegate, D. (OH)—D	129,120	(68,370)	60,750
108 Tucker, W. (CA)—D	130,908	(70,253)	60,655
109 Skaggs, D. (CO)—D	133,458	(72,811)	60,647
110 Woolsey, L. (CA)—D	135,699	(75,289)	60,410
111 Foglietta, T. (PA)—D	133,448	(73,070)	60,378
112 Martinez, M. (CA)—D	135,563	(75,388)	60,175
113 Pickle, J. (TX)—D	131,819	(71,968)	59,851
114 Filner, B. (CA)—D	130,125	(70,313)	59,812
115 Rahall, N. (WV)—D	130,704	(70,898)	59,806
116 Lehman, R. (CA)—D	127,920	(68,375)	59,545
117 Borski, R. (PA)—D	135,626	(76,251)	59,375
118 Shepherd, K. (UT)—D	130,880	(71,552)	59,328
119 Wilson, C. (TX)—D	132,332	(73,141)	59,191
120 Carr, B. (MI)—D	132,782	(73,805)	58,977
121 McCurdy, D. (OK)—D	129,871	(70,988)	58,883
122 Hastings, A. (FL)—D	124,611	(65,777)	58,834
123 Waters, M. (CA)—D	128,403	(69,625)	58,778
124 Roemer, T. (IN)—D	115,914	(57,139)	58,775
125 Mink, P. (HI)—D	133,951	(75,239)	58,712
126 Collins, B. (MI)—D	130,646	(72,086)	58,560
127 Gordon, B. (TN)—D	133,005	(74,449)	58,556
128 Johnson, E. (TX)—D	135,851	(77,427)	58,424
129 Bonior, D. (MI)—D	135,494	(77,509)	57,985
130 Hughes, W. (NJ)—D	122,142	(64,546)	57,596
131 Pelosi, N. (CA)—D	136,146	(78,669)	57,477
132 Hilliard, E. (AL)—D	127,840	(70,623)	57,217
133 Deutsch, P. (FL)—D	135,305	(78,163)	57,142
134 Baesler, S. (KY)—D	131,843	(74,887)	56,956
135 Ford, H. (TN)—D	112,243	(55,410)	56,833
136 Hamburg, D. (CA)—D	131,907	(75,315)	56,592
137 Towns, E. (NY)—D	131,897	(75,597)	56,300

VOTE TALLY MEMBER REPORT SORTED BY NET SPENDING—HOUSE—Continued

[What Members of Congress voted for in the 103d Congress (figures in millions of dollars)]

Name	In-creases	Cuts	Net
138 Lowey, N. (NY)—D	136,236	(80,007)	56,229
139 Neal, R. (MA)—D	135,123	(78,926)	56,197
140 Eshoo, A. (CA)—D	134,752	(79,068)	55,684
141 Swett, D. (NH)—D	131,083	(75,590)	55,493
142 Abercrombie, N. (HI)—D	136,002	(80,623)	55,379
143 Kleczka, G. (WI)—D	136,083	(80,769)	55,314
144 Ford, W. (MI)—D	127,978	(72,795)	55,183
145 Gutierrez, L. (IL)—D	127,792	(72,618)	55,174
146 Hefner, W. (NC)—D	135,846	(80,675)	55,171
147 Huffington, M. (CA)—R	94,862	(39,830)	55,032
148 Wynn, A. (MD)—D	136,193	(81,292)	54,901
149 Lloyd, M. (IN)—D	128,944	(74,208)	54,736
150 Schumer, C. (NY)—D	135,227	(80,604)	54,623
151 Pallone, E. (NJ)—D	113,692	(59,576)	54,116
152 Coppersmith, S. (AZ)—D	117,093	(63,054)	54,039
153 Engel, E. (NY)—D	135,678	(81,675)	54,003
154 Hinchey, M. (NY)—D	135,659	(81,733)	53,926
155 Thurman, K. (FL)—D	132,997	(79,204)	53,793
156 McDermott, J. (WA)—D	134,667	(80,927)	53,740
157 Sharp, P. (IN)—D	131,236	(77,679)	53,557
158 Schenk, L. (CA)—D	133,606	(80,147)	53,459
159 Costello, J. (IL)—D	134,522	(81,139)	53,383
160 Byrne, L. (VA)—D	131,385	(78,014)	53,371
161 Kopetski, M. (OR)—D	130,335	(77,141)	53,194
162 Gilman, B. (NY)—R	110,441	(57,314)	53,127
163 Obey, D. (WI)—D	136,075	(82,955)	53,120
164 Menendez, R. (NJ)—D	133,872	(80,884)	52,988
165 Bryant, J. (TX)—D	133,135	(80,232)	52,903
166 Slaughter, L. (NY)—D	136,055	(83,249)	52,806
167 Kanjorski, P. (PA)—D	136,145	(83,549)	52,596
168 Gillmor, P. (OH)—R	113,401	(60,947)	52,454
169 Kennedy, J. (MA)—D	135,871	(83,428)	52,443
170 Coyne, W. (PA)—D	136,205	(84,074)	52,131
171 Durbin, R. (IL)—D	135,331	(83,300)	52,031
172 Bacchus, J. (FL)—D	132,887	(80,920)	51,967
173 Furse, E. (OR)—D	134,727	(82,816)	51,911
174 Edwards, D. (CA)—D	124,699	(72,855)	51,844
175 Markey, E. (MA)—D	136,201	(84,477)	51,724
176 Fields, C. (LA)—D	136,243	(84,672)	51,571
177 Andrews, M. (TX)—D	124,106	(72,551)	51,555
178 Studds, G. (MA)—D	135,994	(84,675)	51,319
179 Johnson, T. (SD)—D	134,057	(82,854)	51,203
180 Young, D. (AK)—R	107,842	(56,885)	50,957
181 Neal, S. (NC)—D	116,769	(65,916)	50,853
182 Unsoeld, J. (WA)—D	136,071	(85,252)	50,819
183 Strickland, T. (OH)—D	136,034	(85,400)	50,634
184 Evans, L. (IL)—D	136,045	(85,511)	50,534
185 Yates, S. (IL)—D	135,744	(85,592)	50,152
186 Stupak, B. (MI)—D	135,875	(85,738)	50,137
187 Lewis, J. (GA)—D	131,820	(81,783)	50,037
188 Sanders, B. (VT)—I	128,991	(79,303)	49,688
189 Moakley, J. (MA)—D	129,582	(80,030)	49,552
190 Brewster, B. (OK)—D	108,809	(59,262)	49,547
191 Mann, D. (OH)—D	111,590	(62,197)	49,393
192 Clay, W. (MO)—D	126,983	(77,654)	49,329
193 Vucanovich, B. (NV)—R	109,877	(60,553)	49,324
194 Walsh, J. (NY)—R	132,037	(83,063)	48,974
195 Barlow, T. (KY)—D	133,075	(84,133)	48,942
196 Kaptur, M. (OH)—D	135,191	(86,679)	48,512
197 Andrews, T. (ME)—D	134,168	(85,669)	48,499
198 Parker, M. (MS)—D	117,776	(69,297)	48,479
199 Montgomery, G. (MS)—D	122,661	(74,247)	48,414
200 Payne, L. (VA)—D	126,508	(78,141)	48,367
201 Emerson, B. (MO)—R	105,584	(57,296)	48,288
202 Wheat, A. (MO)—D	133,071	(84,832)	48,239
203 Ros-Lehtinen, I. (FL)—R	101,273	(53,047)	48,226
204 Slattery, J. (KS)—D	125,991	(78,020)	47,971
205 Becerra, X. (CA)—D	134,083	(86,337)	47,746
206 Leach, J. (IA)—R	111,274	(63,586)	47,688
207 Combest, L. (TX)—R	86,879	(39,267)	47,612
208 McKinney, C. (GA)—D	132,747	(85,370)	47,377
209 Flake, F. (NY)—D	134,476	(87,420)	47,056
210 Cooper, J. (TN)—D	130,486	(83,481)	47,005
211 Rangel, C. (NY)—D	126,757	(79,759)	46,998
212 Smith, B. (OR)—R	76,561	(29,600)	46,961
213 Oberstar, J. (MN)—D	129,767	(82,993)	46,834
214 Vento, B. (MN)—D	131,653	(84,926)	46,727
215 Watt, M. (NC)—D	131,786	(85,282)	46,504
216 Pomeroy, E. (ND)—D	133,784	(87,344)	46,440
217 Pastor, E. (AZ)—D	128,259	(81,835)	46,424
218 Tanner, J. (TN)—D	131,670	(85,516)	46,154
219 Payne, D. (NJ)—D	131,116	(85,294)	45,822
220 Miller, G. (CA)—D	134,447	(88,752)	45,695
221 Hoagland, P. (NE)—D	132,702	(87,191)	45,511
222 Johnson, D. (GA)—D	131,875	(87,544)	44,331
223 Rush, B. (IL)—D	131,997	(87,780)	44,217
224 Holden, T. (PA)—D	136,034	(92,293)	43,741
225 Kreidler, M. (WA)—D	135,965	(92,527)	43,438
226 Owens, M. (NY)—D	121,084	(77,737)	43,347
227 Lightfoot, J. (IA)—R	96,061	(52,927)	43,134
228 Barcia, J. (MI)—D	132,669	(89,812)	42,857
229 Geren, P. (TX)—D	113,248	(70,661)	42,587
230 Stark, P. (CA)—D	128,276	(86,378)	41,898
231 Collins, C. (IL)—D	117,579	(75,819)	41,760
232 Bereuter, D. (NE)—R	94,106	(52,443)	41,663
233 Regula, R. (OH)—R	115,493	(74,188)	41,305
234 Roukema, M. (NJ)—R	98,215	(57,205)	41,010
235 Hayes, J. (LA)—D	109,938	(69,222)	40,716
236 Brown, S. (OH)—D	136,089	(95,756)	40,333
237 Torricelli, R. (NJ)—D	133,861	(93,755)	40,106
238 Sangmeister, G. (IL)—D	136,095	(96,172)	39,923
239 Stearns, C. (FL)—R	89,425	(49,647)	39,778
240 Serrano, J. (NY)—D	127,638	(87,924)	39,714
241 Foley, T. (WA)—D	75,302	(35,590)	39,712
242 Molinari, S. (NY)—R	112,661	(73,230)	39,431
243 Kim, J. (CA)—R	112,313	(73,194)	39,119

VOTE TALLY MEMBER REPORT SORTED BY NET SPENDING—HOUSE—Continued

[What Members of Congress voted for in the 103d Congress (figures in millions of dollars)]

	Name	In-creases	Cuts	Net
244	Dellums, R. (CA)—D	174,443	(85,450)	38,993
245	Wyden, R. (OR)—D	126,217	(87,274)	38,943
246	Deal, N. (GA)—D	118,788	(80,398)	38,390
247	Klink, R. (PA)—D	136,088	(97,919)	38,169
248	Torkildsen, P. (MA)—R	119,938	(81,861)	38,077
249	Green, G. (TX)—D	117,418	(79,844)	37,574
250	Barrett, T. (WI)—D	129,832	(92,871)	36,961
251	Skeen, J. (NM)—R	112,479	(75,564)	36,915
252	Rowland, J. (GA)—D	109,857	(73,388)	36,469
253	Cardin, B. (MD)—D	133,856	(97,578)	36,278
254	Velazquez, N. (NY)—D	127,188	(90,925)	36,263
255	Frank, B. (MA)—D	124,628	(88,555)	36,073
256	Snowe, O. (ME)—R	123,710	(87,709)	36,001
257	Farr, S. (CA)—D	109,731	(73,906)	35,825
258	Roberts, P. (KS)—R	89,179	(53,720)	35,459
259	Thompson, B. (MS)—D	111,728	(76,771)	34,957
260	Barrett, B. (NE)—R	98,965	(64,067)	34,898
261	McHale, P. (PA)—D	135,817	(101,176)	34,641
262	Clinger, W. (PA)—R	104,552	(71,143)	33,409
263	Smith, C. (NJ)—R	119,676	(86,449)	33,227
264	Bateman, H. (VA)—R	106,621	(73,802)	32,819
265	Lazio, R. (NY)—R	101,259	(68,809)	32,450
266	Callahan, S. (AL)—R	83,227	(50,907)	32,320
267	Andrews, R. (NJ)—D	118,812	(86,934)	31,878
268	McDade, J. (PA)—R	109,525	(78,081)	31,444
269	Jacobs, A. (IN)—D	114,071	(83,108)	30,963
270	Canady C. (FL)—R	94,433	(63,566)	30,867
271	Washington, C. (TX)—D	98,221	(67,452)	30,769
272	DeFazio, P. (OR)—D	112,003	(81,768)	30,235
273	Levy, D. (NY)—R	97,636	(67,711)	29,925
274	Long, J. (IN)—D	134,135	(104,384)	29,751
275	Hefley, J. (CO)—R	74,007	(44,367)	29,640
276	King, P. (NY)—R	94,194	(64,718)	29,476
277	Gilchrest, T. (MD)—R	117,374	(88,017)	29,357
278	Dornan, R. (CA)—R	70,554	(41,368)	29,186
279	Allard, W. (CO)—R	76,951	(47,788)	29,163
280	Lewis, J. (CA)—R	107,912	(78,838)	29,074
281	Houghton, A. (NY)—R	113,776	(85,066)	28,710
282	Stump, B. (AZ)—R	69,828	(41,271)	28,577
283	Dooley, C. (CA)—D	130,330	(102,428)	27,902
284	Inslee, J. (WA)—D	134,108	(106,326)	27,782
285	Hall, R. (TX)—D	103,847	(76,141)	27,706
286	Fish, H. (NY)—R	115,328	(87,667)	27,661
287	Kingston, J. (GA)—R	87,286	(59,930)	27,356
288	Grandy, F. (IA)—R	102,787	(77,665)	25,122
289	McHugh, J. (NY)—R	95,105	(70,325)	24,780
290	Fingerhut, E. (OH)—D	113,373	(88,677)	24,696
291	Calvert, K. (CA)—R	101,960	(77,478)	24,482
292	Poshard, G. (IL)—D	133,523	(109,126)	24,397
293	Blute, P. (MA)—R	117,151	(92,971)	24,180
294	Burton, D. (IN)—R	81,826	(57,877)	23,939
295	Schroeder, P. (CO)—D	117,890	(94,438)	23,452
296	Minge, D. (MN)—D	116,973	(93,856)	23,117
297	Margolies-Mezv, (PA)—D	117,351	(94,689)	22,262
298	Bartlett, R. (MD)—R	90,787	(68,774)	22,013
299	Orton, B. (UT)—D	98,477	(76,968)	21,509
300	Gallo, D. (NJ)—R	102,380	(81,200)	21,180
301	Murphy, A. (PA)—D	117,285	(96,225)	21,060
302	McCollum, B. (FL)—R	86,428	(66,143)	20,295
303	Bilirakis, M. (FL)—R	111,730	(91,474)	20,256
304	Larocco, L. (ID)—D	131,628	(112,089)	19,539
305	Hutto, E. (FL)—D	98,320	(79,123)	19,197
306	Livingston, R. (LA)—R	106,973	(88,408)	18,565
307	Hyde, H. (IL)—R	94,185	(76,478)	17,707
308	Young, C. (FL)—R	112,386	(94,847)	17,539
309	Goodlatte, R. (VA)—R	74,768	(57,421)	17,347
310	Kolbe, J. (AZ)—R	99,503	(82,210)	17,293
311	Meyers, J. (KS)—R	105,890	(89,016)	16,874
312	Valentine, T. (NC)—D	111,821	(95,042)	16,779
313	Ridge, T. (PA)—R	108,188	(92,187)	16,001
314	Hoekstra, P. (MI)—R	96,995	(81,066)	15,929
315	McCandless, A. (CA)—R	80,914	(65,005)	15,909
316	Smith, L. (TX)—R	94,953	(79,108)	15,845
317	Dunn, J. (WA)—R	82,033	(66,335)	15,698
318	Condit, G. (CA)—D	111,786	(96,357)	15,429
319	Lambert, B. (AR)—D	134,547	(119,193)	15,354
320	Archer, B. (TX)—R	59,069	(43,841)	15,228
321	Peterson, C. (MN)—D	117,450	(102,774)	14,676
322	Meehan, M. (MA)—D	135,375	(120,729)	14,646
323	Mcinnis, S. (CO)—R	72,873	(58,742)	14,131
324	McCrery, J. (LA)—R	100,333	(86,945)	13,388
325	Hancock, M. (MO)—R	58,513	(45,127)	13,386
326	Buyer, S. (IN)—R	94,089	(81,664)	12,425
327	Zekuff, B. (NH)—R	79,479	(67,294)	12,176
328	Tauzin, W. (LA)—D	112,409	(100,269)	12,140
329	Shaw, E. (FL)—R	97,003	(85,295)	11,708
330	Hastert, D. (IL)—R	96,879	(85,496)	11,383
331	Ravenel, A. (SC)—R	116,390	(105,123)	11,267
332	Thomas, B. (CA)—R	98,510	(87,775)	10,735
333	Quinn, J. (NY)—R	96,639	(86,354)	10,285
334	Taylor, G. (MS)—D	97,103	(86,878)	10,225
335	Franks, G. (CT)—R	99,359	(89,472)	9,887
336	Baker, R. (LA)—R	93,284	(83,613)	9,671
337	Horn, S. (CA)—R	109,439	(100,148)	9,281
338	Talent, J. (MO)—R	87,618	(78,445)	9,173
339	Gallegly, E. (CA)—R	97,808	(88,778)	9,030
340	Myers, J. (IN)—R	92,448	(83,657)	8,791
341	Gunderson, S. (WI)—R	97,717	(88,982)	8,735
342	Klug, S. (WI)—R	88,482	(79,847)	8,635
343	Quilen, J. (TN)—R	92,083	(83,848)	8,235
344	Mckeon, H. (CA)—R	88,758	(80,696)	8,062
345	Pryce, D. (OH)—R	107,963	(99,910)	8,053
346	Oxley, M. (OH)—R	86,516	(79,548)	6,968
347	Knollenberg, J. (MI)—R	75,492	(69,738)	5,754
348	Kyl, J. (AZ)—R	81,769	(76,110)	5,659
349	Hobson, D. (OH)—R	107,143	(101,560)	5,583
350	Linder, J. (GA)—R	83,347	(78,226)	5,121
351	Saxton, H. (NJ)—R	96,489	(91,386)	5,103

VOTE TALLY MEMBER REPORT SORTED BY NET SPENDING—HOUSE—Continued—Continued

[What Members of Congress voted for in the 103d Congress (figures in millions of dollars)]

	Name	In-creases	Cuts	Net
352	Boehner, J. (OH)—R	71,804	(66,717)	5,087
353	Dickey, J. (AR)—R	91,151	(86,130)	5,021
354	Goodling, B. (PA)—R	98,168	(93,254)	4,914
355	Kasich, J. (OH)—r	93,919	(89,098)	4,821
356	Weldon, C. (PA)—R	91,001	(86,258)	4,743
357	Sundquist, D. (IN)—R	96,191	(91,745)	4,446
358	Hutchinson, T. (AR)—R	94,931	(90,577)	4,354
359	Wolf, F. (VA)—R	94,060	(90,009)	4,051
360	Castle, M. (DE)—R	89,461	(85,686)	3,775
361	Lewis, T. (FL)—R	82,691	(79,105)	3,586
362	Porter, J. (IL)—R	96,466	(93,657)	2,809
363	Crapo, M. (ID)—R	74,138	(71,766)	2,372
364	Bonilla, H. (TX)—R	95,946	(94,297)	1,649
365	Penny, T. (MN)—D	111,140	(110,111)	1,029
366	Goss, P. (FL)—R	71,039	(70,567)	472
367	Gingrich, N. (GA)—R	84,287	(83,872)	415
368	Fields, J. (TX)—R	65,879	(65,861)	18
369	Stenholm, C. (TX)—D	92,638	(92,702)	(64)
370	Cox, C. (CA)—R	69,678	(69,808)	(130)
371	Manzullo, D. (IL)—R	84,545	(85,360)	(815)
372	Delay, T. (TX)—R	72,114	(73,433)	(1,319)
373	Taylor, C. (NC)—R	75,562	(76,931)	(1,369)
374	Schaefer, D. (CO)—R	62,397	(64,193)	(1,796)
375	Armey, D. (TX)—R	66,063	(67,890)	(1,827)
376	Bacgus, S. (AL)—R	76,529	(79,254)	(2,725)
377	Schiff, S. (NM)—R	96,741	(99,656)	(2,915)
378	Baker, B. (CA)—R	74,768	(77,838)	(3,070)
379	Shuster, B. (PA)—R	81,291	(84,389)	(3,098)
380	Mica, J. (FL)—R	83,082	(86,383)	(3,301)
380	Grams, R. (MN)—R	66,974	(70,275)	(3,301)
382	Everett, T. (AL)—R	92,379	(95,818)	(3,439)
383	Bliley, T. (VA)—R	84,660	(88,240)	(3,580)
384	Solomon, G. (NY)—R	67,851	(71,579)	(3,728)
385	Michel, R. (IL)—R	84,049	(87,819)	(3,770)
386	Santorum, R. (PA)—R	91,135	(94,914)	(3,779)
387	Cunningham, R. (CA)—R	88,510	(92,438)	(3,928)
388	Greenwood, J. (PA)—R	103,726	(107,694)	(3,968)
389	Inhofe, J. (OK)—R	64,351	(68,642)	(4,291)
390	Packard, R. (CA)—R	81,520	(85,919)	(4,399)
391	Gekas, G. (PA)—R	83,847	(88,304)	(4,457)
392	Upton, F. (MI)—R	113,730	(119,172)	(5,442)
393	Johnson, S. (TX)—R	64,697	(71,164)	(6,467)
394	Hunter, D. (CA)—R	81,272	(88,508)	(7,236)
395	Barca, P. (WI)—D	98,012	(105,688)	(7,676)
396	McMillan, A. (NC)—R	100,292	(108,494)	(8,202)
397	Walker, R. (PA)—R	60,943	(69,783)	(8,840)
398	Johnson, N. (CT)—R	98,841	(108,139)	(9,298)
399	Fawell, H. (IL)—R	78,104	(87,618)	(9,514)
400	Moorhead, C. (CA)—R	71,534	(82,590)	(10,056)
401	Pombo, R. (CA)—R	79,667	(90,580)	(10,913)
402	Hoke, M. (OH)—R	74,439	(85,429)	(10,990)
403	Petri, T. (WI)—R	65,995	(78,148)	(12,153)
404	Thomas, C. (WY)—R	80,843	(94,142)	(13,299)
405	Collins, M. (GA)—R	75,886	(90,412)	(14,526)
406	Franks, B. (NJ)—R	83,517	(98,412)	(14,895)
407	Dreier, D. (CA)—R	68,710	(84,560)	(15,850)
408	Inglis, B. (SC)—R	72,616	(89,009)	(16,393)
409	Istook, E. (OK)—R	70,383	(87,137)	(16,754)
410	Ewing, T. (IL)—R	90,344	(109,384)	(19,140)
411	Portman, R. (OH)—R	70,694	(89,944)	(19,250)
412	Roth, T. (WI)—R	63,570	(83,398)	(19,828)
413	Herger, W. (CA)—R	71,660	(92,493)	(20,833)
414	Smith, N. (MI)—R	62,611	(83,827)	(21,216)
415	Paxon, B. (NY)—R	58,374	(80,005)	(21,631)
416	Hansen, J. (UT)—R	78,105	(100,181)	(22,076)
417	Duncan, J. (TN)—R	64,137	(86,559)	(22,422)
418	Doolittle, J. (CA)—R	66,669	(89,816)	(23,147)
419	Ballenger, C. (NC)—R	74,183	(97,923)	(23,740)
420	Camp, D. (MI)—R	95,088	(119,653)	(24,565)
421	Shays, C. (CT)—R	87,608	(112,645)	(25,037)
422	Bunning, J. (KY)—R	61,945	(88,179)	(26,234)
423	Miller, D. (FL)—R	71,308	(97,554)	(26,246)
424	Ramstad, J. (MN)—R	75,533	(102,537)	(27,004)
425	Barton, J. (TX)—R	63,541	(91,227)	(27,686)
426	Zimmer, D. (NJ)—R	72,441	(103,701)	(31,260)
427	Crane, P. (IL)—R	56,922	(88,955)	(32,033)
428	Coble, H. (NC)—R	79,221	(111,406)	(32,185)
429	Rohrabacher, D. (CA)—R	68,584	(105,546)	(36,962)
430	Royce, E. (CA)—R	72,229	(110,243)	(38,014)
431	Nussle, J. (IA)—R	77,293	(116,620)	(39,327)
432	Sensenbrenner, F. (WI)—R	56,113	(106,430)	(50,317)

VOTE TALLY STATE DELEGATION REPORT

[What Members of Congress voted for in the 103d Congress (figures in millions of dollars)]

Name	In-creases	Cuts	Net
ALABAMA			
Heflin (D–AL)	133,490	(57,768)	75,722
Shelby (D–AL)	117,660	(92,487)	25,173
Bachus (R–AL)	76,529	(79,254)	(2,725)
Bevill (D–AL)	133,163	(47,841)	85,324
Browder (D–AL)	132,765	(67,654)	65,111
Calahan (R–AL)	83,227	(50,907)	32,320
Cramer (D–AL)	131,079	(47,836)	83,243
Everett (R–AL)	92,379	(95,818)	3,439
Hilliard (D–AL)	127,840	(70,623)	57,217
ALASKA			
Murkowski (R–AK)	111,051	(120,295)	(9,244)
Stevens (R–AK)	122,046	(97,887)	24,159
Young (R–AK)	107,842	(56,885)	50,957

VOTE TALLY STATE DELEGATION REPORT—Continued

[What Members of Congress voted for in the 103d Congress (figures in millions of dollars)]

Name	In-creases	Cuts	Net
ARIZONA			
DeConcini (D–AZ)	137,812	(95,895)	41,937
McCain (R–AZ)	111,698	(139,708)	(28,010)
Coppersmith (D–AZ)	117,093	(63,054)	54,039
English (D–AZ)	131,824	(69,704)	62,120
Kolbe (R–AZ)	99,503	(82,210)	17,293
Kyl (R–AZ)	81,769	(76,110)	5,659
Pastor (D–AZ)	128,259	(81,835)	46,424
Stump (R–AZ)	69,828	(41,271)	28,557
ARKANSAS			
Bumpers (D–AR)	133,128	(65,901)	67,227
Pryor (D–AR)	130,554	(66,918)	63,616
Dickey (R–AR)	91,151	(86,130)	5,021
Hutchinson (R–AR)	94,931	(90,577)	4,354
Lambert (D–AR)	134,547	(119,193)	15,354
Thornton (D–AR)	135,134	(56,709)	78,425
CALIFORNIA			
Boxer (D–CA)	140,993	(54,218)	86,775
Feinstein (D–CA)	132,138	(51,370)	80,768
Baker (R–CA)	74,799	(78,815)	(4,016)
Becerra (D–CA)	137,670	(87,833)	49,837
Beilenson (D–CA)	128,024	(55,597)	72,427
Berman (D–CA)	137,047	(50,800)	86,247
Brown, G (D–CA)	135,173	(65,532)	69,641
Calvert (R–CA)	102,699	(78,647)	24,052
Condit (D–CA)	115,854	(97,670)	18,184
Cox (R–CA)	68,959	(69,864)	(905)
Cunningham (R–CA)	93,751	(102,314)	(8,563)
Dellums (D–CA)	129,203	(86,911)	42,292
Dixon (D–CA)	140,550	(57,899)	82,651
Dooley (D–CA)	135,131	(103,887)	31,244
Doolittle (R–CA)	66,041	(89,544)	(23,503)
Dornan (R–CA)	69,447	(41,442)	28,005
Dreier (R–CA)	70,191	(84,277)	(14,086)
Edwards, D (D–CA)	129,473	(74,367)	55,106
Eshoo (D–CA)	139,611	(80,580)	59,031
Farr (D–CA)	110,293	(68,790)	41,503
Fazio (D–CA)	138,101	(49,121)	88,980
Filner (D–CA)	134,813	(71,825)	62,988
Gallegly (R–CA)	96,618	(89,958)	6,660
Hamburg (D–CA)	133,657	(76,827)	56,830
Harman (D–CA)	137,040	(59,360)	77,680
Herger (R–CA)	72,438	(92,211)	(19,783)
Horn (R–CA)	114,207	(101,517)	12,690
Huffington (R–CA)	95,233	(39,892)	55,341
Hunter (R–CA)	84,581	(97,514)	(12,933)
Kim (R–CA)	112,267	(73,255)	39,012
Lantos (D–CA)	137,512	(68,709)	68,803
Lehman (D–CA)	132,567	(69,735)	62,832
Lewis (R–CA)	108,670	(80,057)	28,613
Martinez (D–CA)	140,397	(76,900)	63,497
Matsui (D–CA)	139,358	(58,752)	80,606
McCandless (R–CA)	78,321	(65,268)	13,053
McKeon (R–CA)	86,349	(80,965)	5,384
Miller, G (D–CA)	139,122	(90,264)	48,858
Mineta (D–CA)	136,052	(59,457)	76,595
Moorhead (R–CA)	72,312	(82,318)	10,006
Packard (R–CA)	82,099	(86,177)	(4,078)
Pelosi (D–CA)	140,834	(80,181)	60,653
Pombo (R–CA)	76,111	(90,302)	(14,191)
Rohrabacher (R–CA)	68,473	(105,263)	(36,790)
Roybal-Allard (D–CA)	137,426	(52,109)	85,317
Royce (R–CA)	71,028	(109,971)	(38,943)
Schenk (D–CA)	138,363	(81,659)	36,704
Stark (D–CA)	127,647	(87,829)	39,818
Thomas, B (R–CA)	97,174	(89,012)	8,162
Torres (D–CA)	137,196	(67,840)	69,356
Tucker (D–CA)	136,399	(67,466)	68,933
Waters (D–CA)	133,217	(71,137)	62,080
Waxman (D–CA)	134,328	(67,965)	66,363
Woolsey (D–CA)	140,508	(76,801)	63,707
COLORADO			
Brown, H. (R–CO)	103,040	(140,292)	(37,252)
Campbell, B. (D–CO)	127,361	(51,818)	75,543
Allard (R–CO)	76,951	(47,788)	29,163
Hefley (R–CO)	74,007	(44,367)	29,640
McInnis (R–CO)	72,873	(58,742)	14,131
Schaefer (R–CO)	62,397	(64,193)	(1,796)
Schroeder (D–CO)	117,890	(94,.438)	23,452
Skaggs (D–CO)	133,458	(72,811)	60,647
CONNECTICUT			
Dodd (D–CT)	126,256	(47,002)	79,254
Lieberman (D–CT)	122,816	(95,098)	27,718
DeLauro (D–CT)	133,097	(49,205)	83,892
Franks (R–CT)	99,359	(89,472)	9,887
Gejdenson (D–CT)	133,578	(64,972)	68,606
Johnson (R–CT)	98,841	(108,139)	(9,298)
Kennelly (D–CT)	133,256	(49,553)	83,703
Shays (R–CT)	87,608	(112,645)	(25,037)
DELAWARE			
Biden (D–DE)	130,708	(46,815)	83,893
Roth (R–DE)	95,926	(114,511)	(18,585)
Castle (R–DE)	89,461	(85,686)	3,775
FLORIDA			
Graham, B. (D–FL)	129,093	(71,883)	57,210

VOTE TALLY STATE DELEGATION REPORT—Continued

[What Members of Congress voted for in the 103d Congress (figures in millions of dollars)]

Name	Increases	Cuts	Net
Mack (R–FL)	113,043	(143,972)	(30,929)
Bacchus (D–FL)	132,887	(80,920)	51,967
Bilirakis (R–FL)	111,730	(91,474)	20,256
Brown (D–FL)	133,224	(49,213)	84,011
Canady (R–FL)	94,433	(63,566)	30,867
Deutsch (D–FL)	135,305	(78,163)	57,142
Diaz-Balart (R–FL)	105,349	(39,199)	66,150
Fowler (R–FL)	117,511	(55,120)	62,391
Gibbons (D–FL)	131,598	(50,571)	81,027
Goss (R–FL)	71,039	(70,567)	472
Hastings (D–FL)	124,611	(65,777)	58,834
Hutto (D–FL)	98,320	(79,123)	19,197
Johnston (D–FL)	130,685	(58,569)	72,116
Lewis (R–FL)	82,691	(79,105)	3,586
McCollum (R–FL)	86,438	(66,143)	20,295
Meek (D–FL)	132,765	(47,663)	85,102
Mica (R–FL)	83,082	(86,383)	(3,301)
Miller (R–FL)	71,308	(97,554)	(26,246)
Peterson (D–FL)	133,241	(47,789)	85,452
Ros-Lehtinen (R–FL)	101,273	(53,047)	48,226
Shaw (R–FL)	97,003	(85,295)	11,708
Stearns (R–FL)	89,425	(49,647)	39,778
Thurman (D–FL)	132,997	(79,204)	53,793
Young (R–FL)	112,386	(94,847)	17,539
GEORGIA			
Coverdell (R–GA)	111,795	(142,899)	(31,104)
Nunn (D–GA)	127,354	(69,730)	57,624
Bishop (D–GA)	133,046	(61,705)	71,341
Collins (R–GA)	75,886	(90,412)	(14,526)
Darden (D–GA)	133,263	(47,811)	85,452
Deal (D–GA)	118,788	(80,398)	38,390
Gingrich (R–GA)	84,287	(83,872)	415
Johnson (D–GA)	131,875	(87,544)	44,331
Kingston (R–GA)	87,286	(59,930)	27,356
Lewis (D–GA)	131,820	(81,783)	50,037
Linder (R–GA)	83,347	(78,226)	5,121
McKinney (D–GA)	132,747	(85,370)	47,377
Rowland (D–GA)	109,857	(73,388)	36,469
HAWAII			
Akaka (D–HI)	130,732	(47,884)	82,848
Inouye (D–HI)	130,702	(46,352)	84,350
Abercrombie (D–HI)	136,002	(80,623)	55,379
Mink (D–HI)	133,951	(75,239)	58,712
IDAHO			
Craig (R–ID)	115,251	(137,160)	(21,909)
Kempthorne (R–ID)	115,281	(137,160)	(21,879)
Crapo (R–ID)	74,138	(71,766)	2,372
LaRocco (D–ID)	131,628	(112,089)	19,539
ILLINOIS			
Moseley-Braun (D–IL)	134,553	(50,324)	84,229
Simon (D–IL)	134,777	(82,337)	52,440
Collins (D–IL)	117,579	(75,819)	41,760
Costello (D–IL)	134,522	(81,139)	53,383
Crane (R–IL)	56,922	(88,955)	(32,033)
Durbin (D–IL)	135,331	(83,300)	52,031
Evans (D–IL)	136,045	(85,511)	50,534
Ewing (R–IL)	90,244	(109,384)	(19,140)
Fawell (R–IL)	78,104	(87,618)	(9,514)
Gutierrez (D–IL)	127,792	(72,618)	55,174
Hastert (R–IL)	96,879	(85,496)	11,383
Hyde (R–IL)	94,185	(76,478)	17,707
Lipinski (D–IL)	135,707	(69,875)	65,832
Manzullo (R–IL)	84,545	(85,360)	(815)
Michel (R–IL)	84,049	(87,819)	(3,770)
Porter (R–IL)	96,466	(93,657)	2,809
Poshard (D–IL)	133,523	(109,126)	24,397
Reynolds (D–IL)	133,322	(70,340)	62,982
Rostenkowski (D–IL)	134,763	(66,907)	67,856
Rush (D–IL)	131,997	(87,780)	44,217
Sangmeister (D–IL)	136,095	(96,172)	39,923
Yates (D–IL)	135,744	(85,592)	50,152
INDIANA			
Coats (R–IN)	111,932	(121,410)	(9,478)
Lugar (R–IN)	115,399	(120,289)	(4,890)
Burton (R–IN)	81,826	(57,887)	23,939
Buyer (R–IN)	94,089	(81,664)	12,425
Hamilton (D–IN)	133,806	(66,170)	67,636
Jacobs (D–IN)	114,071	(83,108)	30,963
Long (D–IN)	134,135	(104,384)	29,751
McCloskey (D–IN)	133,603	(54,139)	79,464
Myers (R–IN)	92,448	(83,657)	8,791
Roemer (D–IN)	115,914	(57,139)	58,775
Sharp (D–IN)	131,236	(77,679)	53,557
Visclosky (D–IN)	133,488	(70,124)	63,364
IOWA			
Grassley (R–IA)	117,692	(152,677)	(34,985)
Harkin (D–IA)	140,062	(64,432)	75,630
Grandy (R–IA)	102,787	(77,665)	25,122
Leach (R–IA)	111,274	(63,586)	47,688
Lightfoot (R–IA)	96,061	(52,927)	43,134
Nussle (R–IA)	77,293	(116,620)	(39,327)
Smith (D–IA)	130,221	(48,374)	81,847
KANSAS			
Dole (R–KS)	117,684	(122,677)	(4,993)
Kassebaum (R–KS)	120,090	(133.058)	(12,968)
Glickman (D–KS)	131,011	(50,128)	80,883
Meyers (R–KS)	105,890	(89,016)	16,874
Roberts (R–KS)	89,179	(53,720)	35,459

VOTE TALLY STATE DELEGATION REPORT—Continued—Continued

[What Members of Congress voted for in the 103d Congress (figures in millions of dollars)]

Name	Increases	Cuts	Net
Slattery (D–KS)	125,991	(78,020)	47,971
KENTUCKY			
Ford (D–KY)	130,732	(49,714)	81,018
McConnell (R–KY)	117,608	(113,755)	3,853
Baesler (D–KY)	131,843	(74,887)	56,956
Barlow (D–KY)	133,075	(84,133)	48,942
Bunning (R–KY)	61,945	(88,179)	26,234
Mazzoli (D–KY)	133,475	(67,925)	65,550
Rogers (R–KY)	129,359	(52,075)	77,284
LOUISIANA			
Breaux (D–LA)	130,572	(45,993)	84,579
Johnston (D–LA)	127,122	(31,700)	95,422
Baker (R–LA)	93,284	(83,613)	9,671
Fields (D–LA)	136,243	(84,672)	51,571
Hayes (D–LA)	109,938	(69,222)	40,716
Jefferson (D–LA)	133,276	(65,803)	67,473
Livingston (R–LA)	106,973	(88,408)	18,565
McCrery (R–LA)	100,333	(86,945)	13,388
Tauzin (D–LA)	112,409	(100,269)	12,140
MAINE			
Cohen (R–ME)	116,295	(146,117)	(29,822)
Mitchell (D–ME)	127,308	(52,668)	74,640
Andrews (D–ME)	134,168	(85,669)	48,499
Snowe (R–ME)	123,710	(87,709)	36,001
MARYLAND			
Mikulski (D–MD)	128,823	(45,826)	82,997
Sarbanes (D–MD)	127,332	(47,571)	79,761
Bartlett (R–MD)	90,787	(68,774)	22,013
Bentley (R–MD)	112,601	(39,832)	72,769
Cardin (D–MD)	133,856	(97,578)	36,278
Gilchrest (R–MD)	117,374	(88,018)	29,357
Hoyer (D–MD)	133,222	(48,893)	84,329
Mfume (D–MD)	135,916	(69,644)	66,272
Morella (R–MD)	116,854	(48,097)	68,757
Wynn (D–MD)	136,193	(81,292)	54,901
MASSACHUSETTS			
Kennedy (D–MA)	127,256	(51,079)	76,177
Kerry J. (D–MA)	127,332	(62,446)	64,886
Blute (R–MA)	117,151	(92,971)	24,180
Frank (D–MA)	124,628	(88,555)	36,073
Kennedy (D–MA)	135,871	(83,428)	52,443
Markey (D–MA)	136,201	(84,477)	51,724
Meehan (D–MA)	135,375	(120,729)	14,646
Moakley (D–MA)	129,582	(80,030)	49,552
Neal (D–MA)	135,123	(78,926)	56,197
Olver (D–MA)	136,248	(67,248)	69,000
Studds (D–MA)	135,994	(84,675)	51,319
Torkildsen (R–MA)	119,938	(81,861)	38,077
MICHIGAN			
Levin (D–MI)	127,302	(61,256)	66,046
Riegle (D–MI)	128,496	(47,037)	81,459
Barcia (D–MI)	132,669	(89,812)	42,857
Bonior (D–MI)	135,494	(77,509)	57,985
Camp (R–MI)	95,088	(119,653)	(24,565)
Carr (D–MI)	132,782	(73,805)	58,977
Collins (D–MI)	130,646	(72,086)	58,560
Conyers (D–MI)	126,861	(58,795)	68,066
Dingell (D–MI)	131,236	(69,533)	61,703
Ford (D–MI)	127,978	(72,795)	55,183
Hoekstra (R–MI)	96,995	(81,066)	15,929
Kildee (D–MI)	133,729	(71,150)	62,579
Knollenberg (R–MI)	75,492	(69,738)	5,754
Levin (D–MI)	133,080	(55,338)	77,742
Smith (R–MI)	62,611	(83,827)	(21,216)
Stupak (D–MI)	135,875	(85,738)	50,137
Upton (R–MI)	113,730	(119,172)	(5,442)
MINNESOTA			
Durenberger (R–MN)	113,712	(122,966)	(9,254)
Wellstone (D–MN)	135,793	(54,280)	81,513
Grams (R–MN)	66,974	(70,275)	(3,301)
Minge (D–MN)	116,973	(93,856)	23,117
Oberstar (D–MN)	129,767	(82,933)	46,834
Penny (D–MN)	111,140	(110,111)	1,029
Peterson (D–MN)	117,150	(102,774)	14,676
Ramstad (R–MN)	75,533	(102,537)	(27,004)
Sabo (D–MN)	129,219	(51,210)	78,009
Vento (D–MN)	131,653	(84,926)	46,727
MISSISSIPPI			
Cochran (R–MS)	117,697	(101,611)	16,086
Lott (R–MS)	115,558	(113,289)	2,269
Montgomery (D–MS)	122,661	(74,247)	48,414
Parker (D–MS)	117,776	(69,297)	48,479
Taylor (D–MS)	97,103	(86,878)	10,225
Thompson (D–MS)	111,728	(76,771)	34,957
Whitten (D–MS)	130,260	(51,373)	78,887
MISSOURI			
Bond (R–MO)	117,452	(112,300)	5,152
Danforth (R–MO)	119,264	(127,421)	(8,157)
Clay (D–MO)	126,983	(77,654)	49,329
Danner (D–MO)	136,122	(70,370)	65,752
Emerson (R–MO)	105,584	(57,296)	48,288
Gephardt (D–MO)	133,462	(51,699)	81,763
Hancock (R–MO)	58,513	(45,127)	13,386

VOTE TALLY STATE DELEGATION REPORT—Continued—Continued

[What Members of Congress voted for in the 103d Congress (figures in millions of dollars)]

Name	Increases	Cuts	Net
Skelton (D–MO)	130,804	(55,373)	75,431
Talent (R–MO)	87,618	(78,445)	9,173
Volkmer (D–MO)	131,029	(54,470)	76,559
Wheat (D–MO)	133,071	(84,832)	48,239
MONTANA			
Baucus (D–MT)	129,869	(79,774)	50,095
Burns (R–MT)	116,079	(118,112)	(2,033)
Williams (D–MT)	138,000	(69,030)	68,970
NEBRASKA			
Exon (D–NE)	130,612	(89,195)	41,417
Kerrey, R. (D–NE)	127,183	(95,574)	31,609
Barrett (R–NE)	98,965	(64,067)	34,898
Bereuter (R–NE)	94,106	(52,443)	41,663
Hoagland (D–NE)	132,702	(87,191)	45,511
NEVADA			
Bryan (D–NV)	132,582	(44,342)	88,240
Reid (D–NV)	132,610	(48,449)	84,161
Bilbray (D–NV)	133,633	(55,667)	77,966
Vucanovich (R–NV)	109,877	(60,553)	49,324
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
Gregg (R–NH)	103,600	(144,296)	40,696
Smith, R.C. (R–NH)	91,214	(136,976)	45,762
Swett (D–NH)	131,083	(75,590)	55,493
Zeliff (R–NH)	79,470	(67,294)	12,176
NEW JERSEY			
Bradley (D–NJ)	129,639	(59,336)	70,303
Lautenberg (D–NJ)	136,633	(74,425)	62,208
Andrews (D–NJ)	118,812	(86,934)	31,878
Franks (R–NJ)	83,517	(98,412)	(14,895)
Gallo (R–NJ)	102,380	(81,200)	21,180
Hughes (D–NJ)	122,142	(64,546)	57,596
Klein (D–NJ)	132,260	(68,715)	63,545
Menendez (D–NJ)	133,872	(80,884)	52,988
Pallone (D–NJ)	113,692	(59,576)	54,116
Payne (D–NJ)	131,116	(85,294)	45,822
Roukema (R–NJ)	98,215	(57,205)	41,010
Saxton (R–NJ)	96,489	(91,386)	5,103
Smith (R–NJ)	119,676	(86,449)	33,227
Torricelli (D–NJ)	133,861	(93,755)	40,106
Zimmer (R–NJ)	72,441	(103,701)	(31,260)
NEW MEXICO			
Bingaman (D–NM)	125,602	(56.267)	69,335
Domenici (R–NM)	113,763	(113,076)	687
Richardson (R–NM)	132,345	(52,617)	79,728
Schiff (R–NM)	96,741	(99,656)	(2,945)
Skeen (R–NM)	112,179	(75,564)	36,915
NEW YORK			
D'Amato (R–NY)	119,056	(121,381)	(2,325)
Moynihan (D–NY)	129,613	(54,602)	75,011
Ackerman (D–NY)	131,936	(54,784)	77,172
Boehlert (R–NY)	136,912	(45,270)	91,642
Engel (D–NY)	135,678	(81,675)	54,003
Fish (R–NY)	115,328	(87,667)	27,661
Flake (D–NY)	134,476	(87,420)	47,056
Gilman (R–NY)	110,441	(57,314)	53,127
Hinchey (D–NY)	135,659	(81,733)	53,926
Hochbrueck (D–NY)	130,549	(64,845)	65,704
Houghton (R–NY)	113,776	(85,066)	28,710
King (R–NY)	94,194	(64,718)	29,476
LaFalce (D–NY)	132,956	(70,487)	62,469
Lazio (R–NY)	101,259	(68,809)	32,450
Levy (R–NY)	97,636	(67,711)	29,925
Lowey (D–NY)	136,236	(80,007)	56,229
Maloney (D–NY)	133,715	(67,248)	65,967
Manton (D–NY)	133,056	(47,900)	85,156
McHugh (R–NY)	95,105	(70,325)	24,780
McNulty (D–NY)	132,851	(62,223)	70,628
Molinari (R–NY)	112,661	(73,230)	39,431
Nadler (D–NY)	132,948	(67,379)	65,569
Owens (D–NY)	121,084	(77,737)	43,347
Paxon (R–NY)	58,374	(80,005)	(21,631)
Quinn (R–NY)	96,639	(86,354)	10,285
Rangel (D–NY)	126,757	(79,759)	46,998
Schumer (D–NY)	135,227	(80,604)	54,623
Serrano (D–NY)	127,638	(87,924)	39,714
Slaughter (D–NY)	136,055	(83,249)	52,806
Solomon (R–NY)	67,851	(71,579)	(3,728)
Towns (D–NY)	131,897	(75,597)	(56,300)
Velazquez (D–NY)	127,188	(90,925)	(36,263)
Walsh (R–NY)	132,037	(83,063)	(48,974)
NORTH CAROLINA			
Faircloth (R–NC)	103,531	(139,538)	(36,007)
Helms (R–NC)	91,567	(112,912)	(21,345)
Ballenger (R–NC)	74,183	(97,923)	(23,740)
Clayton (D–NC)	130,160	(59,698)	70,462
Coble (R–NC)	79,221	(111,406)	(32,185)
Hefner (D–NC)	135,846	(80,675)	55,171
Lancaster (D–NC)	141,669	(59,515)	82,154
McMillan (R–NC)	100,292	(108,494)	(8,202)
Neal (D–NC)	116,769	(65,916)	50,853
Price (D–NC)	133,572	(53,450)	80,122
Rose (D–NC)	130,222	(50,862)	79,360
Taylor (R–NC)	75,562	(76,931)	(1,369)

VOTE TALLY STATE DELEGATION REPORT—Continued

[What Members of Congress voted for in the 103d Congress (figures in millions of dollars)]

Name	Increases	Cuts	Net
Valentine (D–NC)	111,821	(95,042)	16,779
Watt (D–NC)	131,786	(85,282)	46,504
NORTH DAKOTA			
Conrad (D–ND)	131,665	(70,587)	61,078
Dorgan (D–ND)	132,900	(66,454)	66,446
Pomeroy (D–ND)	133,784	(87,344)	46,440
OHIO			
Glenn (D–OH)	127,262	(46,343)	80,919
Metzenbaum (D–OH)	122,709	(71,661)	51,048
Applegate (D–OH)	129,120	(68,370)	60,750
Boehner (R–OH)	71,804	(66,717)	5,087
Brown (D–OH)	136,089	(95,756)	40,333
Fingerhut (D–OH)	113,373	(88,677)	24,696
Gillmor (R–OH)	113,401	(60,947)	52,454
Hall (D–OH)	135,102	(53,743)	81,359
Hobson (R–OH)	107,143	(101,560)	5,583
Hoke (R–OH)	74,439	(85,429)	(10,990)
Kaptur (D–OH)	135,191	(86,679)	48,512
Kasich (R–OH)	93,919	(89,098)	4,821
Mann (D–OH)	111,590	(62,197)	49,393
Oxley (R–OH)	86,516	(79,548)	6,968
Portman (R–OH)	70,694	(89,944)	(19,250)
Pryce (R–OH)	107,963	(99,910)	8,053
Regula (R–OH)	115,493	(74,188)	41,305
Sawyer (D–OH)	133,549	(52,280)	81,269
Stokes (D–OH)	131,023	(59,011)	72,012
Strickland (D–OH)	136,034	(85,400)	50,634
Traficant (D–OH)	132,239	(54,813)	77,426
OKLAHOMA			
Boren (D–OK)	126,528	(100,581)	25,947
Nickles (R–OK)	108,958	(142,761)	(33,803)
Brewster (D–OK)	108,809	(59,262)	49,547
Inhofe (R–OK)	64,351	(68,642)	(4,291)
Istook (R–OK)	70,383	(87,137)	(16,754)
McCurdy (D–OR)	129,821	(70,988)	58,883
Synar (D–OK)	129,921	(59,423)	70,498
OREGON			
Hatfield (R–OR)	112,737	(86,919)	25,808
Packwood (R–OR)	110,030	(121,330)	(11,300)
DeFazio (D–OR)	112,003	(81,768)	30,235
Furse (D–OR)	134,727	(82,816)	51,911
Kopetski (D–OR)	130,335	(77,141)	53,194
Smith (R–OR)	76,561	(29,600)	46,961
Wyden (D–OR)	126,217	(87,274)	38,943
PENNSYLVANIA			
Specter (R–PA)	124,538	(100,781)	23,757
Wofford (D–PA)	132,613	(61,662)	70,951
Blackwell (D–PA)	133,043	(70,656)	62,387
Borski (D–PA)	135,626	(76,251)	59,375
Clinger (R–PA)	104,552	(71,143)	33,409
Coyne (D–PA)	136,205	(84,074)	52,131
Foglietta (D–PA)	133,448	(73,070)	60,378
Gekas (R–PA)	83,847	(88,304)	(4,457)
Goodling (R–PA)	98,168	(93,254)	4,914
Greenwood (R–PA)	103,726	(107,694)	(3,968)
Holden (D–PA)	136,034	(92,293)	43,741
Kanjorski (D–PA)	136,145	(83,549)	52,596
Klink (D–PA)	136,088	(97,919)	38,169
Margolies-Mezv (D–PA)	117,351	(94,689)	22,662
McDade (R–PA)	109,325	(78,081)	31,444
McHale (D–PA)	135,817	(101,176)	34,641
Murphy (D–PA)	117,285	(96,225)	21,060
Murtha (D–PA)	140,515	(47,492)	93,053
Ridge (R–PA)	108,188	(92,187)	16,001
Santorum (R–PA)	91,135	(94,914)	(3,779)
Shuster (R–PA)	81,291	(84,389)	(3,098)
Walker (R–PA)	60,943	(69,783)	(8,840)
Weldon (R–PA))	91,001	(86,258)	4,743
RHODE ISLAND			
Chafee (D–RI)	122,158	(136,007)	(13,849)
Pell (R–RI)	121,372	(58,847)	62,525
Machtley (R–RI)	117,118	(50,818)	66,300
Reed (D–RI)	133,048	(54,455)	78,593
SOUTH CAROLINA			
Hollings (D–SC)	126,315	(62,298)	64,017
Thurmond (R–SC)	117,863	(120,618)	(2,755)
Clyburn (D–SC)	133,732	(60,148)	73,584
Derrick (D–SC)	129,552	(52,095)	77,457
Inglis (R–SC)	72,616	(89,009)	(16,393)
Ravenel (R–SC)	116,390	(105,123)	11,267
Spence (R–SC)	103,080	(40,981)	62,099
Spratt (D–SC)	133,556	(53,868)	79,688
SOUTH DAKOTA			
Daschle (D–SD)	130,763	(46,354)	84,409
Pressler (R–SD)	113,502	(119,079)	(5,577)
Johnson (D–SD)	134,057	(82,854)	51,203
TENNESSEE			
Mathews (D–TN)	129,125	(56,887)	72,238
Sasser (D–TN)	132,719	(60,681)	72,038
Clement (D–TN)	131,474	(43,068)	88,406
Cooper (D–TN)	130,486	(83,481)	47,005
Duncan (R–TN)	64,137	(86,559)	(22,422)

VOTE TALLY STATE DELEGATION REPORT—Continued—Continued

[What Members of Congress voted for in the 103d Congress (figures in millions of dollars)]

Name	Increases	Cuts	Net
Ford (D–TN)	112,243	(55,410)	56,833
Gordon (D–TN)	133,005	(74,449)	58,556
Lloyd (D–TN)	128,944	(74,208)	54,736
Quillen (R–TN)	92,083	(83,848)	8,235
Sundquist (R–TN)	96,191	(91,745)	4,446
Tanner (D–TN)	131,670	(85,516)	16,154
TEXAS			
Gramm (R–TX)	116,963	(117,343)	(380)
Hutchison (R–TX)	112,902	(84,690)	28,212
Andress (D–TX)	124,106	(72,551)	51,555
Archer (R–TX)	59,069	(43,841)	15,228
Armey (R–TX)	66,063	(67,890)	(1,827)
Barton (R–TX)	63,541	(91,227)	(27,868)
Bonilla (R–TX)	95,946	(94,297)	1,649
Brooks (D–TX)	133,173	(58,641)	74,532
Bryant (D–TX)	133,135	(80,232)	52,903
Chapman (D–TX)	139,177	(51,602)	87,575
Coleman (D–TX)	134,930	(56,112)	78,818
Combest (R–TX)	86,879	(39,267)	47,612
de la Garza (D–TX)	132,460	(51,281)	81,179
DeLay (R–TX)	72,114	(73,433)	(1,319)
Edwards (D–TX)	129,825	(54,946)	74,880
Fields (R–TX)	65,879	(65,861)	18
Frost (D–TX)	133,070	(71,340)	61,730
Geren (D–TX)	113,248	70,661	42,587
Gonzalez (D–TX)	140,382	(49,191)	91,191
Green (D–TX)	117,418	(79,844)	37,574
Hall (D–TX)	103,817	(76,141)	27,706
Johnson, E. (D–TX)	135,851	(77,427)	58,424
Johnson, S. (R–TX)	64,697	(71,164)	(6,467)
Laughlin (D–TX)	129,656	(58,974)	70,682
Ortiz (D–TX)	132,218	(47,340)	84,878
Pickle (D–TX)	131,819	(71,968)	59,851
Sarpalius (D–TX)	136,659	(67,164)	69,495
Smith (R–TX)	94,953	(79,108)	15,845
Stenholm (D–TX)	92,638	(92,702)	(64)
Tejeda (D–TX)	141,363	(47,773)	93,590
Washington (D–TX)	98,221	(67,452)	30,769
Wilson (D–TX)	132,332	(73,141)	59,191
UTAH			
Bennett (R–UT)	118,656	(118,998)	(342)
Hatch (R–UT)	118,376	(119,990)	(1,524)
Hansen (R–UT)	78,105	(100,181)	(22,076)
Orton (D–UT)	98,477	(76,968)	21,509
Shepherd (D–UT)	130,880	(71,552)	59,328
VERMONT			
Jeffords (R–VT)	127,492	(79,181)	48,311
Leahy (D–VT)	134,144	(64,377)	69,767
Sanders (I–VT)	128,991	(79,303)	49,688
VIRGINIA			
Robb (D–VA)	127,304	(84,096)	43,208
Warner (R–VA)	104,160	(121,462)	(17,002)
Bateman (R–VA)	106,621	(73,802)	32,819
Bliley (R–VA)	84,660	(88,240)	(3,580)
Boucher (D–VA)	134,942	(73,222)	61,720
Byrne (D–VA)	131,385	(78,014)	53,371
Goodlatte (R–VA)	74,768	(57,421)	17,347
Moran (D–VA)	134,094	(54,248)	79,846
Payne (D–VA)	126,508	(78,141)	48,367
Pickett (D–VA)	110,525	(35,608)	74,917
Scott (D–VA)	129,072	(62,932)	66,140
Sisisky (D–VA)	117,136	(50,586)	66,550
Wolf (R–VA)	94,060	(90,009)	4,051
WASHINGTON			
Gorton (R–WA)	119,839	(108,973)	10,866
Murray (D–WA)	127,332	(48,003)	79,329
Cantwell (D–WA)	133,291	(66,938)	66,353
Dicks (D–WA)	133,328	(47,767)	85,561
Dunn (R–WA)	82,033	(66,335)	15,698
Foley (D–WA)	75,302	(35,590)	39,712
Inslee (D–WA)	134,108	(106,326)	27,782
Kreidler (D–WA)	135,965	(92,527)	43,438
McDermott (D–WA)	134,667	(80,927)	53,740
Swift (D–WA)	132,523	(48,140)	84,383
Unsoeld (D–WA)	136,071	(85,252)	30,819
WEST VIRGINIA			
Byrd (D–WV)	128,325	(53,869)	74,456
Rockefeller (D–WV)	130,488	(46,657)	83,831
Mollohan (D–WV)	127,593	(48,951)	78,642
Rahall (D–WV)	130,704	(70,898)	59,806
Wise (D–WV)	133,297	(47,577)	85,720
WISCONSIN			
Feingold (D–WI)	126,933	(81,812)	45,121
Kohl (D–WI)	124,700	(103,945)	20,755
Barca (D–WI)	98,012	(105,688)	(7,676)
Barrett (D–WI)	129,832	(92,871)	36,961
Gunderson (R–WI)	97,717	(88,982)	8,735
Kleczka (D–WI)	136,083	(80,769)	55,314
Klug (R–WI)	88,482	(79,847)	8,635
Obey (D–WI)	136,075	(82,955)	53,120
Petri (R–WI)	65,995	(78,148)	(12,153)
Roth (R–WI)	63,570	(83,398)	(19,828)
Sensenbrenner (R–WI)	56,113	(106,430)	(50,317)

VOTE TALLY STATE DELEGATION REPORT—Continued—Continued

[What Members of Congress voted for in the 103d Congress (figures in millions of dollars)]

Name	Increases	Cuts	Net
WYOMING			
Simpson (R–WY)	98,332	(130,480)	(32,148)
Wallop (R–WY)	96,189	(100,419)	(4,230)
Thomas (R–WY)	80,843	(94,142)	(13,299)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. MOAKLEY asked and was given permission to include extraneous material.)

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are finally at the end of the contract.

For 100 days America's children, senior citizens, and working families have watched the Republican Congress gut their school lunches, home heating assistance, and student loans. And for what reason? To pay for tax breaks for the very rich. To continue to allow billionaires to renounce their American citizenship to avoid paying taxes.

The tax bill we are considering today illustrates very clearly the winners and losers in the Republican contract.

This bill takes money from school lunches and hands it over to the very rich in the form of tax breaks—from the mouths of babes to the pockets of billionaires.

Some people are very happy with the Republican Congress. Some people got what they wanted. They had their cake and they will eat it too. Those people are special interest lobbyists, corporations, and millionaires.

The losers were children who get meals at school, young people who need summer jobs, and families whose homes are heated with the help of the LIHEAP Program.

Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to see that Mr. SOLOMON's own committee, which is stacked with nine Republicans to four Democrats, refused to make in order any amendments.

Yesterday he called himself the fiercest deficit hawk up here. Still, despite the demand of 102 Members of their own party, despite Mr. SOLOMON's support, the Republican leadership refused to allow amendments to slow down tax cuts in the face of exploding deficits.

They imposed a watered down, milquetoast amendment that doesn't even qualify as a speed bump on the deficit highway.

I know if Mr. SOLOMON were calling the shots on the Rules Committee he would have made stronger amendments in order. Once we're finished with the contract I hope he gets his way.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can come back with an open rule, instead of this gag rule, and help someone other than the special interest lobbyists.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None.
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed; contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule	None.
H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive; Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4; Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 2	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive; only certain substitutes	2R; 4D.
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (OJ)	Restrictive; considered in House no amendments	N/A.
H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 665	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 668	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open; Pre-printing gets preference; Contains self-executing provision	N/A.
H.R. 728	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 729	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive; brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A.
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed; Put on suspension calendar over Democratic objection	None.
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed.	H. Res. 88	Restrictive; makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; waives all points of order; Contains self-executing provision.	1D.
H.R. 830	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A.
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive; makes in order only the Obey substitute	1D.
H.R. 450	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 926	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A.
H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive; 12 hr. time cap on amendments; Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment, waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D.
H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive; 8 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaness against it.	1D.
H.R. 988	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive; 7 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 956	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive; makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered.	8D; 7R.
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive; Combines emergency H.R. 1158 & nonemergency 1159 and strikes the abortion provision; makes in order only pre-printed amendments that include offsets within the same chapter (deeper cuts in programs already cut); waives points of order against three amendments; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the bill, cl 2, XXI and cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments in the Record; 10 hr time cap on amendments. 30 minutes debate on each amendment.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive; Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a ''Queen of the Hill'' procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R
H.R. 4	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive; Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered; The substitutes are to be considered under a ''Queen of the Hill'' procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments..	5D; 26R
H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A
H.R. 660	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A

** 72% restrictive; 28% open. **** Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103rd Congress. **** Not included in this chart are three bills which should have been placed on the Suspension Calendar. H.R. 101, H.R. 400, H.R. 440.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would love to respond to the gentleman but time does not allow right now.

I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], a member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. I thank the gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman, for yielding me the generous time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important vote that is coming up, for many reasons, just one of which is that passage of this rule is indeed going to complete our perfect record of bringing the Contract With America up for a vote just as we promised. We are keeping our promise.

This rule does allow the minority free rein to offer its alternative tax plan, such as it may be, and this rule ensures that we match the primary goal of cutting spending so we can balance the budget with the important need to reduce taxation, to curtail Uncle Sam's persistent depressing reach into Americans' pockets and wallets. The average tax filer in my State of Florida will save $1,605 in taxes if this bill becomes law. Other States will fare similarly well. We are delivering the long overdue tax relief that is good for all America, for every American. It will create jobs by providing investment incentives, particularly for small businesses. And it will give much needed relief to our seniors by eliminating the very unfair 1993 Clinton Social Security tax and rolling back the unfair earnings test limit that saps the energies and earnings of seniors who need to work or want to work.

H.R. 1215 is a down payment on comprehensive tax reform. The first 100 days, we have done a lot. The next 265 days, we can do the rest.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this rule, so we can get on with that job and do what we were elected to do last November.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, we should vote against the previous question, we should vote against the rule and if it passes, we should vote against this bill. It is the wrong time to be cutting taxes. We ought to be cutting the deficit. It is the wrong time, it is the wrong way to be cutting taxes, even if we should be cutting them. This is a terrible gag rule. We are going to do nothing for 3 weeks after Friday. Why can we not spend enough time talking about the impact of this bill instead of gagging us with 1 hour to all the Democrats to talk about the tax matter, a $700 billion mistake?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and one of the most respected Members of this House.

Mr. ARCHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, in September of last year, we promised in our Contract With America that we would vote on tax relief for families and on incentives to create new jobs. We also promised to pay for these tax cuts by slowing down the growth of Federal spending, and today we fulfill that pledge. But we do more. This package nets out with a $30 billion greater reduction in deficit than the President's budget proposal.

□ 1315

We have heard some Democrats say the taxpayers do not need or deserve tax cuts right now, and I disagree. The American family is overworked and it is overtaxed. So as promised, this bill provides a $500 per child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, tax credits for adoption of children and for the care of elderly family members.

It also provides tax incentives for long-term care insurance and for tax-free distributions of life insurance for the terminally and chronically ill.

This bill will repeal current laws that penalize seniors. It repeals the punitive 5-percent tax on Social Security benefits imposed by President Clinton in 1993, and it gives senior citizens greater opportunity to continue to work without suffering the loss of their benefits.

Americans do not save enough. High taxes are a big reason why. So we include incentives for savings and investment. We create a new type of individual retirement account, IRA, the American Dream Savings Account, and

we permit homemakers to build their own IRA's.

We provide much-needed capital gains relief to stimulate job-creating investment. Capital gains for individuals will get a 50-percent exclusion along with indexing for inflation. This will reduce the rate for lower income Americans to only 7½ percent.

Corporations will be eligible for a 25-percent alternative capital gains rate. And people who sell their homes at a loss will finally be able to get a tax deduction for that loss.

Businesses will have incentives to invest in new plant and equipment. The punitive and onerous job stifling alternative minimum tax will be repealed and small businesses will be able to double the amount that they can expense and deduct for the purchase of new equipment.

People who work out of their homes will be able to deduct more home office expenses.

The tax burden on family retention of small businesses and farms will be reduced, because the estate tax exclusion will be increased.

Democrats complain that these tax cuts are too big, they are not fair, and they are not targeted, and they are simply wrong.

These tax cuts are not too big. The total cost of all of the cuts is equal to 2 percent of what the Federal Government will spend over the next 5 years. And this will force a further 2-percent shrinking in the size of the Federal Government as we move to a balanced budget.

I think that is what the American people want to hear. These tax cuts are fair. The biggest tax cuts go to families earning $30,000 to $75,000. Over the next 5 years, higher income people, that is, the top 1 to 10 percent of the income categories, will actually pay a larger share of Federal taxes than they pay under current law. These taxes go to the right beneficiaries. Seventy-five percent go to families and 25 percent to create jobs.

Of the family benefits, 75 percent of the child credit goes to families with incomes under $75,000 and 90 percent goes to families with under $95,000 of annual income.

This rule is the only way that we can comply with our contract pledge, which is to bring before the floor of this House a vote on these provisions. A vote against the rule will be a vote against the contract.

I urge a vote for the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 15 seconds to the former chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Once more we have a major piece of legislation before us, and the Republican majority has structured a rule to get around all kinds of serious Budget Act problems.

The reason we have a Budget Act is to help us think through legislation before we pass it. Yet this is the eighth time this year we have been asked by the new majority to ignore the Budget Act.

The tax before us is a good example of the unwise legislation the House has recently been passing. The measure actually makes the long-term deficit worse since the cost of these tax cuts grow far more quickly than the spending cuts.

By the year 2000, according to CBO, the deficit under the bill will be $12 billion higher than it would be if we simply did nothing. Further, it contains some serious provisions that were never passed or considered by the appropriate committees. One of these provisions is a dangerous new taxpayer debt buydown plan. This proposal lets taxpayers designate a portion of their tax liability for debt reduction, thereby taking decisions about Federal spending from the people's elected representatives and handing them over to the wealthy. Essentially it says that the fundamental nature of the Federal Government should be changed from a representative democracy, one person one vote, to a plutocracy, one dollar one vote, a million dollars a million votes.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of any more invidious scheme for us to include in a tax package. The plan has never been reviewed by the Committee on the Budget. Rather, it was just dropped into the bill by rule as a part of the Kasich substitute.

Mr. Speaker, may I also remind the House that the Speaker, now Speaker, in August 1993 said that we, if we pass the President's program, we would head into a recession.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are in. Employment is up, unemployment is down, inflation is low, growth was at 4 percent in 1994 productivity is improving, factories are operating at high rates, investment is booming. Mr. Speaker, you were wrong 2 years ago. This is a bad bill.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 24½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, this year we have the privilege of having a very outstanding Member, a former judge from Ohio, serve on our Committee on Rules, Ms. DEBORAH PRYCE.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. By adopting this resolution, we will enable the House to complete the contract's promise to strengthen families and grow the national economy by delivering real tax relief.

Today, the average family spends more on taxes than it spends on food, clothing, and shelter combined. Many families now need a second breadwinner just to support the costs of a bloated Federal Government, not to cover the costs of raising a family.

After years of struggling to move a pro-family, pro-growth tax plan through Congress, we have the opportunity today to tip the tax scales back in favor of mothers, fathers, grandparents, and children.

It reduces the tax burden on families with children, and on two-earner married couples. It creates valuable tax incentives to encourage families to adopt children, and to care for elderly relatives. And, it gives families more reason to save their hard-earned money for the future.

In my own State of Ohio, taxes will be reduced by an average of more than $1,400 per person. That's $1,400 more that families can spend as they see fit, on the things they need most, and not as Washington would spend it for them.

More importantly, this legislation is fiscally responsible. As we all know, the best hope for tax fairness for America's families lies in our commitment to reducing the deficit and achieving a balanced Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the House will not have the chance to debate the Ganske amendment, but, as the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee has pointed out, it has been customary over the years to consider tax measures under more restrictive procedures, and I will support this rule. It is a balanced and responsible rule. By allowing the Gephardt substitute and the customary motion to recommit, the rule provides the House with two clear opportunities to offer alternative tax proposals.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, only long-term expansion of our national economy, and the new jobs it will create, can make the American dream a reality for future generations. That is why it is so important that this Congress not miss this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a very productive 93 days so far in the 104th Congress. The majority has kept its promise to the American people, and we have made rebuilding and strengthening America's families a top legislative priority.

I urge our colleagues to adopt this rule so that we can usher in a new era of growth, productivity, and financial security—for our children and future generations of Americans.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

[Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule providing for consideration of this bill, for a variety of reasons. As the ranking member on the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, I want to point out one particular problem with the rule. It includes a provision that was never passed by any committee.

This is a provision which hikes the taxes of 2 million middle-class Americans who work for the Federal Government in order to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy. It imposes these new taxes on Federal employees by making changes in the Federal retirement system; changes which were rejected by the committee of jurisdiction—the Government Reform and Oversight Committee.

This rule places before the House legislation which no committee has ever considered. The retirement provisions in this bill were written by the chairman of the Budget Committee. In what is clearly an extraordinary departure from usual procedure, the Rules Committee has chosen to take a course of action which negates the very existence of authorizing committees. This is a very dangerous precedent to set. This is not the same situation as might occur with a reconciliation bill, where the Congress has previously voted for a budget resolution that included reconciliation instructions.

In such a case, the Congress would vote to authorize the Budget Committee to report the necessary legislation, if the authorizing committee had failed to act, and the Congress had voted that budget reductions in a particular area were justified.

This is not the case. This is bad business.

But there has been no such vote, and the Rules Committee is acting without a mandate from the House.

Continuing with the unusual, the rule makes in order a tax increase in a tax cut bill. The bill would increase the amount of payroll withholding for the average Federal employee by an additional 2.5 percent of their income. This would take $750 more out of an employee's pocket each and every year.

Last week, when I testified before the Rules Committee with a bipartisan panel of Members who made these points, the committee's chairman, Mr. SOLOMON, and one of its most distinguished majority members, Mr. QUILLEN, agreed with us. Chairman SOLOMON said, "This is a case where we are raising taxes on some to pay for tax cuts for others, and that to me is wrong. I don't believe we ought to be doing this in this bill."

When we asked that an amendment be made in order to strike this provision, should it be included in the bill, Mr. QUILLEN asked to be made a cosponsor of any such amendment. Clearly, from their comments and those of other Members, Rules Committee members on both sides of the aisle were deeply troubled by this proposal, yet the rule allows for this proposal to be considered.

For those of my colleagues who are not concerned about imposing a 2.5-percent payroll tax on Federal employees, consider the precedent this sets. I believe that if the Republican leadership can get away with this, next they will try to raise the Social Security tax paid by all other American workers. They promised no new taxes, and yet, with this bill, they have broken that promise.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule. Reject this effort to bypass the jurisdiction of authorizing committees. Oppose this effort by the Republican leadership to impose a tax increase on middle-class Americans.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we continue to reserve our time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, the House acted to reform the welfare system. We also need to ensure that an even larger welfare system—the more than $200 billion in corporate giveaways—is reformed. Corporate taxpayers must live up to their responsibility as U.S. residents and ensure that they do not dodge their duty to pay their fair share of taxes and their obligation to help reduce the deficit.

I gave my Republican colleagues on the Rules Committee the opportunity to seek a fairer tax system by offering an amendment that curbs tax benefits given exclusively to multinational corporations and foreign investors. This amendment would have closed loopholes in the code that drain billions from our Treasury every year.

Yet, the majority again refuses to stand up to corporate interests so that we can reduce the deficit and put fairness in our tax system.

The Republican gravy train for the wealthy never seems to end. Included in this bill is a repeal of the alternative minimum tax. This tax ensures that profitable corporations do not avoid paying taxes in the United States. Many advocates of a repeal say that instead of an AMT, we need to look at individual parts of the code. But once again, the majority leaves loopholes for multinationals virtually untouched.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule.

□ 1330

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us contains a brutal breach of contract with America's public servants. Markup of similar legislation, as the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], has said, was rejected on March 15 because a majority did not support this provision.

The chairman of this committee who brings this bill to the floor said that 2 million Americans were getting a tax increase so that the wealthiest in America could get a tax decrease, because retirement benefits are an integral part of the retirement package that we offer to attract and retain top-quality Federal personnel. We should not make hasty, ill-considered, and not supported by a majority of the committee of jurisdiction decisions by the Committee on Rules, by the chairman's own admission, not having jurisdiction over this matter.

The chairman said it is traditional not to have amendments to tax bills. If this is a tax bill and if title IV is a tax bill, it should take three-fifths of this body to increase the taxes on 2 million Americans.

Proponents of this proposal have offered only one justification: We need to pay for the tax cut. There has been some argument about an unfunded liability, but the Congressional Research Service looked at this issue, is the unfunded liability of CRS a problem? And their answer was no, we have a system that is paid for. But everybody agrees that the Federal Employment Retirement System [FERS] is fully paid for, and it is included in this, a brutal breach of contract, my friends, in this, your last item.

Reject this rule. Reject this brutal breach of contract. Reject this ill-considered tax policy.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to argue about the value of letting the American people keep as much of their money as we can. I support tax cuts.

But the proposed bill gets the process wrong. I offered a straightforward amendment that insured deficit reduction would be the first priority while fulfilling the Contract With America. My amendment would have made us get on track to balance before the tax cuts become effective and would make continued tax cuts dependent upon us staying on track.

The shame is that in making this rule, the majority opted to reject the advice of the American people. I am entering into the RECORD four quotes that show that a vote for this rule is a vote against the best advice provided to the Congress.

I urge Members to support deficit reduction and returning money to the people who earn it by opposing the rule until we get it right.

GOP leadership needs to listen to the public:

> Opinion polls show public support for tax cuts is low and falling. Even Frank Luntz, the pollster who testmarketed the "Contract With America," says support has eroded in recent months. "The public currently believes that you cannot balance the budget and get a tax cut," Mr. Luntz says.—The Wall Street Journal, Monday, April 3, 1995

GOP leadership needs to listen to the experts:

> Now, with all due respect to both parties, the American people don't want a tax cut.

Every poll indicates they want deficits reduced.—Senator Warren Rudman, CNN Late Edition, Sunday, April 2, 1995

GOP leadership needs to listen to its supporters:

''Our members, if you ask them straight up, come down hard for deficit reduction'' ahead of lower taxes, says the head of a national association that is part of the GOP lobbying coalition.—The Wall Street Journal, Friday, March 31, 1995

GOP leadership needs to listen to its pollsters:

Nothing tells America more about your priorities than the sequence of your actions. . . . That's why ''banking'' the budget savings before cutting taxes is so important. It's aligned with the national mood, which would choose ''ensuring no debt for their children'' (72%) over ''getting a tax cut this year'' (24%).—Memorandum from Frank Luntz, January 19, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

I would point out that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] appeared before our Committee on Rules. I have great respect for the gentleman, as much as anybody in this body. But I made a note when he said, ''I not only support a closed rule, I would support you sending this bill back to the Ways and Means Committee and telling us to get it right. That is our job. I support Chairman ARCHER on a closed rule.''

I would just say to my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER], I really do have to resent his calling this a fig leaf. You know, we really are trying to work together here.

Let me just quote some language in this legislation. It says, ''The concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, as agreed to, provides that the budget of the United States will be in balance by fiscal year 2002.'' That is part 1.

Part 2, ''The conference report, as agreed to, on the reconciliation bill for that resolution achieves the aggregate amount of deficit reduction to effectuate the reconciliation instructions required for the years covered by that resolution necessary to so balance the budget.'' That is why people like myself, who have proven that we are deficit hawks year in and year out for the past 16 years, support this rule. Every Member of this body should.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and if there ever was a deficit hawk that meets my standards, it is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my Republican colleagues particularly and to those Democrats who were considering casting a vote for this, this is like the end of a horse race, maybe like the Kentucky Derby, but that would not be appropriate; the last race in the Triple Crown.

What we have done is we have kept our promises. We signed a Contract With America back last fall, and we said that there were a variety of things that we were going to do. We were going to downsize the operations of this House. We were going to cut committees. We were going to cut committee staff. We were going to cut committee funding. We said we would pass the Shays Act which would say that all laws we apply to the American people ought to be applied to ourselves. We said we would pass the balanced budget amendment. We got it done. We said we were going to pass the line-item veto. We got it done.

And you know what else we said? We said we were going to come to this floor, that we were going to downsize the operation of the Federal Government as we head into the 21st century. Let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, the American people are with us. The American people resent the fact that more of their money and more of their power and more control has been sent from where they live to this city.

What the Republicans are beginning to do is to listen to the communications of the American people, and the will of the American people is simple. What they want done is they want this Federal Government downsized. They want it reduced in scope. They want it reduced in power, and they want their money given back to them so they can begin to solve problems where they live.

They believe that, as we move into the 21st century, we need a smaller, more limited, more focused Federal Government, and they are demanding that in the course of doing that, in the course of shrinking this big Federal Government and giving them their money and power back, they can solve problems where they live, and at the same time that we are shifting power from Washington to local communities, we are also going to save the country from financial collapse.

I just commend to you the testimony of Alan Greenspan before the House Committee on the Budget when he said that if, in fact, we balance the budget, the kind of prosperity that we would experience in this country cannot even be estimated, that the power and the ingenuity and the creativity of the American people and the absolute wonderful dynamic process of our economy, our free enterprise, entrepreneurial economy that rewards every individual for hard work, will unleash a prosperity that we have not known in this country.

And what we are doing today by passing this rule and bringing this bill up for consideration is we are keeping our word. First and foremost, it is critical that the Republican Party keep its word to the American people. It is the only way to restore credibility, and when we come to the floor today, we are going to downsize this operation of the Federal Government, and we are going to give families, the building block of this Nation, it needs to be reinforced, in some cases it needs to be rebuilt, the American family is going to get some of their money back so that they can decide, individuals can decide, how to spend money on their children, not leaving it up to bureaucrats to decide.

Second, we have a growth element. We say we want to increase the size of the funnel so that we can pour more prosperity, have more job creation in this country. We are going to help the senior citizens by lifting the earnings limit. Let them work. Do not penalize them for work if they want to work.

We are going to have an IRA program. We are going to say to the people that if you want to save instead of punishing you in this country, we are going to give you an incentive to save.

Let me just say that this is the final leg of the Republican Contract With America. But it is the first downpayment on what we will follow up with in May, and that is to take this provision that gives tax relief and has growth in it, and we are going to marry it up in May with our budget resolution.

You know what we will achieve? What we promised last fall. We are going to balance the budget. We are going to save the future of this country. We are going to give Americans tax relief in the process, and we are going to shift power from this city back to where we live.

That is what the American people want. Those that fight against it are resisting the will of the American people, and you know, the beauty of what we do today, we not only give you tax relief, but we also have more deficit reduction, $60 billion more in deficit reduction than the entire President's budget.

And you know what, when it comes to deficit reduction and balancing the budget, you ain't seen nothing yet. We will be back in May to complete our job, to keep our word and save America and future generations.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, this is not a good tax-cut bill. In fact, there are two tax shelters within it which will make all the other tax shelters even enacted by this body pale by comparison, with regard to the abuse that they will enable people to take advantage of.

But the worst part of this, of what we are to do today, is not even the bill, it is the rule. We are going to consider legislation which was rejected by the committee of jurisdiction, and under the guise of tax fairness, and not breaking contracts, we are going to increase taxes on each Federal employee by an average of $4,525, to provide a tax cut of about $1,000 to the average American.

And talk about breaking contracts, when each Federal employee had to decide how to provide for the retirement security of their wives and children, we told them we would never break this retirement contract, and today we are going to break it. We are going to require them to lose retirement benefits,

and to increase their retirement contribution by 313 percent.

This day will go down in infamy if we pass this bill, and particularly if we do not reject this rule.

Mr. MOAKELY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM.].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, we have come to the end of a long and exhausting 100 days to take up this final piece of the Contract With America, which I have supported 70 to 80 percent thereof.

Unfortunately, though, what we have before us today is not a crown jewel but, rather, fool's gold.

You know, it was about 2 years ago at this time that we were on the floor trying to pass the rule for another high-profile, highly controversial piece of deficit-reduction legislation. As seems to be my destiny, my role leading up to that vote was to provide better assurance of true deficit reduction. We wanted to try to start to get some sort of handle on the entitlement spending which is increasingly driving our deficits.

Let me tell you about the reaction I received for my efforts when we reached the floor from this side of the aisle. I heard about skepticism, cynicism, I was lectured about meaningless guarantees which had no teeth. I was considered gullible for accepting promises of what would happen tomorrow rather than demanding the deal be closed today.

Now we come to today's vote when I hear I do not need to worry about deficit reduction in this bill. I am told the guarantee is already there. I am assured that we can have the promised land, both massive tax cuts and a balanced budge with borrowed money.

Well, the tax cut promises could not be any clearer. But just how does today's deficit-reduction guarantee stack up against the agreement I worked for 2 years ago, the guarantee which was deemed so inadequate, so toothless, so meaningless? Well, we had proposed laying out specific, numeric entitlement targets. If those targets were exceeded, we would have required the House Committee on the Budget to report a budget resolution which brought us back in line with spending cuts.

Now, does today's guarantee have such a requirement? No, it does not. We said that if the budget resolution or budget conference report breached the targets, the bills could not even be considered on the House floor.

□ 1345

No such prohibition in today's bill. We said, if the Congress decided to increase those targets, in other words, they chose to spend more money, a separate vote had to bring that provision into the political sunshine. No such sunshine in today's bill.

As one who has been criticized for alleged weaknesses in spending discipline proposals, which were 100 times stronger than the rule we have today, would somebody please tell me why I should accept this ''trust me'' language before us today? I refuse to trust anything other than an honest, enforceable guarantee that these tax cuts will not come at the expense of my children and grandchildren. I refuse to adorn myself with the jewels of political slogans and then hand to my children and grandchildren those worthless minerals passed off as gold.

Tax cuts with borrowed money is no bargain. Vote ''no'' on this rule and vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule.

It does not comply with what the Contract With America said, that we are going to have a open debate on tax issues. There is no opportunity for us to offer an amendment. It breaks the promise that we would have specific spending cuts before us before we would be asked to vote on a tax cut.

What this bill attempts to do is to use a phony mechanism for saying that we have to pass a budget reconciliation before the tax cuts become effective. But after we do that, the tax cuts become permanent.

I hope my colleagues will read the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, because that is what we did in 1985 with the Gramm-Rudman proposal. By the way, that bill required us to have a balanced budget by fiscal year 1991.

The tax cut in this bill is permanent. The spending cuts are 1 year, and they do not even give us anywhere near the amount of money. Let us do deficit reduction first.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to state my opposition to the rule for H.R. 1327. This rule does not permit a number of very important amendments which are critical to improving this bill. It does not permit the Roberts-Ganske amendment to direct the child tax credit to middle-income families; it does not permit the Porter amendment to require that our budget be balanced before tax cuts go into effect; and it does not permit an amendment I offered with several of my colleagues to remove the tax hike that this bill imposes upon Federal employees. A tax hike in a so-called tax reduction bill.

Title IV of H.R. 1327 would require Federal employees to pay an additional 2.5 percent toward their retirement system. An average Government worker making $20,000 a year would have to pay an extra $500 per year, and the employee making $30,000 would have to pay an additional $750. These are hefty sums for middle-class workers. Whatever happened to our contract with the Federal work force?

Title IV also would change the retirement formula to reflect the highest 5 years of salary as opposed to the present formula based on the highest 3 years. This provision would affect postal workers as well as civil service employees. Changing the retirement formula reduces the lifetime retirement benefits by 4 percent.

The General Accounting Office, just this week, issued a statement in support of the conclusions reached by the Congressional Research Service [CRS] on the status of the civil service retirement system. The report states that:

> (1) the system's unfunded liability is not a problem that needs to be fixed to avoid steep increases in outlays from the Treasury or increases in the deficit and (2) the system is not insolvent nor will it become insolvent in the future.

Mr. Speaker, Federal employees have borne the brunt of deficit reduction for more than a decade. Why are we once again taxing an already overburdened work force? Why have we tucked into this tax bill provisions that were never approved by the Government Reform and Oversight Committee?

I oppose the rule, and I ask my colleagues not to support a tax bill that will harm the more than 2 million Federal workers and their families nationwide.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the Republican whip, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], one of the outstanding Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, boy, he has surely earned his medal in the last 100 days, I will tell you.

Mr. DELAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I hope I do not take the 3 minutes, but I appreciate all work that the chairman of the Committee on Rules has done on this issue. I know it has been very, very hard for all the Members because this is a very big and important bill. Everyone wants a piece of it, but not everyone got what they wanted, and there are some ''push me, pull you'' going on on the rule. I appreciate that. But you have got to also appreciate the hugeness of this bill and what we are trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule, and in strong support of the Tax Fairness and Deficit Reduction Act.

Last November, the American people spoke loud and clear by voting in the first Republican majority in the House in 40 years.

The message voters sent was simple: Cut our taxes and cut Federal Government spending.

The new Republican majority has heard that message, and today we start to deliver on our promise.

The rule we have before us is a fair one. It gives the Democrat minority a chance to offer an alternative while keeping the integrity of the Republican majority package.

The rule also gives the American people a very clear choice.

You can vote for a Democrat package that contains no tax relief for middle class Americans. Or you can vote for the Republican package that finally begins the process of talking the tax burden of the American people.

I am reminded of the vote we had in 1993, when President Clinton and the leadership in the Congress voted in a tax increase that hit seniors, hit the middle class, and slowed economic growth.

Two hundred forty billion dollars' worth of tax increases. All we are doing is allowing people to keep $190 billion of those taxes for themselves to spend the way they think it ought to be spent. Not one Republican voted for that tax increase.

So today I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join with us in righting the wrongs of 1993. Vote to stop taxing our seniors, vote to allow middle-class families to keep more of their money, and vote to create jobs for our workers.

We have been asked how do you balance the budget by cutting taxes? Well, we have shown you that we honor our promises with passing the Contract With America; we will also show you in May when you cut taxes, as President Kennedy and President Reagan did, revenues go up and as we cut spending and the size of this Government, the cost of government goes down and the American people allowed to hold onto their money and spend it the time way they think is important.

So I urge all my colleagues to vote for this rule, vote for job-creating, deficit-cutting, the Tax Fairness and Deficit Reduction Act.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule before us. The majority leadership is desperate to convince this House and the American public that this is a bill for middle-income Americans. But their very rule snuffs out an amendment offered by Democrats and Republicans alike to ensure that it goes where it ought to. The bill, the amendment I offered is a case in point. It would have established tax fairness in the deductibility of health insurance. Presently corporations can deduct 100 percent, self-employed individuals 30 percent, other individuals paying their own premium, nothing at all. The bill I introduced would have allowed an 80-percent reduction in premiums paid by individuals. This would have made coverage more affordable for their families and would have installed tax fairness. That is why my amendment was supported by the Farm Bureau, supported by the Farmers Union, supported by the National Association of the Self-employed. And we do not even get a vote. In fact, when the Committee on Rules addressed this issue, at least one said, ''We don't want to open up the Tax Code on this issue.'' Well, they opened up the Tax Code for America's most wealthy; why will they not open up this bill for an amendment to help working Americans?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, more than half of the tax cuts proposed by the Republicans today for individuals will benefit families earning over $100,000 a year, and more than a quarter of the tax cuts will go to families earning over $200,000 a year.

The highest-earning 1 percent of families will get more in tax cuts than the 60 percent of families at the lower end of the income scale.

This is the Robin Hood proposal in reverse. We savagely cut programs for the poor and the vulnerable, and we give huge tax breaks to the rich and the powerful.

Mr. Speaker, this is bad legislation because it does not allow us to debate the tens of billions of dollars in corporate welfare that goes to rich and large corporations. It does not allow us to debate the propriety of millionaires saving huge amounts of money on mortgage interest deductions. This is bad legislation, a bad rule; let us defeat it.

Mr. Speaker, politics and much of what goes on here in Congress is really not very complicated. Everybody here understands that the majority of poor and working people don't vote and, for a variety of reasons, don't have much confidence that what happens here is relevant to their lives.

On the other hand, the wealthy and the powerful do vote, do contribute very heavily to the political parties, do have well-paid lobbyists and lawyers working full time for their interests. And that in a nutshell is why the rich get richer, the middle class is shrinking, and the poor are becoming poorer and are facing a terrible onslaught from the leadership of this House.

Mr. Speaker, during the last several months some of the wealthiest people in America and representatives of the largest corporations came together to contribute $11 million in one night to the Republican Party. Others came together for a $50,000-a-plate fund raising dinner with NEWT GINGRICH to raise money for a rightwing television network. Corporation like Amway and Golden Rule Financial have been contributing hundreds of thousands of dollars into Republican party coffers.

And today, Mr. Speaker, is payback time. After cutting back massively on programs for low income people, on programs for children, on programs for the elderly, for students, for the homeless, for people with Aids, today is payback time for the rich and the powerful. Today, they get the return on their campaign contributions to the Republican party.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Treasury Department, more than half of the tax cuts proposed by the Republicans for individuals will benefit families earning over $100,000 a year, and more than one quarter of the tax cuts will go to families earning over $200,000 a year. The highest earning 1 percent of families will get more in tax cuts than the 60 percent of families at the lower of the income scale. For the very highest income people, the top 1 percent, the Republican proposal creates an average tax reduction of $20,362, for the lowest income 20 percent taxes are reduced by all of $36.00. The Robinhood proposal in reverse. We cut savagely programs needed by the poor and vulnerable in order to give tax breaks to the rich and the powerful.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill because it does not allow us to provide rational alternatives to the tax breaks for the rich scheme that is being presented today. It does not allow us to cut the tens and tens of billions of dollars in corporate welfare that the largest corporations in America receive. It does not allow us to debate the propriety of millionaires saving large sums of money in taxes from the mortgage interest deduction on their palatial mansions. It does not allow us to remove Federal subsidies for such Federal agencies as OPIA, the Overseas Private Investment Association in which tax payers are paying to see their own jobs go to third world countries.

Mr. Speaker, we need open and vigorous debate about how we can move toward a balanced budget in a fair and progressive way—not on the backs of the weak and the vulnerable. We need fair and open debates to begin the process of eliminating the tax loopholes and the subsidies which the wealthy in large corporations receive.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] an outstanding Member and the first Freshman female Republican Member to serve on the Committee on Rules since the First World War.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, today we will have the chance to vote on a bill that will help restore tax fairness to families and senior citizens.

For too long, American families and seniors have seen their tax burden rise. Today, the average American family pays more in taxes than it spends on food, clothing and shelter combined. Some senior citizens now face a marginal tax rate of 85 percent—a rate much higher than that of other Americans.

The problem is not that the Government taxes too little; the problem is that it spends too much. The American people are simply overtaxed. The Tax Fairness and Deficit Reduction Act recognizes families for what they are—the basic building block of American society. It will give them the tax relief they so desperately need and deserve, and despite allegations that this bill is for the wealthy, seventy-six percent of the tax cuts go directly to families.

The $500 per child tax credit will help nearly one-quarter million parents in my State of Utah alone. Listening to the other side of the aisle you would

think that only wealthy people have children. But, 75 percent of the family tax credit goes to people with incomes of less than $75,000.

Our bill recognizes the invaluable contribution homemakers make to the family by allowing nonworking spouses a full $2,000 deductible IRA contribution instead of the current $250, helping homemakers provide for their retirement years and recognizing the value and worth of their work at home.

Our bill also helps senior citizens. Under the Clinton tax bill our seniors were unfairly singled out for higher taxes through an increase on their Social Security. Our bill will repeal that tax increase and restore tax fairness to elderly Americans. In addition, we will help remove the penalty for seniors who choose to work in their sunset years by raising the earnings test limit—rewarding rather than punishing working seniors.

The tax money we collect is not ours, it belongs to the taxpayers. As we cut Government spending and reduce the size of the Government and balance the budget, we need to let people keep more of the money they earn. I encourage my colleagues to support this rule, and this bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is true the circus is in town, but not really the roar of the lion that we hear today. The significant thing is a certain mooing sound that is under way. You see, I do not believe we will ever get the budget in balance without a true bipartisan effort. I thought we were headed in that direction because I have a letter here that was signed by 105 Republican Members who said that they recognized there was a need for more money for deficit reduction and they could change their tax proposal and apply it to only 85 percent of the families in this country and provide an addition $12 billion to $14 billion in deficit reduction.

□ 1400

That represented a half step, and it is sure a lot better than the lockstep we have seen most of this session of Congress. But somewhere along the way that all changed. We are not going to have a chance to vote on that proposal of 105 Republican Members because somewhere along the way the Speaker said ''no,'' and I do not know what it is that is so persuasive about him, but sometimes I get the feeling that, when these Members are around him, they are so cowed, I can almost hear them moo.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, in this tax bill, where are the tax breaks designed to improve the lives of ordinary Americans? This bill has provisions to allow Exxon to write off expenses on capital improvements, but there are no breaks for students that try to improve themselves through higher education. The greatest threats to our Nation's economy are soaring deficits and the erosion of the middle class. Today's tax cut legislation will not remedy any of these problems. Instead it places the burden of future deficits squarely on the backs of working Americans.

Economic indicators tell us that the economy is growing at a strong, steady pace. Do we really need to stimulate it with massive tax cuts for wealthy Americans and big business?

We should take advantage of a healthy economy and follow a prudent course of deficit reduction that will solidify our financial base. Let us send a message to Americans that Congress is making honest spending cuts that pay off our debts. Tying spending cuts to budgetary gimmicks further undermines the credibility of this institution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I rise against the rule and the Republican tax cut for the wealthy that this rule allows, a Republican tax cut plan where, according to the Citizens for Tax Justice, more than 71 percent of total capital gains tax cut breaks goes to those who make more than $200,000 a year.

The question is: Who is going to pay?

School lunches are getting cut. Elderly are getting tossed out of senior high-rises because they are reducing the amount of subsidies for the elderly to have affordable high-rises. In addition, they have not let the students alone either. They are now going to tack on interest payments for student loans starting the day the student enters the university.

This is not progressive and far from being the middle-class tax cut that the Republicans would have us believe because it is putting the burden on the students, and who gets the break? The people who have the most money.

It figures. It is the Republicans all over again.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI], another outstanding freshman Member who was helpful in writing in the language that is going to bring us to a balanced budget.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, as we have kept our promises these first 100 days, we have made the democratic process work. This week it will continue to work with the passage of this rule and this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as originally written I must confess that I was concerned that the tax package in the Contract With America did not place enough emphasis on deficit reduction. Mindful of that concern, a group of us, including the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and a host of others from both sides of the aisle, worked with the Republican leadership and fashioned an agreement on the issue that makes it entirely clear to the public that in passing tax relief we will not abandon our pledge to bring the deficit down to zero.

According to the new provision, the tax cuts in the bill cannot go into effect until a budget is passed, putting us on course to a balanced budget in the year 2002, and each year thereafter Congress will have to revisit our deficit reduction goals to make sure we stay on track.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that with the addition of these provisions to this original bill my concerns have been satisfied. A good bill has been made better, and the process is working again. I urge support of this rule and this bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the former chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, this is a time when we, as Members of Congress, should be deliberative and we should take our time in doing the Nation's business. This is a very, very important piece of economic legislation. It is a very, very important piece of social legislation. The Senate, when it will look at it, will call this a $700 billion tax cut. That is because they prefer to look at it in its longer term rather than the very short term that we House Members look at it.

This is the wrong time in America's history to be cutting taxes. This is a time in America's history to be cutting the deficit. Why? Because America is at full employment today. Why? Because America is using its maximum factory capacity utilization today. Factory capacity utilization today in America is the highest it has been in 15½ years. The Federal Reserve knows it; that is the reason why they have increased interest rates 7 times in the last 14 months. Every sensible economist knows that this is the wrong time to be cutting taxes. They tell us it is only time, the right time, to cut the fiscal deficit.

This bill, when it comes up, and it is going to come up, they have twisted enough arms to get it up, is an inequitable piece of social justice. Let us take the capital gains issue. It is a huge item in all of this, and who gets it? Only 8 percent of all taxpayers ever take a capital gains, 8 percent. But in this bill one-half of the capital gains will be taken by the upper 1 percent of our income earners every years, and they will take them every year, not just one time in a lifetime like most Americans.

Let us tell the truth about the capital gains thing. Eight percent of Americans ever take a capital gain. Of

that 8 percent, more than half of it goes to those above $200,000, and I say, ''If you look at those people again, they're not just taking one or two capital gains in a lifetime. They take multiple capital gains every year.'' And what do they do? They are just swapping their equities around between each other. Somebody buys their bad investment if they want to get rid of it. There is no creation of additional capital. It is just a game there.

So it is bad economic justice, it is bad social justice.

Now let us take the family credit. When the Republicans first introduced this bill, they gave a family credit, to low income individuals, those below $50,000. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] stood on the Capitol steps out there with the bill on September 27, 1994, and shook it into everybody's face, but this bill takes away 13 billion dollars worth of family tax credit from all those families earning less than $50,000 a year. That is not fair, that is not just, and that is not correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. GOODLATTE). The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] has expired.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Florida want another minute?

Mr. GIBBONS. Yes.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Florida. I just did not want to slow the gentleman down when he got that steam going.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate it, and I say, ''You know I appreciate you, Mr. SOLOMON, but you gave me an hour to ration between 204 Democrats. I've been swamped for requests for time. They would like to stay here and debate this.''

I see the Speaker standing in the back back there chatting with the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, and I say, ''We welcome you here, Mr. Speaker. We don't see you as much as we used to, but we're glad to have you here today. Have you gotten off the elephant out there in the circus. or are you coming in here to ride this elephant?''

Mr. Speaker, this is a lousy bill. It is the wrong time to be reducing taxes. We ought to be reducing the deficit now. We should not be cutting taxes the way we are doing it. It is reckless, it is irresponsible, it is bad policy for the American economy, it is bad policy for the American people.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed and restrictive rule. I cannot believe that my colleagues in the majority, who claimed that they would open up this House, could come to us with a straight face and gag this Chamber with a rule that restricts us to 5 hours of debate on a matter of such gravity for the Nation's future—$630 billion to be exact.

While I dare say that H.R. 1215 is far from the crown jewel that it has been touted to be by some, I will be the first to admit that the bill makes several changes in the Tax Code that I think are long overdue: easing the tax burden on senior citizens, providing tax credits for expenses incurred when adopting a child or caring for an elderly parent or grandparent in your home, and indexing capital gains. I would like to support provisions such as these, but this rule doesn't allow me to do that in a fiscally responsible manner. We are told to take all or nothing, and if that is the case I will have no choice but to vote no.

Mr. Speaker, I will not vote for a bill that will enable some of our wealthiest corporations to avoid taxes altogether while giving just $90 in tax relief for a family with an income of $20,000, and then forces massive cuts in programs that would have a devastating impact on hardworking Americans. For the citizens I represent in New York, this bill spells higher transit fares, devastating cuts in Medicare, reduced student loans, hungrier school children, less affordable child care, and fewer police on the beat.

One of the bill's more offensive provisions is the repeal of the corporate alternative minimum tax, which was instituted in 1986 because more than half of the Nation's most profitable corporations had been able to utilize various loopholes in the Tax Code to pay no Federal income taxes, even though they were reporting huge profits. The inequity of this situation was so clear that the Reagan Administration supported establishment of a corporate AMT.

Repeal of the corporate AMT would clearly represent an inequitable shift in the tax burden. Seventy-four percent percent of the corporations who pay the corporate minimum tax have assets greater than $250 million. Given these facts, it is not surprising that its repeal was not originally part of the Contract With America. Instead, it was added in at the 11th hour, when the American people weren't looking and special interest lobbyists were hard at work.

Let me remind my colleagues that under this rule we will not have the opportunity to vote to restore the corporate AMT; to make the Social Security tax repeal effective immediately, as it should be; to help students pay for college; and to decide if the child tax credit should be available to the families of 35 percent of our Nation's children who need it most but who would not benefit from the credit as it is currently written in this bill.

I urge a no vote on this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], a very outstanding veteran member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this fair and balanced modified closed rule.

Now, when the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] came before the Committee on Rules, he requested a closed rule. We are not even going as far as the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means would like, but we do have a modified closed rule. It is a measure which is bringing to the floor an opportunity for us to do what the American people have said overwhelmingly that they want. They want us to try and reduce the size and scope of Government and allow them to keep a little bit of what they have earned.

Now, as I have been listening to the rhetoric over the past few minutes about us versus them, class warfare, I am very discouraged. I have enjoyed working for years with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] on trade issues, but, when I hear him talking about the very few who will utilize the capital gains tax reduction versus those working individuals who do not or would not be able to, I cannot help but think of a column that appeared recently in the New York Post where Thomas Sowell said,

> Class-warfare politics is not just fraudulent, it is a cheap play on envy and a very serious disservice to the whole country. Not only does it divide us yet another way, it threatens the very process by which all of us have benefited economically.

□ 1415

This is a balanced approach. We want to recognize that we are in this together. The American people want us to responsibly deal with deficit reduction.

This bill is a very important step on the road toward a balanced budget. Why? Because every shred of evidence is that with this capital gains tax rate reduction, we are going to see an increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury. That increase is going to help us responsibly get to a balanced budget.

I urge support of this fair and balanced modified closed rule, and urge my colleagues to join us.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] a former Governor of Delaware and one of the outstanding Members of this body, who has participated in writing the balanced budget legislation.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for consideration of H.R. 1215, the Tax Fairness and Deficit Reduction Act of 1995.

The American people deserve to keep more of their hard-earned money. They recognize that the Federal Government is collecting an ever larger share of their earnings and that the money it collects is often not well spent. Americans do not mind paying their fair share of the costs for our Nation's needs—protecting our national security, looking after those who truly

need help. But the programs and operations of the Federal Government have become too big and far too inefficient. Excessive Federal spending has resulted in a national debt of $4.8 trillion and deficits of almost $200 billion adding to that debt every year.

Americans want relief from taxes, but what my constituents in Delaware tell me is that reducing the deficit, balancing the budget, and making the Government live within its means is what they want done first, I am happy to say that we now have language in this bill that will ensure that Congress acts to cut the deficit and balance the budget before the tax cuts can become law.

The Rules Committee has added an amendment offered by Mr. UPTON, Mr. MARTINI, and myself which states that the tax provisions in this bill cannot become law until Congress passes a budget resolution and reconciliation legislation that will result in a balanced budget by the year 2002. This provision reflects the will of our constituents: cut taxes, but not at the expense of balancing the budget.

By including this important provision in the bill we are insuring that Congress will have to face the difficult decisions to reduce Government spending. If Congress cannot make those decisions, the tax cuts will not go into effect. It is as simple as that.

The Castle-Upton-Martini amendment also adds two key requirements to force Congress and the President to continue to work toward a balanced budget.

After Congress passes the budget reconciliation legislation that places us on course to a balanced budget, in each subsequent year the budget committees and CBO must report on whether we are still on the path to balance in 2002. If we fall off course, Congress must consider ways to get back on course in that year's budget resolution. In short, Congress must take action if the deficit begins to increase.

Equally as important, this provision will require the President to join in this effort, by requiring him to submit a balanced budget each year. This year, President Clinton has chosen again to propose a budget that would result in annual deficits of $200 billion for the next 5 years. Under this amendment, if the President chooses not to officially submit a balanced budget, he would have to offer an alternative plan that shows how the budget could be balanced. It forces the President to face the same decisions the Congress must face.

Mr. Speaker, I support tax relief for families, savings incentives for individual Americans, and investment incentives for business. But, I am adamant about the critical need to balance the budget. I support the rule because it clearly links tax cuts to deficit reduction. My colleagues and I will continue this effort on the budget resolution and the budget reconciliation bill to ensure that we stay on course to a balanced budget.

I want to thank FRED UPTON and BILL MARTINI for their efforts on this amendment. I also want to acknowledge Mr. BROWDER and Mr. ORTON for their leadership on the need for deficit reduction. Finally, I appreciate the work of JOHN KASICH and JIM NUSSLE, and the Republican leadership for working with us to make this provision part of the bill. I urge support of the rule and approval of the tax fairness and deficit reduction bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule as a noninclusive rule and hurting the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Democratic substitute to H.R. 1215. The Democratic substitute benefits primarily low- and middle-income Americans. Whereas, H.R. 1215 benefits primarily wealthy Americans with incomes above $200,000.

The Democratic substitute sponsored by my colleague, RICHARD GEPHARDT of Missouri, ensures that 100 percent of the benefits of the tax cut will accrue to families with adjusted gross income of less than $100,000. Moreover, it permits us to invest in human capital by allowing middle-income families to deduct up to $10,000 in educational expenses per year.

Furthermore, the Gephardt bill encourages Americans to emphasize savings for their retirement years by expanding the number of taxpayers who would be eligible to deduct contributions to individual retirement accounts [IRA]. This is accomplished by raising the adjusted gross income level requirement from $35,000 to $50,000 for single taxpayers and $60,000 to $75,000 for couples who file joint tax returns.

The Gephardt bill also affirms our commitment to balancing the Federal budget. This bill requires certification by the Office of Management and Budget [OMB] that the Federal budget will be balanced in fiscal year 2002. H.R. 1215 fails to incorporate the requirement that deficit reduction be a priority.

Frankly, the Democratic bill promotes fairness, maintains fiscal responsibility, and strengthens American families. And finally it is a good commonsense tax bill because it invests in our people—college loans for students—part of America's future.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to urge Members to defeat the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I intend to offer an amendment to the rule which will allow Members to vote on several amendments:

The Ganske amendment, which lowers the eligible income level for the child tax credit;

The Kennelly amendment relating to taxable income for the blind;

The Browder amendment tying the tax cuts to deficit reduction;

The Wolf amendment which strikes the tax increase on Federal workers; and

The Nadler-Lowey amendment which restores the pre-1993 lower tax rate for middle-income seniors immediately rather than being phased in as the bill does.

And many others as well.

This will be the only opportunity on this bill to have votes on these issues affecting Federal workers, the blind, the middle class, deficit reduction, and the elderly. I urge Members to vote ''no'' on the previous question.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have here the U.S. Tax Code. It is the fear of every American. If we had an open rule today we would open it up, and gosh knows what would happen.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of complaining about the tax cuts in this bill, but I wonder if the real opposition is to the fact on something we have not heard about much here today. Is there $100 billion in real spending cuts in this bill? That is what Members are going to be voting for.

You know, I said at the time when we opened this debate that a vote on this rule is going to be a vote for a balanced budget. Let me tell you, a vote against the rule is going to be a vote against a balanced budget.

What the people are really afraid of is the language that appears in this bill, and it says, ''. . . the budget of the United States will be in balance by the fiscal year 2002.'' And the second part of it is something they fear even more. It writes into law ''the aggregate amount of deficit reduction to effectuate the reconciliation instructions required for the years covered by that resolution necessary to so balance the budget.''

That will become the law if you vote for this rule and the bill it will bring up.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at this chart, you see that President Clinton projected, when he gave us the budget a few months ago, another $1 trillion, $996 billion, added to the debt. What is compassionate about that, to load that kind of deficit on the American people and their children and my grandchildren?

We can have a chance to do something about it right now. Vote for the previous question.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule on the Tax Fairness and Deficit Reduction Act, H.R. 1215.

The Contract With America states that ''within the first 100 days of the 104th Congress, we shall bring to the House Floor the following bills, each to be given full and open debate, each to be given a clear and fair vote and each to be immediately available this day for public inspection and scrutiny.'' With a closed rule on the tax bill, the Republicans have not provided, as they said they would, for a ''full and open debate'' on this crucial legislation.

I would agree that many Americans need tax relief, and that we must do all that we can to ensure fairness for our seniors and families. That is why I offered two amendments to this legislation which would have furthered these very important goals. But, unfortunately, ''full and open debate'' on these amendments was denied, and the Members of this House will not have the opportunity to vote on these amendments.

My colleague from New York, NITA LOWEY, and I introduced an amendment which would repeal immediately the increased tax on Social Security benefits rather than repeal it over a 5-year period, as the Republican bill does. While our amendment would have granted seniors

immediate tax relief, and would have been paid for by striking from the bill a repeal of the Corporate Alternative Minimum Tax—making corporations pay their fair share of taxes—it was, nonetheless, rejected by the Rules Committee. When we raised this issue of equity regarding our Nation's seniors we were hushed.

While this bill does much to provide significant and immediate tax relief for wealthy corporations, it delays tax relief and fairness for our Nation's seniors. While the Republicans state that this bill will provide fairness, this, to me, does not seem fair.

Repealing the Social Security tax increase immediately and paying for it by requiring Republicans to retain the Corporate Alternative Minimum Tax is only fair and equitable. The Alternative Minimum Tax was adopted to stop the practice of large corporations using the talents of high-priced tax lawyers to contrive ingenious loopholes that enable them to escape all taxation. To provide these huge tax giveaways to corporations and not provide immediate tax relief and fairness to our Nation's senior would be the height of unfairness and hypocrisy. It would be a moral outrage to allow or Nation's most profitable corporations to cease paying income taxes immediately, while requiring seniors to wait half a decade for tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, after restoring fairness to seniors by repealing the Social Security tax increase immediately, our amendment would have left approximately $7 billion for deficit reduction—almost half of the amount of appropriations this House rescinded earlier this month for this very purpose.

Our amendment would have significantly reduced the deficit, while restoring tax fairness to our Nation's seniors, but the Republican leadership would not allow this fiscally prudent amendment to be considered on the House floor.

Our amendment would have done the right thing by making profitable corporations pay their fair share and lifting this unjustified increased tax burden off senior citizens immediately.

I asked, again with no success, that the Rules Committee consider another one of my amendments. The amendment would simply index income taxes to reflect regional differences in the cost of living. These differences mean that an income which might make one well off in, say, rural Arkansas, would barely afford a middle-class lifestyle in New York or Dallas. Yet the current Tax Code, by taxing nominal, rather than regionally adjusted, incomes, treats each of these taxpayers as if their incomes were economically equivalent.

We know that this is not the case.

People living in high cost-of-living areas, like New York City, should not be penalized by the tax system. By regionally adjusting income tax brackets, we can make the tax burden on American families more fair and equitable.

Furthermore, I find it ironic that this rule waives the requirement for a three-fifths vote in order to increase taxes. The Republicans passed a rule earlier this Congress which would require that in order to increase taxes the House had to have a three-fifths vote. Now they are waiving this rule for the purposes of passing their tax bill which gives tax breaks to the wealthy. The hypocrisy here again is blatant.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is unfair and I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule.

Two years ago, the liberal Democrats voted for the largest tax in history. Today, we right that wrong by allowing the American people to keep more of their hard-earned money.

The Republican Tax Relief and Deficit Reduction Act accomplishes many things for American families. One of the most symbolic and important is the provision that corrects an inequity against the American homemaker.

Mr. Speaker, the current Tax Code treats American homemakers, who are overwhelmingly women, as second class citizens.

In the eyes of the Federal Government, the work of the homemaker is not as valuable as the work of her husband.

For tax purposes, a single-income family can set aside for retirement roughly one-half what a dual-income family can. Our spousal IRA proposal allows the work-at-home spouse to save $2,000 just like the spouse.

This rule, and the Republican tax relief bill, acknowledge the value and hard work of the millions of homemakers in America.

Support this rule, support homemakers, and support the families of America.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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 203, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

YEAS—230

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—203

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

Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—2

Reynolds
Stark

☐ 1437

Mr. DAVIS changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 204, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

AYES—228

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—204

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—3

Pomeroy
Reynolds
Waters

☐ 1455

Mr. TAUZIN changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I was not present for rollcall vote No. 290, the rule to provide for the consideration of H.R. 1215, the Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995. I was unavoidably detained in a meeting with Office of Management and Budget Director Alice Rivlin regarding Missouri River flood control. I spoke on the floor of the House twice against the rule and, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MORAN. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my recollection that this body passed legislation earlier this term, in fact, on the first day of this session, that required that any tax increase be passed with a three-fifths vote of this body.

Since there is a tax increase to be leveled on Federal employees, in the case of the Federal Employees Retirement System, a 313 percent increase on their retirement contribution; in the case of the Civil Service Retirement System there was a 35 percent increase in their retirement contribution. This is clearly a tax increase, Mr. Speaker.

Therefore, it seems to me, to be consistent with the legislation this body previously passed, it would require a three-fifths vote. I would reserve my point of order, but I would make that parliamentary inquiry at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will take the gentleman's inquiry under advisement and rule on it at the appropriate time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I would ask, when would be the appropriate time for a ruling on this parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pending final passage of the legislation.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, when would I be able to get a division of the question on that issue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the rule relates to the vote on passage. The question becomes ripe for the House upon passage of the legislation.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, the rule said that all points of order are waived, but yet I am making an inquiry as to whether this is consistent with previously passed legislation of this body.

☐ 1500

It seems to me this then ought to enable us to call for a division as to the ruling of the Speaker. What I want to understand is when that might occur, when this body might be able to vote on that ruling.