

Republican colleagues that at this historic moment, as a new Member of Congress, let us forge a new beginning as we move into this next century. Let us find common ground for all working Americans.

One would think that they would have learned from the disaster aid relief bill that they were wrong. One would think they would learn from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] that they were wrong.

Do the right thing for the American people, provide tax relief for working Americans. Let Democrats come together and work on behalf of American families.

THE REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN PROVIDES NO BREAKS FOR THE RICH, JUST EQUAL TREATMENT

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, this is really a pretty simple debate we are in. Let me just refer to this chart once again. I want particularly the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD] who just spoke to understand this.

Mr. Speaker, this is a chart which shows who pays taxes in America and what the Republican plan will do to various categories of people who pay taxes. It is important to point out that in the top 40 percent of the taxpayers in America, those people pay 84 percent of all the money we have here to spend, I would say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD], the top 40 percent of the taxpayers in America pay 84 percent of all the money that comes to Washington to spend.

So when the Republican tax plan gets ready to change things, do we change things for that group? This chart shows we definitely do not. As a matter of fact, the top 20 percent today under the Clinton tax hike plan pay 63 percent of all the money that is paid to Washington, and under the Republican plan we do not change that at all. They still pay 63 percent.

The next 20 percent today under the Clinton tax hike plan pay 21 percent, and under the plan that we propose, they continue to pay 21 percent; no breaks for the rich, just equal treatment.

WHO WILL BENEFIT FROM THE PROPOSED TAX CUTS?

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the issue is who benefits from the tax cut. Quite frankly, the Republicans' data distorts the effects of their bill. They only analyze the first 5 years of what is a 10-year plan.

That said, Democrats in fact have designed a tax proposal to give every

working man and woman a shot at the American dream, and the right to quality education has always been an essential part of that dream.

Republicans decide to skimp on education tax breaks to pay for their tax breaks for the wealthy. The Republican plan provides only half of the \$1,500 tuition credit for the first 2 years of college, does virtually nothing for college juniors and seniors, and actually raises taxes on some graduate students.

The Democratic proposal has offered an alternative that includes the full \$500 HOPE credit for the first 2 years of college, plus a 20-percent tuition credit for subsequent years.

The American people are watching this budget debate and wondering, who is on my side? Sixty-one percent of them have concluded that the Republicans are out of touch with the people in this country. It is differences like the education issue that makes it clear. Republicans are on the side of the wealthiest Americans, Democrats are fighting for the middle class.

□ 1045

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

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

Mr. ROGAN. 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 364, nays 49, answered "present" 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]  
YEAS—364

Ackerman	Bliley	Carson	Davis (VA)	Kildee	Radanovich
Aderholt	Blumenauer	Castle	Deal	Kilpatrick	Rahall
Allen	Blunt	Chabot	DeGette	Kim	Rangel
Andrews	Boehlert	Chambliss	Delahunt	Kind (WI)	Regmond
Archer	Boehner	Chenoweth	DeLauro	King (NY)	Regula
Bachus	Bonilla	Christensen	DeLay	Kingston	Reyes
Baesler	Bono	Clayton	Dellums	Kleczka	Riley
Baker	Boswell	Clement	Deutsch	Klink	Rivers
Baldacci	Boucher	Clyburn	Dickey	Klug	Rodriguez
Ballenger	Boyd	Coble	Dicks	Knollenberg	Roemer
Barcia	Brady	Coburn	Dingell	Kolbe	Rogan
Barr	Brown (FL)	Collins	Doggett	LaHood	Rogers
Barrett (NE)	Brown (OH)	Combest	Dooley	Lampson	Rohrabacher
Barrett (WI)	Bryant	Condit	Doolittle	Lantos	Ros-Lehtinen
Bartlett	Bunning	Conyers	Doyle	Largent	Rothman
Barton	Burr	Cook	Dreier	Latham	Roukema
Bass	Burton	Cooksey	Duncan	LaTourette	Roybal-Allard
Bateman	Buyer	Cox	Dunn	Lazio	Royce
Bentsen	Callahan	Coyne	Ehlers	Leach	Ryun
Bereuter	Calvert	Cramer	Ehrlich	Levin	Salmon
Berman	Camp	Crapo	Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Sanchez
Berry	Campbell	Cubin	Engel	Lewis (KY)	Sandlin
Bilbray	Canady	Cummings	Eshoo	Linder	Sanford
Bilirakis	Cannon	Danner	Etheridge	Lipinski	Sawyer
Bishop	Capps	Davis (FL)	Evans	Livingston	Saxton
Blagojevich	Cardin	Davis (IL)	Everett	Lofgren	Scarborough
			Ewing	Lowey	Schaefer, Dan
			Farr	Lucas	Schumer
			Flake	Luther	Scott
			Foley	Maloney (CT)	Sensenbrenner
			Forbes	Maloney (NY)	Serrano
			Ford	Manzullo	Sessions
			Fowler	Martinez	Shadegg
			Frank (MA)	Mascara	Shaw
			Franks (NJ)	Matsui	Shays
			Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (MO)	Sherman
			Frost	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus
			Furse	McCollum	Shuster
			Galleghy	McCrary	Sisisky
			Ganske	McDade	Skaggs
			Gejdenson	McGovern	Skeen
			Gekas	McHale	Skelton
			Gillmor	McHugh	Smith (MI)
			Gilman	McInnis	Smith (NJ)
			Gonzalez	McIntosh	Smith (OR)
			Goode	McIntyre	Smith (TX)
			Goodlatte	McKeon	Smith, Adam
			Goodling	McKinney	Smith, Linda
			Gordon	McNulty	Snowbarger
			Goss	Meehan	Snyder
			Graham	Meek	Solomon
			Granger	Menendez	Spence
			Green	Metcalf	Spratt
			Greenwood	Mica	Stabenow
			Hall (OH)	Millender	Stark
			Hall (TX)	McDonald	Stearns
			Hamilton	Miller (CA)	Stenholm
			Hansen	Miller (FL)	Stokes
			Harman	Minge	Strickland
			Hastert	Mink	Stump
			Hastings (WA)	Moakley	Sununu
			Hayworth	Molinari	Talent
			Hefner	Mollohan	Tanner
			Herger	Morella	Tauscher
			Hill	Murtha	Tauzin
			Hinojosa	Myrick	Taylor (NC)
			Hobson	Nadler	Thomas
			Hoekstra	Neal	Thornberry
			Holden	Nethercutt	Thune
			Hookey	Neumann	Thurman
			Horn	Ney	Tierney
			Hostettler	Northup	Torres
			Houghton	Norwood	Towns
			Hoyer	Nussle	Traficant
			Hulshof	Ortiz	Turner
			Hunter	Owens	Upton
			Hyde	Oxley	Velazquez
			Inglis	Packard	Vento
			Istook	Pappas	Walsh
			Jackson (IL)	Parker	Watkins
			Jackson-Lee	Pastor	Watt (NC)
			(TX)	Paul	Watts (OK)
			Jenkins	Paxon	Waxman
			John	Payne	Weldon (FL)
			Johnson (CT)	Pease	Weldon (PA)
			Johnson (WI)	Pelosi	Wexler
			Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (PA)	Weygand
			Johnson, Sam	Petri	White
			Jones	Pickering	Whitfield
			Kanjorski	Pitts	Wicker
			Kaptur	Pomeroy	Wise
			Kasich	Porter	Wolf
			Kelly	Portman	Woolsey
			Kennedy (MA)	Price (NC)	Wynn
			Kennedy (RI)	Pryce (OH)	Yates
			Kennelly	Quinn	Young (FL)

NAYS—49

Abercrombie	Gutknecht	Pascrell
Bonior	Hastings (FL)	Pickett
Borski	Hefley	Poshard
Brown (CA)	Hilleary	Ramstad
Clay	Hilliard	Rush
Costello	Hinchee	Sabo
Cunningham	Hutchinson	Schaffer, Bob
DeFazio	Kucinich	Stupak
English	LaFalce	Taylor (MS)
Ensign	Lewis (GA)	Thompson
Fawell	LoBiondo	Tiahrt
Fazio	McDermott	Visclosky
Filner	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Fox	Oberstar	Waters
Gephardt	Obey	Weller
Gibbons	Olver	
Gutierrez	Pallone	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gilchrist

NOT VOTING—20

Armey	Foglietta	Riggs
Becerra	Jefferson	Sanders
Crane	Manton	Schiff
Diaz-Balart	Markey	Slaughter
Dixon	Moran (VA)	Souder
Edwards	Peterson (MN)	Young (AK)
Fattah	Pombo	

□ 1107

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2015, BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1997

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2015) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (c) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SPRATT moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2015 be instructed as follows:

(1) On the matters pertaining to increasing the age of eligibility for medicare, reject the provisions contained in section 5611 of the Senate amendment.

(2) On the matters pertaining to the minimum wage, worker protections, and civil rights—

(A) insist on paragraphs (2) and (3), and reject the remainder, of section 417(f) of the Social Security Act, as amended by sections 5006 and 9006 of the bill, as passed the House, and

(B) reject the provisions contained in sections 5004 and 9004 of the bill, as passed the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] is recognized for 30 minutes in support of his motion and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

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

Briefly, as a matter of introduction to what this motion to instruct pertains, it is a double-barrel motion. On the one hand we say the Senate provisions that would raise the age of eligibility for Medicare from 65 to 67 were not part of our bipartisan budget agreement, were not essential to achieving the objectives we set for ourselves. Indeed we were able to do the \$115 billion in Medicare cost reduction over a 5-year period of time with substantial consensus.

This particular portion of the bill was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means with a near unanimity, with as close to consensus as we can get in this House. It was unnecessary to do it and, furthermore, it raises more questions than it answers: What will this coverage cost for people from 65 to 67; will it be available; how much lead time should we give people to get ready for this unexpected adjustment?

So we would instruct the conferees to reject those Senate provisions.

Second, the House and the Senate both added other provisions outside the budget agreement unnecessary to it that would deny the basic protections of one of the fundamental laws of the land, the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, to individuals coming off TANF, coming out of welfare into workfare, or participating in the welfare to work program. We think that is unwarranted and unnecessary, and we would say to the conferees excise, take out, those provisions as well and reject them as part of this bipartisan agreement so it can truly be called a bipartisan agreement.

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

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

First of all, these motions to instruct are kind of gimmicky, to be truthful. They are just designed for somebody to come to the House floor, lay out difficult positions that are hard to win in a debate and, basically, they do not have the force of law.

Now, let me just speak to the three of them. First of all, the first one is we should not raise the age of eligibility for Medicare recipients from 65 to 67.

□ 1115

In the House bill we did not do that. We said it ought to be 65. But let me make it clear to everybody who is in this Chamber, that if they think that when their children must be put into the workplace to work day and night to pay for our benefits, and they think that there is not a fundamental restructuring of the system in need, then are we doing injustice to the young people of this country.

The fact is, in Medicare and Social Security and in Medicaid, we are going to find ourselves in a position where the number of young people will be few

in number and the number of people getting benefits, which will be us, are going to be great in number.

Mr. Speaker, our young children in this country deserve a chance, the same kind of chance our parents gave to us, and we know that there must be fundamental structural changes in the major entitlement programs because these programs are not sustainable. We put our children in a position that is untenable and unconscionable if we are not willing to meet the challenge of the baby boomer retirement and what it does to our children.

Now, I am not so sure that this House is capable, along with the Senate, of designing the real solutions that are going to be necessary, the structural changes that are going to be necessary in the area of Social Security, in the area of Medicare and in the area of Medicaid.

I will say this: I think this House has taken a large step forward in terms of designing changes in Medicare that are structural in nature, that are positive, that move us in the right direction. But I would hope that this House will reject in the future the rhetoric of 1995, where some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said that we were trying to damage the senior citizens in this country by our Medicare reforms, and they are the Medicare reforms that they are today accepting.

So for those people who want to stand and demagogue and scare the elderly, scare the children, we are going to stand against you, just like we did in 1995 and just like we did in 1996, and finally had you support our program on a bipartisan basis.

Now in the area of worker protection, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] had a comment on that. In the area of worker protection, let me just make one other statement here to my colleagues on the other side. And I have some friends on the other side who understand my heart, and there are friends I have on the other side who risked a lot for things they believed in.

The bottom line on this is, the House is not prepared to move to changing the retirement date on Medicare this week, but we sure as heck better open our mind and open our heart to what we are going to need to do long-term for the future of the next generation. And we will not be stopped by demagoguery because the young people in this country will not permit the politicians in this House, who are going to be the beneficiaries of all the benefits, the young people are not going to stand for it; and there are going to be many of us who get the benefits who are not going to permit you to demagogue this on your own and be able to win the day.

In the area of worker protections, the third recommendation that my friend from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] recommends, which is that we do not prohibit or we do not discriminate in the area of sex or health or safety for our people who go to work, who are on welfare, the House intends to stand behind