United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 18, 1995 No. 83

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We are grateful, O God, for all Your gifts to us and Your promises to all people. On this day we remember with gratitude those who have given of their talents and abilities in public service and who have sought to fulfill the biblical injunction to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with You. May the example of those who have served faithfully in this place remind others of their opportunity to be involved with public responsibility in working together for the common good. Bless all gathered here and be with all Your people, this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. 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. Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed until later this afternoon.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DOGGETT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 483. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 395. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Energy to sell the Alaska Power Administration, and to authorize the export of Alaska North Slope crude oil, and for other purposes; and

S. 534. An act to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide authority for States to limit the interstate transportation of municipal solid waste, and for other purposes.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO ATTEND MEETING OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 276d, the Chair appoints as members of the United States delegation to attend the meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group the following Members of the House: Mr. MANZULLO of Illinois, Chairman; Mr. LATHAM of Iowa; Mr. CRAPO of Idaho; Ms. DUNN of Washington; Mr. ZIMMER of New Jersey; Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut; Mr. GOODLING of Pennsylvania; Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida; Mr. DE LA GARZA of Texas; Mr. GIBBONS of Florida; Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York; and Mr. MCNULTY of New York.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, to receive the former Members of Congress.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0905

RECEPTION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The SPEAKER. On behalf of the Chair and this Chamber, I consider it a high honor and a distinct personal privilege to have the opportunity of welcoming so many of our former Members and colleagues as may be present here for this occasion. We are taking this recess for the purpose of welcoming them.

Let me say that I, in particular, want to take a moment to thank all of my former colleagues who are teaching, who are lecturing, and who are helping explain this complex and amazing process by which we try to do things. I think that all too often the country does not appreciate that the legitimate process of tension and debate and dialog are, in fact, how a free people makes decisions.

I would say to any of my former colleagues who are able and have the time and are willing to do so that you do the

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

country a service and you continue your public service when you engage in that kind of opportunity.

Somebody who I have had several very enjoyable occaasions of trying to explain why we, on television, do not always seem to be pulling in the same direction, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, it is my high honor to be here today and to welcome our former colleagues. As I look around the room, I see many Members that I had the honor and pleasure to serve with, and we welcome all of you to the Chamber today.

If there has ever been a time in our history when we need to explain our form of Government to the American people, it probably is right now. We have a lot of reaction among the public, people saying, Why do you all go up there and argue and bicker so much?

I understand their frustration and concern, but all of you well know that that is what this place is about. It is about the resolution of conflict. People have to be a little more willing to have conflict resolved in our great society and, of course, that is what goes on in this room and in the room across the other way of the building.

I tried to stop, as I handed the Speaker the gavel a few months ago, and remind Americans that we should celebrate the passing of power, in this case after 40 years in the House of Representatives, from one party to another with peace and civility and respect. That is the hallmark of our society.

I simply wanted to rise today to congratulate all my former colleagues who have been such an important part of carrying on that tradition and, I am sure, are still carrying on that tradition as they continue to relate to the public and explain the meaning of what goes on here.

Mr. Speaker, it is good to be part of this ceremony today and to welcome our friends back. We look forward to talking to them today and greeting them.

The SPEAKER. Let me just say, my understanding is this is the 25th annual report to the Congress by the Association of Former Members. I want to encourage every Member to stay active and to stay involved.

I want to tell you that we, on our part, when I have a chance, for example, to talk with John Rhodes and pick his brain a little bit about where we are and what we are trying to do, it is very helpful to have the counsel of folks who have been here before and have done it before. It is good to be here with all of you. It is, frankly, a nice occasion to suspend all the other things we are doing that may not be quite this pleasant and have a chance to share with you.

The Chair recognizes the Honorable James W. Symington, immediate past president of the association, to take the chair.

Mr. SYMINGTON (presiding). The Clerk will now call the roll of former Members of Congress.

The Clerk called the roll of former Members of the Congress, and the following former Members answered to their name:

ROLLCALL OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ATTENDING MEETING, MAY 18, 1995

William H. Ayres of Ohio;
J. Glenn Beall, Jr. of Maryland;
Ed Bethune of Arkansas;
James H. Bilbray of Nevada;
Lindy Boggs of Louisiana;
Daniel B. Brewster of Maryland;
William S. Broomfield of Michigan;
James T. Broyhill of North Carolina;
John H. Buchanan, Jr. of Alabama;
M. Caldwell Butler of Virginia;
Elford A. Cederberg of Michigan;
Charles E. Chamberlain of Michigan;
R. Lawrence Coughlin of Pennsylvania;
James K. Coyne of Pennsylvania;
Hal Daub of Nebraska;
William D. Ford of Michigan;
Nick Galifianakis of North Carolina;
Robert Garcia of New York;
Robert A. Grant of Indiana;
Gilbert Gude of Maryland;
James M. Hanley of New York;
Robert P. Hanrahan of Illinois;
Ralph R. Harding of Idaho;
Jeffrey P. Hillelson of Missouri;
John W. Jenrette, Jr. of South Carolina;
Don Johnson of Georgia;
Hastings Keith of Massachusetts;
David S. King of Utah;
Ernest L. Konnyu of California;
Peter N. Kyros of Maine;
H. Martin Lancaster of North Carolina;
Norman F. Lent of New York;
John V. Lindsay of New York;
Manuel Lujan of New Mexico;
John Y. McCollister of Nebraska;
Romano L. Mazzoli of Kentucky;
Robert H. (Bob) Michel of Illinois;
James L. Nelligan of Pennsylvania;
Dick Nichols of Kansas;
Stanford E. Parris of Virginia;
Jerry M. Patterson of California;
Charles H. Percy of Illinois;
Shirley N. Pettis of California;
John J. Rhodes of Arizona;
John J. Rhodes III of Arizona;
John H. Rousselot of California;
Philip E. Ruppe of Michigan;
George E. Sangmeister of Illinois;
Ronald A. Sarasin of Connecticut;
Harold S. Sawyer of Michigan;
Richard S. Schweiker of Pennsylvania;
Carlton R. Sickles of Maryland;
Henry P. Smith III of New York;
Peter Smith of Vermont;
James W. Symington of Missouri;
Andrew Jackson Transue of Michigan;
Doug Walgren of Pennsylvania;
Charles W. Whalen, Jr. of Ohio;
Lyle Williams of Ohio;
Robert (Bob) Wilson of California; and
Larry Winn, Jr. of Kansas;

Mr. SYMINGTON (presiding). The Chair announces that 37 former Members of Congress have responded to their names. Any who may appear later will have their names added to the list.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Philip Ruppe.

Mr. RUPPE. First I would like to thank the Speaker and the majority leader for giving us the opportunity to be here today and to enable me to present to you the annual report of the former Members of Congress.

I must say we, we do have a very good turnout this morning. I recall how difficult it was to be down here at 9 in the morning when we were well paid for the effort. Considering that our remuneration is somewhat less at this particular time, I do want to thank everybody for showing up at 9, a very early hour, I suspect, for a number of us.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I are very pleased and honored to have this opportunity, as I stated, to once again be on the floor of Congress to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress. We want to thank you and we want to thank every Member, seated Member of Congress, for the warm welcome extended to our group today. The association, over 25 years since its inception, has grown to a membership of some 600 individuals, an annual budget in excess of $600,000.

The association, following the mandate of its charter, has developed a number of programs of which we are very proud, programs both domestic and international, to promote the improved public understanding of the Congress as an institution, and representative democracy as a system of Government.

One of our earliest initiatives was our highly successful Congressional-Campus Fellows Program. Launched in 1976, former Members of Congress visit colleges, universities, and high school campuses for 2, sometimes 5 days to have formal and informal meetings with the faculty and students. Also community representatives are invited to share with them firsthand knowledge about the operations of the U.S. Congress, the executive branch, and the Judiciary.

Under this program, 72 former Members of Congress have reached more than 100,000 students through 231 programs on 164 campuses in 49 States. Interestingly enough, this is the association's program that our members feel most strongly about, and it is a program which is going to receive renewed attention in our next program year.

I want to emphasize that, because we have done a good deal of reorganization, but the Campus Fellowship Program is popular with our members. It does a service to the communities where we are involved, and I think it is a very good way to show how the Congress operates and in the very best manner in which it operates.

Mr. Speaker, we have without exception a warm attachment, as we obviously indicate by being here today, to

this body, its traditions and its role in a democratic society, and we welcome, as we always did and will, the opportunity to speak out on behalf of all of its Members.

The association also provides opportunities for our members to share their congressional experiences overseas. Fourteen study tours have been carried out for members of the association who, entirely at their own expense, have participated in educational and cultural visits to China, the former Soviet Union, Eastern and Western Europe, the Middle East, South America, New Zealand, and Australia.

□ 0920

At this time, in fact just yesterday morning, we held discussions with our former colleague, Congressman Jim Jones of Oklahoma, our current Ambassador to Mexico, to explore the possibility of a study tour in that country. I would like to see that Ambassador Jones is very anxious that we do develop something in the way of a study trip to Mexico, and while we are there, USIA, our information agency, may well use our Members or former Members to interact with their Mexican counterparts south of the border. It could be not only a lot of fun, but an opportunity, I think, to enable us to explain better the role of Congress in our society.

The association cooperates with a number of other nonprofit organizations which make available for educational projects the experiences and perspectives of persons who have served in the Congress. It has provided former Members of Congress for programs sponsored by USIA's AMPARTS [American Participants] Program in Africa, Asia, Latin America, Europe, and Australia. USIA staff hope to involve more former Members of Congress in these programs and have asked us to notify them when any of our Members are traveling abroad who might be interested in participating in these programs, so I can say to all of you today, if you are traveling abroad, let us know your plans. USIA representatives in the field are anxious to get a hold of you, your experience, and your expertise.

The association also provides opportunities for current Members of Congress to share their expertise with legislators of other countries and to learn first hand the operations of those governments. It has continued serving as the secretariat for the Congressional Study Group on Germany, which is the largest and most active exchange program between the United States Congress and the Parliament of another country. The study group is an unofficial, informal, and bipartisan organization open to all Members of Congress. Currently, I am proud to say, it involves more than 100 Representatives and Senators, and provides opportunities for Members of Congress to meet with their counterparts in the German Bundestag to facilitate better understanding and greater cooperation between these great countries.

In addition to hosting a number of members of the Bundestag and other German Government leaders at the Capitol this past year, the study group hosted a retreat in early February in Maryland for new Members of Congress and new members of the Bundestag. This was enormously successful, and it was followed up by the 12th Annual Congressional-Bundestag Seminar which was held in April in Dresden, Germany, in which 10 Members of the Congress and 11 members of the Bundestag participated, along with two of our members, Lou Frey and Martin Lancaster. Also, four members, former members, of the Bundestag were involved, as well as having indepth discussions about the many facets of United States-German relations on the national level, and the participants had the opportunity to observe the progress that has been made in Eastern Germany since the reunification a few years ago, and to discuss continuing developmental efforts being conducted by state legislators in the new states of Saxony and Brandenberg.

The Study Group Program is funded primarily by the German Marshall Fund of the United States, and we do want to thank them again in this forum for their support. It has included joint meetings of the Agriculture Committees and the Bundestag, and visits by members of the Bundestag to observe the Illinois presidential primary and the Iowa caucus, as well as congressional districts throughout the country with Members of Congress to learn about the U.S. political process at the grassroots level. I hope they did not go back too confused, but I think it was a great experience for all of them.

The association also serves as the secretariat for the Congressional Study Group on Japan, which seeks to develop a congressional forum for the sustained study and analysis of policy options on major issues in United States-Japanese relations, and to increase opportunities for Members of Congress to meet with their counterparts in the Japanese Diet for frank discussions on these key issues. This informal, bipartisan group, which, again, is open to all Members of the Congress, has 67 Member participants, and an additional 45 Members of Congress have asked us to keep them informed of our activities. An ongoing activity of the study group, one of them, is to host breakfasts, luncheons, and discussions with Americans and Japanese who are experts on various facets of the United States-Japanese relationship. For example, just last week Ambassador Mickey Kantor met with study group members for what I am sure was a very lively discussion of the auto and auto parts negotiations.

The association's program to assist the new democratic nations in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, which was begun in 1989, has continued to expand. Under funding from the United States Information Agency, the association has hosted delegations of Members of the Parliaments of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and the United States, sent bipartisan teams of former Members of Congress, accompanied by either congressional or country expert, to Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, and has placed a congressional fellow in Budapest, and highly successfully so, for 2 years to provide technical assistance to the Members and staff of the Hungarian Parliament. The final aspect of this grant from USIA will be the hosting of a delegation of four Members of the Slovak Parliament in the United States next month.

Under a grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts, the association has placed one congressional fellow in Slovakia, a gentleman by the name of John Holstine, who has done a tremendous job, and another Congressional Fellow in the Ukraine, Cliff Downen there, has done an outstanding service to this country and to our organization. They have been at their posts for a year, and will remain until April 1996. Former Members of Congress, Lou Frey of Florida and Lucien Nedzi of Michigan, have visited these fellows to assist them in their work, and they have conducted workshops and participated in seminars with members of the Parliament. We plan to have additional former Members, and we would like to have additional former Members of Congress visit Slovakia and the Ukraine in the next calendar year.

Back here in the United States, the association has continued its program of hospitality for distinguished international visitors, parliamentarians, cabinet ministers, judges, academicians, and journalists here at the Capitol. This program, originally funded by the Ford Foundation, has been continued under grants from the German Marshall Fund of the United States. It has enabled us to host 306 events: breakfasts, lunches, dinners, receptions, and so forth, for visitors from 82 countries and the European Parliament, and has proved to be an effective avenue for improving communication and understanding between Members of the Congress and leaders of other nations.

In addition to our work with current parliamentarians, we maintain close relationships with associations similar to ours; that is, former members of the Parliaments of other countries. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize and welcome two representatives of these associations who are with us today, Aideen Nicholson of the Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians, and Joachim Raffert, of the Association of Former Members of the German Bundestag.

I might say they were both here well before 9 o'clock, setting a good example for their American counterparts.

These relationships have been cordial, they have been a lot of fun. We have made within the group lasting

friendships, and I think really have, through this process, developed a better understanding and appreciation of the common democratic institutions that we share.

Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my very sad and unhappy duty to inform the House of those persons within our membership who have served in the U.S. Congress and have now passed away since our report last year. Those deceased Members of the Congress are:

Glenn M. Anderson, California;
Irene B. Baker, Tennessee;
Joseph H. Ball, Minnesota;
Wallace F. Bennett; Utah;
Albert M. Cole; Kansas;
Emily Taft Douglas; Illinois;
John Dowdy, Texas;
Daniel Flood, Pennsylvania;
J.W. Fulbright; Arkansas;
Claude Harris, Alabama;
Patrick J. Hillings, California;
W. Pat Jennings, Virginia;
August E. Johnsen, Michigan;
Thomas H. Kuchel; California;
Thomas J. Lane, Maine;
Clarence D. Long, Maryland;
Gillis Long, Louisiana;
Richard Dean McCarthy; New York;
Thomas C. McGrath, Jr., New Jersey;
Hervey G. Machen, Maryland;
George Meader, Michigan;
D. Bailey Merrill, Indiana;
Jack R. Miller, Iowa;
Edward J. Patten, New Jersey;
Richard L. Roudebush, Indiana;
Hugh Scott, Pennsylvania;
Robert L.F. Sikes, Florida;
Jessie Summer, Illinois;
Roy A. Taylor, North Carolina;
Lera Thomas; Texas; and
Albert Watson, South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for a moment of silence in their memory.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose, since I have the platform, I can tell the story about one of the former Members who is deceased. I'm sure we all knew most of them. I can remember Dick Roudebush and others on the floor. I'm sure most of us have very great stories to tell about each of the individuals, but since I have the platform, I'm going to tell a little one on Roy Taylor.

One time when we were on the Interior Committee's Parks Committee we were out in Iowa and we were inspecting a site that may have been included or would have been included as a national park or wildlife refuge, but in any event, the Forest Service took us fishing. They helicoptered us up to this wonderful lake and gave us the opportunity to fish for cutthroat trout. There were about a dozen of us in the group, and Roy Taylor was the chairman.

We all got outfitted with fishing poles and we all went at it. Roy Taylor got the first six fish, and of course, we were a little nervous, but we knew the chairman of the committee deserved better service than the rest of us, so no one was too upset. Roy Taylor was a pretty good sport. He said, ''Fine, no problem, maybe the pole is lucky,'' so he gave the pole to somebody else and took another pole, and he got five more fish, all for the chairman.

Finally we said ''Roy, this is a little too much. We are going to move you off that site, because we know they have probably got some frogmen down below to put the fish on the hook,'' so we moved Roy about one-eighth of a mile to another site, and he got 4 more fish. Let me say, I think there were something like 14 or 15 fish, and Roy got them all, got every one of them, no matter where he was, what pole he used.

I grant you, he had talent, but it certainly shows, at least in those days, that chairmanship did indeed have rank and power. But he was a wonderful man, and I hope that his wife, Evelyn, realizes how much we think of him, and all of the other Members with whom we have served.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my happy duty to report that nominated to be our association's new president is our colleague, Lindy Boggs of Louisiana, and as vice president, Lou Frey of Florida.

Is Lindy Boggs here? I know some of them have had obligations this morning. Lou Frey was on his near deathbed in Florida with flu the other day. I should say that Lou and a couple other of our members are responsible for getting the very attractive pins that are now available or have been made available to all of our members. Lou Frey, over what I extended, which could be no more than lukewarm support, went on and got it, and the Speaker graciously consented to make it official, so we have a very lovely, handsome pin for the former Members of the Congress. Therefore, I believe the leadership of the association will be in capable and experienced hands.

I do want to say at this time that Linda Reed, who has been our acting director, has been a tremendous asset to this organization. She has worked countless hours, organized the exchanges with the Germans and the Japanese, gotten much of this program put together today, and has done a tremendous job. I would also like to say that Nola Golson, her executive and our executive assistant for the organization, again has done an outstanding job keeping the office going, keeping the mail moving, keeping those old Wang computers doing their job.

In Nola's case, she has two charming daughters that you may well have noted last evening helped us get our reception underway, and also have done the proverbial job of stuffing envelopes on a number of occasions, so we want to thank them both for an outstanding job.

Mr. Speaker, each year the association presents a Distinguished Service Award to an outstanding public servant. This award rotates between political parties, as do our officers. Last year's recipient on the Republican side was former Ohio Representative, Clarence J. ''Bud'' Brown.

This year, the Democratic recipient has been the distinguished former Representative and Senator from Tennessee and the current Vice President of the United States, ALBERT GORE, Jr. The award was presented to Vice President GORE during our congressional reception last evening in the Hart Building.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD at this point my remarks in presenting the award to the Vice President, and the Vice President's remarks in accepting the award:

PHILIP RUPPE'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

This is a very special occasion tonight, the 25th Anniversary of the founding of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress. In 1970, Walter Judd of Minnesota and Brooks Hays of Arkansas conceived this organization to promote the improved public understanding of the Congress as an institution, and representative democracy as a system of government.

Tonight, I speak for every member of FMC as well as our friends, families and our guests from abroad, when I state that we are honored indeed to have with us at this our anniversary celebration, Mr. Al Gore, the Vice President of the United States.

We are proud, Vice President Gore, that you began your political career in the United States Congress where, following graduation from Harvard University and a tour of wartime duty in Vietnam, you served eight years representing the 4th district of Tennessee. In 1984, you went on to be elected to the United States Senate.

Since most of us in this room can attest to the fact that campaigning is a pretty rugged business, I should point out that when Al Gore was re-elected in 1990, he was the first candidate in modern history—Republican or Democrat—to win all of Tennessee's 95 counties.

Vice President Gore has had a long and distinguished career of leadership in Congress and in the Executive Branch of government. These accomplishments are both national and international.

In 1992, he chaired the U.S. Senate Delegation to the Earth Summit in Reo de Janeiro, the world's largest gathering ever of heads of state whose focus was directly on the envionment.

Last year, Vice President Gore helped President Clinton unveil the Global Climate Change Action Plan, a public-private partnership to dramatically reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the atmosphere while promoting economic development.

As a Member of the Senate, Al Gore introduced and steered to passage the High Performance Computing Act to create a national, high speed computer network, and increase research and development of high performance technologies.

As Vice President, Al Gore chairs the Community Enterprise Board of the President's Empowerment Zone and Enterprise Community Program which will designate certain areas of the country as eligible to receive federal assistance and support for the development of strategic plans for revitalization.

Al, press accounts suggest that you are focusing much of your time on reinventing government. It seems to me that you have already been doing that for a full 20 years.

Also, Mr. Vice President, we cheered and applauded—as did millions of Americans—when you led the U.S. delegation to the inauguration of the first freely-elected President of South Africa, Nelson Mandela. What a victory for freedom and democracy.

Last, and most importantly, or, as has been said about most of us in this room, ''lucky for him,'' he is married to Mary Elizabeth Aitcheson—Tipper Gore—mother of

four lovely children, articulate campaigner and author—a truly gracious lady.

It is my pleasure, as President of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress, speaking on behalf of the members of our Association—your friends and admirers all—to present to you this plague for exemplary service to the nation and these two books of letters from your friends.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT AL GORE

It's such an honor to get a Distinguished Service Award from a group that epitomizes Distinguished Service.

And, I'm pleased to be a part of the 25th Annual Spring Meeting. For the last 25 years, every spring, a group of individuals have come together to reflect on—and to add to—the role they played in the oldest democracy in the world—a government that more than any other can shape life.

In or out of office, you serve your country—by your leadership, by your dedication, and by your very example.

In Congress, we entered a world of traditions. There are those who will never understand why in the midst of a heated debate that we refer to opponents as ''My distinguished colleague'' or ''My esteemed friend from the other side of the aisle.''

Though, of course, there are limits. Thaddeus Stevens (R–PA) once said, ''I will now yield to my honorable colleague * * * who will make a few feeble remarks.''

Then there was Senator Homer Capehart of Indiana. He once got so carried away with the rhetorical courtesies that he referred to himself as ''The Distinguished Senator from Indiana.''

But those of us who have been lucky enough to serve in our Nation's Capitol, know that these traditions ensure civility when we need it most.

And we also know, that when we say ''good friends on the other side of the aisle* * *'' that it is not only civil * * * that it is not only just tradition of our Congress * * * but something which is absolutely true.

I know that your service and your contribution hasn't stopped with your retirement from Congress. Of course, sometimes retirement is involuntary. My father, who ''retired'' from the Senate in 1970, likes to say, it was due to a marginal error on the part of the people of Tennessee.

There is a line attributed to Jefferson that ''When a man assumes a public trust, he should consider himself as public property.''

That isn't always easy.

Two reasons come to my mind right away.

First, regardless of what side of the aisle you sit on—you came here with the intent to serve your constituents and your nation the best way you knew how. And not only was that your goal: it was your accomplishment.

And second, and on a more personal note, no one knows more than all of you how much you sacrificed during your time in office. You were on the road * * * working long hours * * * you were away from the family. You missed the kids' baseball games for a hearing on the budget. Instead of helping your daughter with her homework, you had to be in the Cloakroom—eating a hot dog for dinner—waiting for a vote.

Your spirit of self-sacrifice has always inspired me to remember what really matters. Serving the nation. And for me to be honored by a group of people with such noble intentions—that is the highest compliment I could be paid.

President Kennedy once said that: ''Mothers all want their sons to grow up to the President. They don't want them to become politicians in the process.''

You have all been politicians. None of us has been President. But on this week after Mother's Day, I hope you feel you've made not only your family, but your country very proud.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say one thing, I thought the Vice President was very, very kind and gracious to give us his time last evening. I think I can say to everyone here that his remarks certainly reflected his empathy with Members, former and present Members of the U.S. Congress.

The Speaker was bipartisan, he was gracious, he was kind, and I think he really was, as he well should have been, indeed, the highlight of that evening. I hope his friends and his family realize how important his being there and accepting that award was for all of us as former Members of Congress.

Lindy Boggs, our new president coming up.

Lindy, I just want to say how pleased we are as an association that you will be the next president, and how happy we were that you did, I'm sure, a great deal of work in getting Vice President GORE to be with us last evening. It was a marvelous evening, an outstanding event, and he was very, very gracious to join us.

I would also like to put in a statement from the Ukrainian People's Deputies of the Former Verkhovna Rada, who, for their association, extended to us their greetings at the time of their 25th anniversary:

MAY 18, 1995.

Hon. PHILIP E. RUPPE,
President, U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. RUPPE: On behalf of the Association of Ukrainian People's Deputies of Former Verkhovna Rada we want to, first of all, congratulate you and AFMC on the occasion of your 25th Anniversary. We wish you enjoyable festivities and many, many more years of success.

Secondly, we want to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to you and, through you, to your entire membership, first of all—Kyiv Representative of FMC Mr. Cliff Downen, for the support, both advisory and financial, that the U.S. Association of Former Members of our Association.

Our organization's meeting was held on the floor of the Verkhovna Rada on the 31st of March with the participation of the Chairman of Verkhovna Rada and almost two hundred former members. We signed up 168 member's of our Association on the first day. We look forward to working with you and other former members associations of the World in the years ahead.

Thank you again for your assistance and support.

With warm regards and our best wishes for your continued success,

PAVLO KYSLYI,
President of Association.
OLEXANDR BARABASH,
LEONID BILYI,
JURYJ GNATKEVICH,
Vice Presidents of Association.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the 25th Annual Report to the Congress by the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress.

I want to say to the Speaker that we were very honored by his warm welcome and by his generous comments to all of us here today. We want to thank those seated Members of the Congress for their very personal greetings. It is always fun to come back on the floor and see some of the Members with whom we have served in the past, or others whom we have gotten to know via C–SPAN or other forms of media, and have the opportunity to greet them personally.

I think I can say for everyone in this group, and I certainly can say it for me, that being a Member of Congress was probably the most exciting and the most challenging moment of my life, so this, for me, and I think it is for all of us, is a rare and thoroughly enjoyable opportunity to greet old friends, to feel for a moment the majesty of this Chamber, and share with everyone here the activities of its former Members.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we want you to know that this association will continue its efforts to promote greater public understanding of and appreciation for this very uniquely American legislative body, the U.S. Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the very distinguished Member, and the statements will be conveyed to the Speaker wholeheartedly.

The Chair wishes to thank the former Members of Congress for their presence here today. I should say, before terminating these proceedings, the Chair would like to invite all those former Members who did not respond when the roll was called to give their names to the reading clerks for inclusion on the roll.

The Chair wishes to thank all the other former Members of the House for their presence here today. Good luck to you all.

The House will continue in recess until 10 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 37 minutes a.m.), the House continued in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma] at 10 o'clock a.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize each side for five 1-minutes.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the recess have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

REPUBLICANS COMMITTED TO BALANCING THE BUDGET

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

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, the changes going on here in Washington are truly historic. The new majority here in the House has said goodbye to the old Washington ways.

Congress is now run by those who see that the Federal Government is not a solution to everything. It has become much too big and it spends too much.

For the first time in a generation, Congress has stood up to the mess we call a budget. We are committed to balancing this budget, so that our children will have a future free of debt and full of opportunity.

The defenders of the status quo on the other side of the aisle though criticize us, they offer no alternative. They have no vision and they have no plan. The only thing they have left are worn-out class welfare slogans and programs that will continue out Nation's course to more spending, more taxes, higher interest rates, and greater debt for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are moving ahead to preserve the American Dream for our children and their children. We have a plan, we have a vision of a debt-free America, and we will balance the budget.

BUDGET DEBATE IS ABOUT REAL PEOPLE

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, this debate comes down to one simple question: Do you think we should be cutting Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security in order to pay for tax breaks for the privileged few in our society?

I can tell you one thing—Margaret Leslie doesn't think so.

I have a picture here of Margaret. She is a senior citizen who lives in my district.

During World War II, she was known as ''Margie the Riveter.''

She helped build the B–29's that helped the Allies defeat Hitler in the Second World War. Today, she lives on Social Security.

After paying for her rent, her medicine, her Medicare and MediGap premiums, she is left with about $130 each month to pay for food, bill, and everything else.

Mr. Speaker, this budget before us today will take $240 out of Margaret's pocket because of cuts in Social Security.

And over the next 7 years—it will force her to pay an additional $3,500 for Medicare.

Not to cut the deficit. Not to balance the budget. But to pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest few in our society.

Mr. Speaker, we need to defeat this budget.

REPUBLICANS OFFER HISTORIC PLAN TO BALANCE OUT-OF-CONTROL FEDERAL BUDGET

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, our liberal friends are tragically on the wrong side of history. Their time has come and gone. Their ideas have been clearly refuted with evidence, their representatives defeated at the polls. For those that remain in this House, there cannot be much to motivate them as we move to smaller, less costly Government.

Clearly, the promise of big Government has crumbled and given way to a total reassessment of the Federal Government.

Something else is just as clear—the need to balance the budget.

Republicans have offered a historic plan to balance the out-of-control Federal budget. I can think of few things more important to our future and the future of our children than to balance the budget. We will return power to families and local governments as we shift the focus of governing away from Washington.

Republicans believe in the ability of the individual and of families to make the right choices, instead of big Government.

This philosophy places us against status quo liberalism here in Washington, but squarely on the side of the American people.

MILLIONS OF NEEDY AMERICANS DEPEND ON MEDICARE

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this is Tom McDonough. Tom McDonough is not interested in liberal or conservative. Tom McDonough is interested in the problems he has as a family member. Tom McDonough is 66 years of age. Tom McDonough's heart is failing, Tom McDonough lives in Bowie, MD, in my district and he gets $800 on Social Security.

And the Republicans' budget wants to say to Tom McDonough, we are not going to help you pay for the medical care you need. We promised it as a Nation. We made a promise, and we talk about promises kept, but this is a promise broken.

Social Security is going to be cut in 5 years, in 4 years, and in 3 years for Tom McDonough. He does not think that is a promise made and a promise kept.

His Medicare is going to be cut back. Tom McDonough does not think that is a promise made or a promise kept.

REPUBLICAN PLAN WILL SAVE MEDICARE

(Mr. BASS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, when we began this debate yesterday or since we have begun this debate yesterday the debt has risen by $846 million. That is $846 million more that you and I and our children and our grandchildren are going to have to pay.

We will see the other side all day long today produce props and photographs of individuals who will be affected by this so-called budget reduction, which is not a reduction unless you live inside the beltway.

But I am here today in Congress for these people. Here today are my two children, Lucy and Jonathan. That is what it is all about today, because today is historic. The Republican Budget Committee is going to turn this budget around, and I would like to see the American people judge this Congress not by the harsh rhetoric and the hard choices that we will be making over the next couple of days but by the country and the government that we give to our children and our children's children long after we are gone.

AMERICANS WILL PAY MORE FOR MEDICARE

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Lewis and Ed Kierklewski are two hard-working Texans. They have worked hard all of their lives. One is retired, one is nearing retirement, and they deserve to have the security of Medicare and Social Security.

But today that security is threatened, because the Republicans say we need to have the largest corporations in this country pay less taxes and we need for Lewis and Ed to pay more for Medicare.

Interestingly enough, as peaceful as Ed and Lewis look, the Republicans are scared to death of them, and so in 6 hours of debate, they have provided us this plan. This is exactly what they have told Lewis and Ed they will do with their Medicare.

Now we know that on this sheet of blank paper there is nothing about doubling the deductible for Lewis and Ed. There is nothing about raising their premium every year. There is nothing about increasing their costs, because the Republicans are afraid to stand in this well and tell Lewis and Ed and millions of American seniors the truth that they are about to hike their out-of-pocket expenses for Medicare to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy.

CLINTON'S CHANGE OF HEART CONCERNING MEDICARE

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, let me just say as one Member who speaks in this well to the Member who just spoke, the Democrats have bankrupted Medicare for 30 years. It is now the Republicans' responsibility and obligation to preserve, protect, and improve the Medicare system, which we intend to do.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give you a quote and ask who said this quote:

> Today Medicaid and Medicare are going up at three times the rate of inflation. We propose to let it go up at two times the rate of inflation. That is not a Medicare or Medicaid cut. We are going to have to have increases in Medicare and Medicaid, but a reduction in the rate of growth.

Who said that? President Clinton said that last year.

Let me give you a quote from Mrs. Clinton:

> We feel confident * * * that we can reduce the rate of increase in Medicare without undermining quality for Medicare recipients.

That is Mrs. Clinton. That is what she said. So when the President or Mrs. Clinton proposed slowing down the rate of growth in Medicare and Medicaid, it was not a cut. But now that the Republicans offer our budget which contains a similar proposal, the Democrats are now saying it is a cut.

My friends, let us put aside our differences and work in a bipartisan manner to solve the problems of how to save the Medicare program.

HOW THE BUDGET WILL AFFECT ANTOINETTE ''TONI'' PODOJIL

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, these Republican Medicare cuts are not just number-crunching, they mean real medical service reductions affecting real people.

Let me introduce you to Toni Podojil from Cleveland. Toni is 83 years old. She worked in the textile industry before her first retirement, but with minimum pension benefits and Social Security benefits, which is true with many women she had to get a job with the united labor agency. She will have to retire again soon and they will then live on a combined pension of about $600 a month.

Toni is a survivor of uterine cancer, she has had a heart attack, and she suffers from a hearing loss. Uncovered medical expenses now equal almost half her retirement income. When she retires a second time at age 83, what can she expect under this unfair budget? A doubled Medicare part B premium; over $553 more a year? An increased part A deductible over $1,200 more a year?

Let us balance the budget, not give away tax breaks to the wealthiest in this country.

PRESIDENT'S PROMISED VETO OF RESCISSIONS BILL IRRESPONSIBLE

(Mr. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's promise to veto the rescissions bill is irresponsible and lacking of leadership: irresponsible because just 2 weeks ago the President pretended to negotiate in good faith with House Republicans, only to back out at the last minute for short-term political gain; lacking of leadership because this President who only 2 years ago was promising a balanced budget by 1996 is now incapable of cutting $16 billion, $16 billion, that is only 1 percent that he says he cannot cut.

What reasons does he give? Well, first he says he wants to eliminate more pork, but then turns around and says well, we cannot cut the AmeriCorps program, the biggest boondoggle there ever was.

Then he says, ''You can't cut efforts to help people,'' and then turns around and says he is going to veto the relief package to Oklahoma City.

The fact the President would save his veto for this bill demonstrates that he is more interested in playing politics than acting as leader. Does anyone wonder why the American people consider the President irrelevant to the process?

MEDICARE CHECK

(Mr. GUTIERREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, this country once had a system of checks and balances. Now with the Republican budget scam we have checks without balances. Here is one check, Mr. Speaker, a big check, a whopping $228 billion check made out by the senior citizens of this country who face a massive cut in Medicare, and who is this check written out to, Mr. Speaker? To the wealthiest, who will rake in billions thanks to the Republican budget scam.

Yes, the oldest Americans in this country will face $3,500 in out-of-pocket medical bills, while the richest Americans will put $20,000 into their pockets. What a shame.

But big checks are nothing new to the GOP. Think about all of the big campaign checks they got in 1994.

So, Mr. Speaker, go ahead and protect the wealthy and the powerful, and we Democrats will protect the health of the powerless.

Go ahead and help those who helped finance your victory in the last election, while we Democrats will help those seniors who led us all to victory in World War II.

Seeing this huge check makes me realize that the Republicans must have checked their compassion and decency at the door, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1015

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. TATE. 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 360, nays 37, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

YEAS—360

Ackerman	Collins (IL)	Gejdenson
Allard	Collins (MI)	Gekas
Andrews	Combest	Geren
Archer	Condit	Gilchrest
Bachus	Conyers	Gilman
Baesler	Cooley	Gonzalez
Baker (CA)	Cox	Goodlatte
Baker (LA)	Coyne	Goodling
Baldacci	Cramer	Gordon
Ballenger	Crapo	Goss
Barcia	Cremeans	Graham
Barr	Cubin	Greenwood
Barrett (NE)	Cunningham	Gutknecht
Barrett (WI)	Danner	Hall (OH)
Bartlett	Davis	Hall (TX)
Barton	Deal	Hamilton
Bass	DeLauro	Hancock
Bateman	DeLay	Hansen
Becerra	Dellums	Hastert
Beilenson	Deutsch	Hastings (WA)
Bentsen	Diaz-Balart	Hayes
Bereuter	Dickey	Hayworth
Bevill	Dicks	Hefner
Bilbray	Dixon	Heineman
Bilirakis	Doggett	Herger
Bishop	Dooley	Hilleary
Bliley	Doolittle	Hobson
Blute	Dornan	Hoekstra
Boehlert	Doyle	Hoke
Boehner	Dreier	Holden
Bonilla	Duncan	Horn
Bonior	Dunn	Hostettler
Borski	Edwards	Houghton
Boucher	Ehlers	Hoyer
Brewster	Ehrlich	Hunter
Browder	Emerson	Hutchinson
Brown (FL)	English	Hyde
Brown (OH)	Eshoo	Inglis
Bryant (TN)	Evans	Jackson-Lee
Bryant (TX)	Everett	Jefferson
Bunn	Ewing	Johnson (CT)
Bunning	Farr	Johnson (SD)
Burr	Fawell	Johnson, E. B.
Burton	Fields (LA)	Johnson, Sam
Buyer	Flake	Johnston
Callahan	Flanagan	Jones
Calvert	Foglietta	Kanjorski
Camp	Foley	Kaptur
Canady	Forbes	Kasich
Cardin	Ford	Kelly
Castle	Fowler	Kennedy (RI)
Chabot	Fox	Kennelly
Chambliss	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Chenoweth	Franks (CT)	Kim
Christensen	Franks (NJ)	King
Chrysler	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Clement	Frisa	Klink
Clinger	Frost	Klug
Clyburn	Funderburk	Knollenberg
Coble	Furse	Kolbe
Coleman	Gallegly	LaFalce
Collins (GA)	Ganske	LaHood

Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—37

Brown (CA)
Clayton
Costello
Crane
DeFazio
Durbin
Engel
Fazio
Filner
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Green
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilliard
Jacobs
Kennedy (MA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
McKinney
McNulty
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pombo
Rush
Sabo
Schroeder
Shays
Stark
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Vento
Volkmer
Waters

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Harman

NOT VOTING—36

Abercrombie
Armey
Berman
Bono
Brownback
Chapman
Clay
Coburn
de la Garza
Dingell
Ensign
Fattah
Fields (TX)
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Istook
Kleczka
Largent
Laughlin
Livingston
McCrery
McHugh
Meehan
Moran
Pryce
Richardson
Riggs
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Spence
Stokes
Tucker
Weldon (FL)
Wise
Young (AK)

□ 1035

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma). Pursuant to House Resolution 149 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 67.

□ 1035

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, with Mr. SENSENBRENNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, May 17, 1995, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment printed in House Report 104–125 is adopted and the concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 67, as amended by House Resolution 149, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 67

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996.

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, October 1, 1997, October 1, 1998, October 1, 1999, October 1, 2000, and October 1, 2001:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $1,057,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,058,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,099,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,138,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,189,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,247,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,316,600,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $14,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: −$24,393,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: −$34,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: −$48,354,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$58,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$69,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$71,859,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $103,815,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $108,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $114,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $120,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $126,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $133,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $140,425,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $1,285,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,321,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,355,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,388,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,421,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,436,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,459,800,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $1,287,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,313,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,326,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,363,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,400,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,414,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,437,300,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: −$229,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: −$255,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: −$227,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: −$224,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$211,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$167,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$120,700,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $5,195,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $5,516,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $5,809,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $6,099,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,374,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,614,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,806,100,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, October 1, 1997, October 1, 1998, October 1, 1999, October 1, 2000, and October 1, 2001 are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $37,600,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $193,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $40,200,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $187,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $42,300,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $185,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $45,700,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $183,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $45,800,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $184,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $45,800,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $186,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $46,100,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $187,600,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1996 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $267,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $269,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $277,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $281,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $271,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $287,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $287,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $287,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $13,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $9,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $16,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $16,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $15,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $4,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $3,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $19,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $17,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $18,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $17,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $12,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $2,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $4,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $2,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $2,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $1,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $1,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $40,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $42,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $43,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $43,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $44,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $43,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $43,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $6,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $45,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $45,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $16,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $44,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $19,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $45,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $21,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $45,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $21,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $45,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $22,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $44,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $22,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $121,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $127,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $127,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $132,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $136,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $136,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $141,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $141,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $146,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $149,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $148,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $177,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $175,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $186,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $185,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $195,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $194,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $206,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $203,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $214,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $212,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $224,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $222,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $234,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $232,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $222,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $225,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $231,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $235,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $248,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $243,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $255,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $265,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $267,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $277,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $5,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $8,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $9,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $37,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $26,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $38,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $21,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $38,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $39,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $39,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $39,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $40,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $17,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $16,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $16,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $12,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $295,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $304,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $308,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $308,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $314,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $314,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $319,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $319,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $320,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $320,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $322,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $322,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, −$2,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$1,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, −$2,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$2,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, −$2,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$2,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, −$2,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$2,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$2,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$2,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$2,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$2,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$2,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$2,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, −$34,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$34,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, −$34,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$34,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, −$37,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$37,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $36,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $36,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$38,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$38,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$37,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$37,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$39,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$39,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a)(1) Not later than July 14, 1995, the House committees named in paragraphs (1) through (12) of subsection (b) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) Each committee named in paragraphs (1) through (11) of subsection (b) shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee for—

(A) fiscal year 1996,

(B) the 5-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2000, and

(C) the 7-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2002,

does not exceed the total level of direct spending in that period in the paragraph applicable to that committee.

(3) Each committee named in paragraphs (2)(B), (4)(B), (5)(B), and (6)(B) of subsection (b) shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction as set forth in the paragraph applicable to that committee.

(4) The Committee on Ways and Means shall carry out subsection (b)(12).

(b)(1) The House Committee on Agriculture: $35,824,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $171,886,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $263,102,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(2)(A) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services: −$12,897,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, −$43,065,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and −$57,184,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: $0 in fiscal year 1996, −$100,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and −$260,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(3) The House Committee on Commerce: $293,665,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $1,726,600,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $2,625,094,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(4)(A) The House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities: $13,727,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $61,570,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $95,520,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(B) In addition to changes in law reported pursuant to subparagraph (A), the House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities shall report program changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would result in a reduction in outlays as follows: −$720,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, −$5,908,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and −$9,018,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(5)(A) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: $57,725,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $313,647,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $455,328,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(B) In addition to changes in law reported pursuant to subparagraph (A), the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: −$988,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, −$9,618,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and −$14,740,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(6)(A) The House Committee on International Relations: $14,246,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $62,076,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $83,206,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(B) In addition to changes in law reported pursuant to subparagraph (A), the House Committee on International Relations shall shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: −$19,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, −$95,000,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and −$123,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(7) The House Committee on the Judiciary: $2,580,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $14,043,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $20,029,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(8) The House Committee on National Security: $38,769,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $224,682,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $328,334,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(9) The House Committee on Resources: $1,558,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $6,532,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $12,512,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(10) The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: $16,636,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $83,227,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $117,079,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(11) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs: $19,041,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $105,965,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $154,054,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(12)(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee for—

(i) fiscal year 1996,

(ii) the 5-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2000, and

(iii) the 7-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2002,

does not exceed the following level in that period: $356,336,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $2,152,905,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $3,297,787,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(B) In addition to changes in law reported pursuant to subparagraph (A), the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee for—

(i) fiscal year 1996,

(ii) the 5-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2000, and

(iii) the 7-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2002,

is not less than the following amount in that period: $1,027,612,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $5,371,087,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $7,836,405,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(c)(1) Not later than September 14, 1995, the House committees named in paragraphs (2) and (3) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Budget Committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revisions.

(2) In addition to changes in laws reported pursuant to subsection (b)(3), the House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee for—

(A) fiscal year 1996,

(B) the 5-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2000, and

(C) the 7-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2002,

does not exceed the following level in that period: $287,165,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $1,592,200,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $2,338,694,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(3) In addition to changes in laws reported pursuant to subsection (b)(12), the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee for—

(A) fiscal year 1996,

(B) the 5-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2000, and

(C) the 7-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2002,

does not exceed the following level in that period: $349,836,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $2,018,505,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $3,009,387,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(d) For purposes of this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 5. AGRICULTURAL SAVINGS.

Congress shall re-examine budget reductions for agricultural programs in the United States Department of Agriculture for fiscal years 1999 and 2000 unless the following conditions are met—

(1) land values on agricultural land on January 1, 1998, are at least 95 percent of the same values on the date of adoption of this resolution;

(2) there is enacted into law regulatory relief for the agricultural sector in the areas of wetlands regulation, the Endangered Species Act, private property rights and cost-benefit analyses of proposed regulations;

(3) there is tax relief for producers in the form of capital gains tax reduction, increased estate tax exemptions and mechanisms to average tax loads over strong and weak income years; and

(4) there is no government interference in the international market in the form of agricultural trade embargoes in effect and there is successful implementation and enforcement of trade agreements,

including the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) to lower export subsidies and reduce import barriers to trade imposed by foreign governments.

SEC. 6. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the prohibition on scoring asset sales has discouraged the sale of assets that can be better managed by the private sector and generate receipts to reduce the Federal budget deficit;

(2) the President's fiscal year 1996 budget included $8,000,000,000 in receipts from asset sales and proposed a change in the asset sale scoring rule to allow the proceeds from these sales to be scored;

(3) assets should not be sold if such sale would increase the budget deficit over the long run; and

(4) the asset sale scoring prohibition should be repealed and consideration should be given to replacing it with a methodology that takes into account the long-term budgetary impact of asset sale.

(b) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—For purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts realized from sales of assets shall be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''sale of an asset'' shall have the same meaning as under section 250(c)(21) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) TREATMENT OF LOAN ASSETS.—For purposes of this section, the sale of loan assets or the prepayment of a loan shall be governed by the terms of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

SEC. 7. INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE COMPLIANCE INITIATIVE.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—(1) For purposes of points of order under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and concurrent resolutions on the budget—

(A) the discretionary spending limits under section 601(a)(2) of that Act (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the current fiscal year and each outyear;

(B) the allocations to the Committee on Appropriations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of that Act; and

(C) the appropriate budgetary aggregates in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget,

shall be adjusted to reflect the amounts of additional new budget authority or additional outlays (as defined in paragraph (2)) reported by the Committee on Appropriations in appropriation Acts (or by the committee of conference on such legislation) for the Internal Revenue Service compliance initiative activities in any fiscal year, but not to exceed in any fiscal year $405,000,000 in new budget authority and $405,000,000 in outlays.

(2) As used in this section, the terms ''additional new budget authority'' or ''additional outlays'' shall mean, for any fiscal year, budget authority or outlays (as the case may be) in excess of the amounts requested for that fiscal year for the Internal Revenue Service in the President's Budget for fiscal year 1996.

(b) REVISED LIMITS, ALLOCATIONS, AND AGGREGATES.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate or the House of Representatives (as the case may be) shall submit to that chairman's respective House appropriately revised—

(1) discretionary spending limits under section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the current fiscal year and each outyear;

(2) allocations to the Committee on Appropriations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of that Act; and

(3) appropriate budgetary aggregates in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget,

to carry out this subsection. These revised discretionary spending limits, allocations, and aggregates shall be considered for purposes of congressional enforcement under that Act as the discretionary spending limits, allocations, and aggregates.

(c) REPORTING REVISED SUBALLOCATIONS.—The Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to sections 302(b)(1) and 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

(d) CONTINGENCIES.—

(1) The Internal Revenue Service and the Department of the Treasury have certified that they are firmly committed to the principles of privacy, confidentiality, courtesy, and protection of taxpayer rights. To this end, the Internal Revenue Service and the Department of the Treasury have explicitly committed to initiate and implement educational programs for any new employees hired as a result of the compliance initiative made possible by this section.

(2) This section shall not apply to any additional new budget authority or additional outlays unless—

(A) the chairmen of the Budget Committees certify, based upon information from the Congressional Budget Office, the General Accounting Office, and the Internal Revenue Service (as well as from any other sources they deem relevant), that such budget authority or outlays will not increase the total of the Federal budget deficits over the next five years; and

(B) any funds made available pursuant to such budget authority or outlays are available only for the purpose of carrying out Internal Revenue Service compliance initiative activities.

SEC. 8. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON BASELINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) Baselines are projections of future spending if existing policies remain unchanged.

(2) Under baseline assumptions, spending automatically rises with inflation even if such increases are not provided under current law.

(3) Baseline budgeting is inherently biased against policies that would reduce the projected growth in spending because such policies are scored as a reduction from a rising baseline.

(4) The baseline concept has encouraged Congress to abdicate its constitutional responsibility to control the public purse for programs which are automatically funded under existing law.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that baseline budgeting should be replaced with a form of budgeting that requires full justification and analysis of budget proposals and maximizes congressional accountability for public spending.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EMERGENCIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) The Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 exempted from the discretionary spending limits and the Pay-As-You-Go requirements for entitlement and tax legislation funding requirements that are designated by Congress and the President as an emergency.

(2) Congress and the President have increasingly misused the emergency designation by—

(A) designating funding as an emergency that is neither unforeseen nor a genuine emergency, and

(B) circumventing spending limits or passing controversial items that would not pass scrutiny in a free-standing bill.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress should study alternative approaches to budgeting for emergencies, including codifying the definition of an emergency and establishing contingency funds to pay for emergencies.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRIVATIZATION OF THE STUDENT LOAN MARKETING ASSOCIATION (SALLIE MAE).

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) The Student Loan Marketing Association was established in 1972 as a government-sponsored corporation dedicated to ensuring adequate private sector funding for federally guaranteed education loans.

(2) Since 1972, student loan volume has grown from $1,000,000,000 a year to $25,000,000,000 a year. The Student Loan Marketing Association was instrumental in fostering this expansion of the student loan program.

(3) With securitization and 42 secondary markets, there currently exist numerous alternatives for lenders wishing to sell or liquidate their portfolios of student loans.

(4) Maintaining Student Loan Marketing Association as a Government-sponsored enterprise exposes taxpayers to an unnecessary liability.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense Congress that the Student Loan Marketing Association should be restructured as a private corporation.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING DEBT REPAYMENT.

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the Congress has a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt;

(2) the Congress should enact a plan that balances the budget, and then also develops a regimen for paying off the Federal debt;

(3) after the budget is balanced, a surplus should be created, which can be used to begin paying off the debt; and

(4) such a plan should be formulated and implemented so that this generation can save future generations from the crushing burdens of the Federal debt.

SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING REPEAL OF HOUSE RULE XLIX AND THE LEGAL LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) rule XLIX of the Rules of House of Representatives (popularly known as the Gephardt rule) should be repealed;

(2) the fiscal year 1996 reconciliation bill should be enacted into law before passage of the debt limit extension; and

(3) the debt limit should only be set at levels, and for durations, that help assure a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 or sooner.

SEC. 13. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS FOR DIRECT LOANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 understates the cost to the Government of direct loans because administrative costs are not included in the net present value calculation of Federal direct loan subsidy costs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the cost of a direct loan should be the net present value, at the time the direct loan is disbursed, of the following cash flows for the estimated life of the loan:

(1) Loan disbursement.

(2) Repayments of principal.

(3) Interest costs and other payments by or to the Government over the life of the loan after adjusting for estimated defaults, prepayments, fees, penalties, and other recoveries.

(4) In the case of a direct loan made pursuant to a program for which the Congressional Budget Office estimates that for the coming fiscal year (or any prior fiscal year) loan commitments will equal or exceed $5,000,000,000, direct expenses, including expenses arising from—

(A) activities related to credit extension, loan origination, and loan servicing;

(B) payments to contractors, other Government entities, and program participants;

(C) management of contractors;

(D) collection of delinquents loans; and

(E) write-off and close-out of loans.

SEC. 14. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING COMMISSION ON THE SOLVENCY OF THE FEDERAL MILITARY AND CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUNDS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the Federal retirement system, for both military and civil service retirees, currently has liabilities of $1.1 trillion, while holding assets worth $340 billion and anticipating employee contributions of $220 billion, which leaves an unfunded liability of $540 billion.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that a high-level commission should be convened to study the problems associated with the Federal retirement system and make recommendations that will ensure the long-term solvency of the military and civil service retirement funds.

The CHAIRMAN. No further amendments are in order except the amendments printed in section 2 of House Resolution 149, which may be considered in the following order:

First, an amendment in the nature of a substitute by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16, 1995;

Second, an amendment in the nature of a substitute by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], consisting of the text of House Concurrent Resolution 66;

Third, an amendment in the nature of a substitute by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16, 1995; and

Fourth, an amendment in the nature of a substitute by the minority leader or a designee based on a revised Presidential budget, if printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 17, 1995.

The amendments may be offered by a Member designated, shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to amendment. Each amendment will be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

The adoption of any amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute conclusion of the amendment process.

At the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there will be a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member on the Committee on the Budget.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GEPHARDT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the rule, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. GEPHARDT:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996.

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriated for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, October 1, 1997, October 1, 1998, October 1, 1999, October 1, 2000, and October 1, 2001:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $1,043,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,083,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,136,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,191,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,253,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,322,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,397,102,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $0.
Fiscal year 1997: $0.
Fiscal year 1998: $0.
Fiscal year 1999: $0.
Fiscal year 2000: $0.

Fiscal year 2001: $0.
Fiscal year 2002: $0.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $103,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $109,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $114,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $120,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $126,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $133,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $140,400,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $1,278,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,308,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,356,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,395,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,452,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,474,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,523,900,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $1,279,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,305,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,334,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,377,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,430,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,459,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,506,100,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $236,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $222,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $198,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $185,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $177,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $137,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $109,300,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $5,195,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $5,516,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $5,809,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $6,099,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,374,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,614,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,806,100,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, October 1, 1997, October 1, 1998, October 1, 1999, October 1, 2000, and October 1, 2001 are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $37,600,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $193,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $40,200,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $187,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $42,300,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $185,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $45,700,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $183,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $45,600,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $184,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $45,800,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $186,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $46,100,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $187,600,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1996 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $257,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $253,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $259,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $266,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $259,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $275,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $275,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $273,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $281,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $276,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $13,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $9,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $16,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $16,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $15,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $2,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $2,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $4,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $4,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $4,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $4,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $4,00,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $19,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $18,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $16,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $13,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $12,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $2,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−7,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $1,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−5,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−7,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−5,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−3,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $38,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $41,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $42,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $43,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $44,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $44,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $44,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $6,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $7,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $7,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $6,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $53,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $53,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $16,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $52,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $19,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $53,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $21,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $53,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $21,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $53,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $22,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $54,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $22,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $124,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $130,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $130,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $138,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $146,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $153,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $159,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $159,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $166,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $166,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $171,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $169,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $182,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $181,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $198,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $196,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $215,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $212,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $235,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $234,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $254,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $277,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $275,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $227,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $226,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $239,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $240,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $259,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $263,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $281,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $281,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $286,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $300,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $300,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $5,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $8,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $6,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $5,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $37,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $26,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $38,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $21,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $38,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $39,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $39,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $39,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $40,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $17,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $18,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $19,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $19,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $18,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $18,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $12,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $296,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $302,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $304,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $307,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $307,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $310,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $310,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $309,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $309,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $311,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $311,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $−8,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−6,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $−8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−8,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $−7,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−7,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$6,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$7,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$35,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $−37,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−38,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $−39,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−41,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $−41,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−41,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $−42,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−42,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) Not later than September 14, 1995, the House committees named in subsections (b) through (o) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the House Budget Committee. After receiving those recommendations, the House Budget Committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $1,120,000,000 in budget authority and $1,120,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $2,530,000,000 in budget authority and $2,530,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $2,650,000,000 in budget authority and $2,650,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $2,810,000,000 in budget authority and $2,810,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $2,650,000,000 in budget authority and $2,650,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $2,700,000,000 in budget authority and $2,700,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $2,760,000,000 in budget authority and $2,760,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(c) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $910,000,000 in budget authority and $910,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $930,000,000 in budget authority and $930,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $950,000,000 in budget authority and $950,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $1,030,000,000 in budget authority and $1,030,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $1,050,000,000 in budget authority and $1,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $1,070,000,000 in budget authority and $1,070,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $1,070,000,000 in budget authority and $1,070,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(d) The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $15,780,000,000 in budget authority and $15,650,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $30,830,000,000 in budget authority and $30,830,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $36,070,000,000 in budget authority and $36,080,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $49,820,000,000 in budget authority and $50,010,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $59,140,000,000 in budget authority and $59,140,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $68,760,000,000 in budget authority and $68,760,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $82,480,000,000 in budget authority and $82,480,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(e) The House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $460,000,000 in budget authority and $390,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $770,000,000 in budget authority and $730,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $800,000,000 in budget authority and $790,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $830,000,000 in budget authority and $830,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $880,000,000 in budget authority and $880,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $1,210,000,000 in budget authority and $1,200,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $1,290,000,000 in budget authority and $1,280,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(f) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $280,000,000 in budget authority and $280,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $570,000,000 in budget authority and $570,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $890,000,000 in budget authority and $890,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $1,220,000,000 in budget authority and $1,220,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $1,810,000,000 in budget authority and $1,810,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $840,000,000 in budget authority and $840,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $1,160,000,000 in budget authority and $1,160,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(g) The House Committee on International Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $0 in budget authority and $0 in fiscal year 2002.

(h) The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $120,000,000 in budget authority and $120,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $130,000,000 in budget authority and $130,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $140,000,000 in budget authority and $140,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $270,000,000 in budget authority and $150,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $270,000,000 in budget authority and $160,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $280,000,000 in budget authority and $160,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $290,000,000 in budget authority and $170,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(i) The House Committee on National Security shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2000,

(j) The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $60,000,000 in budget authority and $60,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $80,000,000 in budget authority and $80,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $2,330,000,000 in budget authority and $2,330,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $1,090,000,000 in budget authority and $1,090,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $290,000,000 in budget authority and $290,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $3,970,000,000 in budget authority and $3,970,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $3,380,000,000 in budget authority and $3,380,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(k) The House Committee on Science shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $0 in budget authority and $0 in fiscal year 2002.

(l) The House Committee on Small Business shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $0 in budget authority and $0 in fiscal year 2002.

(m) The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $550,000,000 in budget authority and $550,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $550,000,000 in budget authority and $550,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $550,000,000 in budget authority and $550,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $610,000,000 in budget authority and $610,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $620,000,000 in budget authority and $620,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $620,000,000 in budget authority and $620,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $620,000,000 in budget authority and $620,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(n) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $300,000,000 in budget authority and $300,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $300,000,000 in budget authority and $300,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $400,000,000 in budget authority and $400,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $500,000,000 in budget authority and $500,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $1,200,000,000 in budget authority and $1,200,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $1,300,000,000 in budget authority and $1,300,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $1,500,000,000 in budget authority and $1,500,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(o) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit, as follows: $14,370,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $27,550,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, $28,460,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, $35,960,000,000 in fiscal year 1999, $35,340,000,000 in fiscal year 2000, $42,320,000,000 in fiscal year 2001, and $50,220,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(p) For purposes of this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and the term ''new budget authority'' has the meaning given to such term in section 3(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TAX CUTS.

It is the sense of the Congress that changes in tax laws which stimulate private investment of savings should be enacted if the deficit reduction targets in this resolution are met.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING EMERGENCIES.

It is the sense of the Congress that Congress should study alternative approaches to budgeting for emergencies, establishing regular procedures and funds for paying for emergencies.

SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING DEBT REDUCTION.

It is the sense of the Congress that eliminating the deficit by producing a balanced budget is only the first step toward the ultimate goal of reducing and eventually eliminating the public debt.

SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TRUST FUND SURPLUSES.

Congress finds that all recent year Federal budgets, as well as both fiscal year 1996 budget resolutions reported out by the Budget Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, have masked the magnitude of annual deficits by counting various trust

fund surpluses. Therefore, it is the sense of the Congress that upon reaching a balance in the Federal budget, the Government should move toward balance without consideration of trust fund surpluses.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING LOCK-BOX.

(a) It is the sense of the Congress that:

(1) The current practice of reallocating for other spending purposes spending cuts made during floor consideration of appropriations bills should be ended.

(2) A ''Deficit Reduction Lock-Box'' should be established to collect these spending reductions.

(3) These spending reductions should be used for deficit or debt reduction.

(b) To facilitate Deficit Reduction Lock-Box compliance by the Committees on Appropriations, the Congressional Budget Office shall score all general appropriation measures and have such score card published in the Congressional Record.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FIREWALLS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the discretionary spending totals for defense, international, and domestic spending should be enforced through spending limits for each category with firewalls to prevent funds from being shifted between categories.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of the Congress that, in order to ensure that a balanced budget is achieved by 2002 and remain in balance thereafter, strict enforcement should be enacted. Such language should—

(1) require the Federal Government to reach a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2002 and remain in balance thereafter;

(2) establish procedures for developing honest, accurate, and accepted budget estimates;

(3) require that the President propose annual budgets that would achieve a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2002 and for each year thereafter, use accurate assumptions;

(4) require the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and Senate to report budget resolutions that achieve a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2002 and for each year thereafter, using accurate assumptions; [and]

(5) establish a comprehensive system of budgetary enforcement to ensure that the levels of discretionary spending, mandatory spending, and revenues in this resolution are met.

SEC. 12. INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE COMPLIANCE INITIATIVE.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—(1) For purposes of points of order under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and concurrent resolutions on the budget—

(A) the discretionary spending limits under section 601(a)(2) of that Act (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the current fiscal year and each outyear;

(B) the allocations to the Committee on Appropriations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of that Act; and

(C) the appropriate budgetary aggregates in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget,

shall be adjusted to reflect the amounts of additional new budget authority or additional outlays (as defined in paragraph (2)) reported by the Committee on Appropriations in appropriation Acts (or by the committee of conference on such legislation) for the Internal Revenue Service compliance initiative activities in any fiscal year, but not to exceed in any fiscal year $405,000,000 in new budget authority and $405,000,000 in outlays.

(2) As used in this section, the terms ''additional new budget authority'' or ''additional outlays'' shall mean, for any fiscal year, budget authority or outlays (as the case may be) in excess of the amounts requested for that fiscal year for the Internal Revenue Service in the President's Budget for fiscal year 1996.

(b) REVISED LIMITS, ALLOCATIONS, AND AGGREGATES.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate or the House of Representatives (as the case may be) shall submit to that chairman's respective House appropriately revised—

(1) discretionary spending limits under section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the current fiscal year and each outyear;

(2) allocations to the Committee on Appropriations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of that Act; and

(3) appropriate budgetary aggregates in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget,

to carry out this subsection. These revised discretionary spending limits, allocations, and aggregates shall be considered for purposes of congressional enforcement under that Act as the discretionary spending limits, allocations, and aggregates.

(c) REPORTING REVISED SUBALLOCATIONS.—The Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to sections 302(b)(1) and 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

(d) CONTINGENCIES.—

(1) The Internal Revenue Service and the Department of the Treasury have certified

(2) This section shall not apply to any additional new budget authority or additional outlays unless—

(A) the chairmen of the Budget Committees certify, based upon information from the Congressional Budget Office, the General Accounting Office, and the Internal Revenue Service (as well as from any other sources they deem relevant), that such budget authority or outlays will not increase the total of the Federal budget deficits over the next five years; and

(B) any funds made available pursuant to such budget authority or outlays are available only for the purpose of carrying out Internal Revenue Service compliance initiative activities.

SEC. 13. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MEDICAID BLOCK GRANTS.

It is the Sense of Congress that Medicaid block grants should be distributed based on a formula that takes into account the proportion of individuals with income below the poverty level in each State.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] will be recognized for 30 minutes and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] rise in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. KASICH. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me under the rule be yielded to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON], a key author of the amendment, and that he may control the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the minority leader for submitting our budget resolution to the committee when the Committee on Rules refused to make it in order and allow us to bring it to the floor. So I thank the gentleman for doing that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

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

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to acknowledge and thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the minority leader, for allowing us this opportunity to present this budget this morning. On behalf of the coalition I extend a warm appreciation to him for this time because we may not have had this opportunity had it not been for Mr. GEPHARDT allowing us to present this budget. I also want to recognize and commend the task force chairman from the Coalition, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] for their work on this budget. Let me also say three members on that task force are members of the Committee on the Budget, and for the Members who may not be committed yet on this proposal, they should understand that those three Members are well informed about the budgetary process, about this proposal, and they intend to explain it today and hopefully persuade my colleagues to be supportive of it.

Mr. Chairman, let me also say that none of the proposals before this House today is perfect. I say to my colleagues, if you're looking for perfection, you will not find it because we have to make some serious choices about where we're headed in terms of the financing of this country, and some of the choices that we have to make are difficult and hard, and we don't want to make them, but let me tell you it's been 27 years since we've had a balanced budget in this country, 27 years, and if we move to 2002, that makes it 35 years until we've had a balanced budget in this country. That is way too long.

Mr. Chairman, it is time that we came to grips with this issue and that we restored integrity, financial integrity, to this Government, to this House. So I would urge my colleagues today:

You know, if you're looking for perfection, you won't find it, but if you're

looking for a beginning, a beginning to balance the budget, to get us on a glide path, this is your opportunity. I encourage you to support this budget proposals today.

Mr. Chairman, for the past several months the coalition, a group of 23 Democrats committed to seeking bipartisan solutions to our Nation's problems, has played an active and constructive role in the issues considered by the House. As a cochair of the coalition, I have been extremely proud of our work on unfunded mandates, regulatory reform, tort reform, welfare, the Clean Water Act, and numerous other issues. Today, the coalition will play a central role in the passage of a balanced Federal budget.

I rise today in strong support of a balanced Federal budget. As all of us know, our current budgetary policies cannot continue. The budget deficit in 1994 was around $200 billion. The accumulated national debt is approaching $4.8 trillion. The human costs of the national debt are staggering. For every $200 billion we add to the debt, each American child will pay an additional $7,000 in taxes over their working lifetime just to meet debt service costs. A few years ago, the cost of the net national debt to every man, woman, and child was $10,000. If spending patterns are not changed, the national debt will be about $64,000 per American in the year 2030. Clearly, these levels are unsustainable.

Just a few months ago, this body debated a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Opponents of the amendment said it was unnecessary because Congress already had the ability to balance the budget. Those people were right, we do have the ability to balance the budget—all we need now is the will to do it.

Well, today is the day that my colleagues can demonstrate whether their actions match their words. If you support a balanced budget, then vote for a balanced budget. Before the House today are four alternatives that will get the budget in balance by the year 2002.

The budget resolution authored by my good friend, Congressman ORTON of Utah, which is offered on behalf of the coalition, is a good budget. It is a realistic proposal that makes the necessary cuts in a fair and reasonable manner. It actually produces a bigger budget surplus in the year 2002 than does the House Budget Committee budget. By not including the tax reductions that are included in the House Budget Committee proposal, the coalition budget allows the deficit to be eliminated with less cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, and student loans. For these reasons, I prefer the coalition budget to the other alternatives, and I will support it when it comes up for a vote.

Should the coalition budget fail, and I suspect that it might, I will also support the budget produced by the House Budget Committee under the leadership of Chairman JOHN KASICH.

When I came to this body in 1989, budget deficits were running around $300 billion a year. To think that the budget resolution that we pass today will bring about a balanced Federal budget is an enormous and historic accomplishment.

Many of my colleagues have criticized the House Budget Committee budget as being too harsh on various segments of our society. In 1990 and 1993, we avoided tough spending cuts and increased taxes in order to reduce the deficit. As we know, neither of these proposals gave us a balanced budget. In 1993, my constituents told me over and over that we should cut spending first. The House Budget Committee proposal does this. It eliminates numerous Federal programs, cuts other programs, and reduces the rate of growth in others.

We have heard a lot of talk about Medicare cuts during this debate. While no one is pretending that reducing the deficit will be easy or painless, the fact of the matter is that Medicare spending in the House Budget Committee document will increase over the next 7 years. Current projections have the Medicare Program increasing by 11 percent a year. The House Budget Committee budget increases Medicare by 5 percent a year over the next 7 years. Only in Washington is a 5-percent increase in a program considered a cut.

Another point about Medicare that needs to be made is that the trustees of the program have informed the Congress and the administration that the Medicare Program will become insolvent in the year 2002 if we do not change course. I think it is a shame that some would ignore the looming bankruptcy of our Nation's health program for senior citizens in order to score a few cheap political points. This is the type of behavior that the American people rejected last November and want changed.

Under the House Budget Committee budget, total Federal spending over the next 7 years will go from $9.4 to $11.9 trillion. Is an increase of $2.5 trillion over 7 years too cruel for America to withstand? I don't think so and I suspect that most Americans don't either.

Our last balanced Federal budget was in 1968—27 long years ago. Every year we keep saying that we'll do better—and we never do. Today some are saying that we cannot and should not try to balance the budget in 7 years. Wait until 2010, until 2020, they say. They justify these views by saying that cutting the spending necessary to balance the budget will hurt too much. Mr. Chairman, the pain will only get worse the longer we wait. We cannot afford to postpone this task any longer. Today, we should be bold and responsible and vote for a balanced budget.

Because of our debt and our spending patterns, over 70 percent of the budget is already determined for us. Mandatory entitlement programs and interest on the debt already consumes most of our revenues and leaves very little left over to spend on other Federal priorities. Our debt service is close to $300 billion each year. The money we spend on interest payments for the debt is money that is denied to health care, nutrition programs, national defense, student loans, farm programs, community development, crime, education, and aid to local governments. By being fiscally responsible and eliminating our budget deficit, we will free up billions of dollars which can be reinvested in these worthy public policy concerns.

Rarely do we have before us a truly historic vote. Today we set upon the path to a balanced Federal budget. No more excuses, no more evasions, no more misrepresentations. The partisan bickering and gamesmanship needs to be put aside. Instead of a partisan dispute, the national debt belongs to all of us—and the solution we adopt will determine our future as a nation. None of the proposals are perfect—and they never will be. There are few attractive options to balancing the budget, but we must do it. Let us begin now. I urge all of my colleagues to vote to balance the budget.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first of all let me begin by saying that I commend the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] and the other members of his group for the effort that they have made, and I do think that they have certainly made something that would have to be considered a substantial improvement over what the President submitted in his budget. This, after all, the proposal before us, does reach a balanced budget, but I think it is seriously flawed. It is seriously flawed in several respects, and let me just highlight for the moment, as we begin this debate, what I would say are some of the errors or the flaws in this proposal.

□ 1045

In the first case, it does spend considerably more than the committee's budget proposal does, 102 billion more in spending. That is actual spending. Now again, let us recognize that we get to the same balanced budget but it has more spending in it.

It contains total discretionary spending nearly identical with that of the committee budget, but it spends more than $50 billion more on welfare over 5 years than the committee would propose to do. It also cuts defense spending by $55 billion below that that is in the committee level.

I think all the Members of this body who have, certainly those that have been around here a few years or who have looked at budgets over the last several years can see the decline that we have had in defense spending. I think most of us recognize that there is a point below which you do not cut spending without significantly damaging the national security of this country.

Where that is exactly, I think, is open for debate. But I think most of us, most in this body would agree that the 55 billion additional cut coming on top of the one steady decreasing baseline that we have seen over the last 10 years in the budget, in defense spending, is precipitous, is probably not warranted and certainly is subject to a lot more debate before we could justify that kind of cut.

The alternative proposal that we are debating now also contains $8 billion in fees, including an airport slot fee and a Commodity Futures Trading Commission transaction fee. These fees, we would suggest, are really not much more than some kind of tax on certain groups.

There are $96 billion more on Medicare than in the committee budget, but it does nothing. It has no plan to really reform the program. Thus, it fails to ensure any kind of long-term solvency for the Medicare program.

The proposal that is offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] would spend $49 billion

more over the next 7 years on Medicaid than the committee proposes in its mark. It provides most importantly, and this is where we get to the bottom line because we do both agree, we have a zero at the end for a balanced budget, most importantly with the discretionary cuts that it has, which are going to be painful. They are going to be difficult. This committee, this proposal has no tax relief for families or for seniors, no incentives for economic growth. In other words, it preserves entirely the $250 billion tax increase that this Congress enacted in 1993 as part of President Clinton's tax increase proposal.

I think when we are talking about this kind of cut in discretionary spending, and we acknowledge, we must acknowledge that there are going to be difficulties, there is going to be pain. And you cannot do this easily, that when we do this, that we should acknowledge, we should say to people, there is going to be some reward at the end. There is something for you in this. And the something for you should be for American families to have some kind of tax relief, for senior citizens some kind of tax relief, and for the economy, for the country to have some kind of tax incentives for economic growth.

None of that, none of that is going to be found in the alternative budget proposal that we are debating here today. So I would say, Mr. Chairman, that this proposal, while certainly it represents a step forward from what the president submitted to this Congress, is far, falls far short of what we should be doing in terms of balancing the budget, reforming Medicare, and giving tax relief to American taxpayers.

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, again I wish to thank our minority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, for filing this substitute budget resolution on our behalf, when the Committee on Rules refused to make it in order, and allowing us to bring it to the floor. Without his action, we would not have had the opportunity to present a balanced budget proposal which does come to balance in the year 2002.

During the 1980's, Congress made a fundamental error in attempting to balance the budget. They cut taxes first and then never got around to cutting spending. Here we are again, $3½ trillion later. This time we believe we should cut spending first, balance the budget, and then cut taxes. If you are trying to climb out of a $5 trillion hole, you do not start by digging yourself $700 billion deeper.

The coalition budget actually reaches a budget surplus in the year 2002 and does it by cutting spending ratably over 7 years. Our cuts are not back loaded. We have a gradual glidepath to balance where the Kasich budget continues deficits well over $100 billion until the 6th year and then falls off the cliff.

Our reductions are more responsible and allow funding of high priority programs while balancing the budget and actually accumulating a $160 billion less in public debt over the next 7 years.

Specifically, our budget funds Medicare with $112 billion more than Kasich and $65 billion more than Domenici but $174 billion less than the current baseline. We reduce growth in Medicare costs sufficient to maintain solvency, but do not take an additional $100 billion to pay for a tax cut.

We fund Medicaid with $50 billion more than Kasich and $38 billion more than Domenici but $138 billion less than current baseline. This allows States a more reasonable transition to block granting of Medicaid.

We also assume the coalition welfare reform proposal, which saves $25 billion over the 7 years.

The coalition budget continues $19 billion of funding for student loans and in agriculture, which has already been cut by 60 percent, our budget cuts $13 billion less than the Kasich budget.

We spend $60 billion less on defense than Kasich, but $37 billion more than the current baseline. By the way, this is also $11 billion more than the Solomon-Neumann budget, which you will have an opportunity to vote on later today, and $11 billion more than the Domenici budget.

Nondefense discretionary programs receive $62 billion more than Kasich. By the way, $35 billion of this is in education. Our budget provides $56 billion more in domestic discretionary programs than Domenici. But this is still over $400 billion less than the current baseline.

Finally, our budget does not include the $353 billion in upfront taxes, which, by the way, will cost almost $700 billion over the next 10 years, nor does it include the unspecified $25 billion in corporate tax increases included in the Kasich budget.

In summary, the coalition budget provides sufficient funding to maintain solvency in the Medicare trust fund, provide a more reasonable transition to Medicaid block grants for States, preserve American agriculture, continue student loan assistance, reform welfare, continue funding for Head Start, President Bush's Goals 2000, drug-safe schools, public libraries, Public Broadcasting, children's health and immunization, women's health programs, rural health programs, basic health research, economic development programs such as CDBG, and many, many more high priorities while balancing the budget and saving $160 billion in debt accumulation by 2002.

We say, cut spending first, balance the budget, then cut taxes.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the coalition budget substitute.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Arizona for yielding time to me.

I thank my friends on the other side of the aisle who brought forth this amendment. I listened with interest to my good friend from Utah thanking the distinguished minority leader for the time to bring this to the floor. I am sorry the minority leader had to leave the floor so quickly because I believe inherent in any question of policy is the question of process. So I find it very curious that it is widely speculated upon in the press that the distinguished minority leader will not vote for the budget plan which bears his own name.

Perhaps there will be some late-breaking developments in this case, but I find it incredibly interesting that so bereft of ideas is the other side of the aisle that the minority leader, in final summation of the arguments, will not vote for this budget plan and indeed, despite the valiant efforts of our friends who are blue dogs, they are truly blue dogs today, in all respect I say that, because so many Members of their own party will abandon them.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, it is so ludicrous to bring up process, I will not even respond.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, under the arbitrary restrictions that Republicans have imposed on discussing the most important economic document that we are going to vote on, the coalition substitute is by far the best option that we have before us.

It provides more deficit reduction without the draconian cuts that are in the Republican budget. How is that accomplished? It is $188 billion actually less borrowing over the 7-year period. It is accomplished by providing earlier deficit reduction, by not giving defense a priority. The Republican budget exempts defense from any of the other cuts. That is not fair. Defense should be treated the same as any other program.

And the coalition budget does deficit reduction first and does not provide for the tax breaks for the wealthy.

Because of those changes, it allows us to restore $163 billion of the Republican cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, which is desperately needed in order not to reduce the quality of care that our seniors are receiving. It allows us to restore the student loan cuts that the Republicans are suggesting to make it more difficult for students to be able to attend college. This budget removes that cut and restores those funds.

It provides more realistic caps on domestic spending so that we can argue

on the floor the restoration of the cuts proposed by the Republicans on environmental clean up or commuter rail. We had the opportunity to restore those cuts.

Mr. Chairman, there is a clear choice before us. You have a choice to do deficit reduction first before tax breaks for the wealthy. You can do that if you vote for the coalition budget. I urge my colleagues to do that.

Mr. Chairman, the annual debate we hold in this Chamber on the budget resolution is the most important statement we make on the role of the Federal Government in the kind of country we want to live in.

Given the importance of this debate, it is vital that we have a full range of options to consider. We should present to the American people a broad discussion of each aspect of the budget.

The overriding issue, of course, is the direction of fiscal policy we will take. We have strong agreement in this body that the most single important challenge we face remains the need to reduce the Federal budget deficit.

We have less agreement on the best set of policies to achieve that goal. We disagree on the mix of spending cuts that should be enacted to reduce the deficit. We disagree on the wisdom of cutting taxes before we have even brought the deficit under control.

The point of reducing the deficit is to strengthen the economy. The decision of whether to reduce the deficit by $500 billion, or $700 billion, or $1 trillion over the next 7 years should be driven by what's best for the economy. It should also be driven by consideration of the value of the government programs that will be cut.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership of the House has denied the American people the debate they deserve. The people who promised an open house have made sure that we would not have a full and open debate on this crucial issue.

Instead, they set up an arbitrary requirement. They said that it is not enough to propose a budget that dramatically reduces the deficit. They said the magic test is to balance the budget in 7 years or less, using their standards.

The Republicans have brought the budget resolution to the floor under a gag rule designed to prevent either substitutes or amendments that do not comply with their narrow notion of sound fiscal policy. By shutting off debate and preventing responsible alternatives, they have denied a debate on the priorities that would reflect the interests of my constituents.

The Republican leadership has set up artificial and short-sighted constraints to prevent a full and open debate on budget policy. But within those ideologically driven and extreme limits, one budget proposal has the promise of preserving America's priorities.

The coalition budget meets all the requirements. It balances the budget in 7 years. In fact, over the period, it has dramatically lower deficits than the Republican committee budget.

Let me emphasize that point. The coalition budget would borrow $188 billion less over the 7-year period than the Republican budget. To those of us who are concerned about excess borrowing and the soaring expense of interest of the debt, the coalition budget is far superior to the Kasich budget. It will save billions of dollars in interest costs.

In addition to lower deficits, the coalition budget also gets to a balanced budget without inflicting the harsh damage on important priorities the American people care about. The American people understand the need to make sharp spending reductions to reduce the deficit. But they do not understand making those cuts any deeper or more damaging than is absolutely necessary to achieve the goal.

The Republican committee budget cuts Medicare and Medicaid by $475 billion over 7 years. They have tried to justify this draconian plan by saying they are rescuing Medicare. I will work to rescue the Medicare trust fund. But we should do that work in the context of health care reform. This budget will force Medicare recipients to pay more for less. It does so not in the interest of improving or reforming health care for the elderly or anybody else, but to balance the budget and offset $360 billion in tax cuts.

The coalition budget substitute will restore $163 billion of the cuts that the committee budget would make in Medicare and Medicaid. The coalition budget refuses to balance the budget on the backs of the elderly and the sick, and it says no to tax breaks until we have brought the deficit under control.

When we set priorities to try to ensure our country's economic prosperity, nothing looms larger than the imperative of providing higher education to our young people. Yet the Republican committee budget will cut guaranteed student loans by nearly $19 billion. The coalition preserves full funding for guaranteed student loans, proving that we can balance the budget without turning back on young Americans trying to afford a college education.

Another area where the coalition budget is far preferable to the Republican committee plan is in the preservation of valuable domestic priorities. The Republican committee budget will force drastic reductions in high priority programs like mass transit assistance, water treatment, women and children's health care, and the National Institutes of Health research, just to mention a few. When the American people say they want us to get spending under control and eliminate wasteful spending, these are not the types of programs they have in mind. They know better, and the coalition budget will permit us to fund these priorities.

Finally, the chairman of the Budget Committee has said that he is especially proud that his budget leaves no aspect of the budget untouched. But under the committee budget, one area of Federal spending escapes the budget axe. Over 7 years, the plan will increase military spending by $76 billion. At a time when every other area of the budget is facing severe restraint, when children and the elderly and students are facing significant cuts in services, we cannot afford to increase spending on defense.

For all these reasons, in my judgment, the coalition budget is much the best of a poor set of choices. It is far superior to the Republican committee budget, for all the reasons I have mentioned and many more.

Under the arbitrary and unfair ground rules that have controlled this debate, the priorities of my constituents have not been given fair consideration. But the coalition budget comes closest to achieving the goals that are important to my district and to the country, and I will vote for it as a substitute to the badly flawed Republican budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Budget for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, last night, as we debated the first Budget Committee plan to balance the budget in 25 years, our friends on the other side of the aisle were upset about our tax relief for the American family. We hear this same objection in the amendment we are debating. Many of the same people who 2 years ago supported the largest tax hike in history can't believe that we're trying to return some of this money to the American family.

They tried to divide American against American, employer against employee, worker against worker. But underlying their opposition to tax relief for American families is one undeniable, unbelievable fact: They actually think it's their money.

They've gotten so used to a big Federal Government that takes $1 out of every $4 the American family earns that they actually have forgotten who earns the money. They forget that it's the American family's money to spend. It's not Washington's money to take.

Mr. Chairman, the American family's hard earned dollars belong to the American family, not the Federal Government. It's the American people's money, Mr. Chairman, it's not ours. Support the balanced budget plan that reduces the government's budget and restores the family budget. Support the Budget Committee proposal.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Orton-Stenholm Democratic substitute, the fair balanced budget.

Mr. Chairman, today is an historic debate that could result in balancing the Federal budget. I strongly support the Orton-Stenholm balanced budget, because it is the only fair, responsible budget this House will consider.

The Orton-Stenholm budget is the best option for a difficult task. It balances the Federal budget in 7 years. It makes tough but reasonable cuts without dramatically hurting children and seniors as the Kasich budget would. It does not include tax cuts for the wealthiest which we cannot afford. This is right, because we should not cut taxes before our budget is balanced. We tried this in 1981 and quadrupled the national debt in the process.

In contrast, the Republican budget is ill-conceived legislation. The Medicare cuts in the Republican budget are devastating for both seniors and the institutions that serve them. I will not support a bill which cuts health services to senior citizens, especially after they have already paid into the system. It will result in higher copayments, deductibles, and out of pocket costs and less choice of doctors. No matter how you shape it, less services for more money is a cut. It cuts Medicaid which will result in higher out of pocket costs to senior citizens for long-term care in nursing

homes. That is a cut. And the Republican budget cuts Medicare and Medicaid to pay for its tax breaks. This is imprudent.

In my district, these cuts will have a severe impact on the Texas Medical Center. I am particularly concerned about the cuts that will reduce funding for graduate medical education. For many teaching hospitals such as Baylor College of Medicine and University of Texas Medical Center, these reductions will reduce the number of trained physicians. Medicare is a major contributor toward the cost of this education. Yet this budget will cut this function dramatically.

The Orton-Stenholm budget is better for our Nation's children. Another institution in my area, Texas Children's Hospital, receives 48 percent of its funding from the Medicaid Program in the form of reimbursement and disproportionate care. The Republican budget will cut Medicaid by 30 percent. This is unfair and should be stopped. The Stenholm budget restores $50 billion for Medicaid. Medicaid serves children and we should not forget these children in our efforts to balance the budget.

Health research is also unfairly cut by the Republican budget. Their plan would cut over 10 percent in fiscal year 1996—that means many research projects for breast cancer, Alzheimer's, and HIV will go unfinished. I am pleased that the Orton-Stenholm budget will provide $11 billion more for health research programs like those conducted at University of Texas Health Science Center, M.D. Anderson, Methodist, St. Luke's, Baylor, and Hermann Hospitals.

The Orton-Stenholm budget also incorporates all of the provisions of democratic welfare reform bill that requires welfare recipients to work. Ultimately, with a good paying job, welfare will not be necessary.

The Orton-Stenholm budget restores funding of $18.7 billion for student loans. For many middle-class families, these student loans are critical to pay for the cost of a college education. The Republican budget would give a tax break to the very wealthiest in the name of economic growth and investment and yet it would cut student loans, education, and job training. This is an ironic folly.

The Orton-Stenholm budget helps veterans. The Republican budget hurts veterans by reducing benefits for those who have served. The Republican budget breaks the promise that we made when we asked these valiant Americans to serve our Nation. I will not support breaking that promise.

The Orton-Stenholm budget is better for Federal employees. The Republican budget will reduce pension benefits and health care benefits for Federal employees. The Stenholm budget will not require these cuts.

The Orton-Stenholm budget also includes more funding for housing and economic development. In my district, a place to live and a job are the keys to one's success. Many of these housing programs help families to purchase their first home. I believe it is good public policy to encourage home ownership, not reduce it.

It is a question of fairness. My constituents will accept cuts, if they are fair. Orton-Stenholm is fair. The Republican budget is not because it cuts benefits for senior citizens, children, students, and veterans while giving a tax break we cannot afford to the very wealthiest.

As a new Member of Congress, I was elected by my constituents to reduce the deficit. And although there are many tough choices to be made and many programs ultimately will be cut, the Orton-Stenholm plan is the best way to achieve a balanced budget and a healthier economy without sacrificing our investments in the American people.

☐ 1100

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON], a member of our task force.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the substitute, which is the coalition budget proposal. This budget, which was drafted by the coalition budget task force and has been endorsed by the coalition, is the most responsible and sensible budget before the House.

The coalition budget is based on the common-sense principle that we should not cut taxes until we have done the hard work to balance the budget. The coalition is not opposed to tax cuts. In fact, coalition members strongly support tax cuts to stimulate investment and savings. What the coalition budget says very clearly is that we should make certain that the budget is on a clear path toward balance before we consider tax cuts. If we do not bring the deficit under control first, any economic benefit from tax cuts will be undercut by the continued drag that our national debt places on the economy.

We recognize that if we are not careful when we make changes in Medicare and Medicaid there will be severe consequences for individuals who depend on these programs and the small hospitals that will not be able to survive if we are not careful. The coalition budget calls for significant reforms to achieve savings in the Medicare and Medicaid Programs, but is based on a careful review of how much we can reduce those programs with out having an adverse impact on our health care system.

The same is true in agriculture programs. Once again, agriculture is being asked to bear more than its fair share of cuts. Cuts of this magnitude will unilaterally disarm Americans farmers in the battle in the global economy. The coalition budget will require real cuts in agricultural programs that will require sacrifice on the part of many of my constituents. However, the coalition budget sets a reasonable level of cuts that can be made without dismantling agriculture policy.

The budget we pass should make our country stronger for future generations by stopping the practice of putting an increasing burden of debt on their back and by providing funds for programs such as education, research and other programs which invest in the future of our country. We do not include reductions in the Stafford loan program that the committee budget requires. We provide $35 billion more than the committee in education and training programs that will help us achieve a strong economy and high standard of living.

The coalition budget is a realistic budget that balances the budget by 2002 without jeopardizing valuable programs. I urge its adoption.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH].

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, as we enter into this budget debate, I think it is very important to consider the job and the task at hand. Let us not miss this opportunity to reduce the role of the Federal Government in our lives.

In the budget process, I think we need to concentrate on two things, and that is if government has a role in anything, let us push it to the most local level. Second, let us review and get out of the things that government should never have been doing. Let us being to privatize. That is what the Kasich budget does.

We must also never pass up the opportunity to make the point that if people are taxed and regulated less, that they will be more productive, and there needs to be room in a budget to assume that that more productivity returns revenue into the Treasury.

Third, let us not underestimate the ability of the American people to rise to the challenge of less bureaucratic control in Washington, DC. That is what the Kasich budget does.

Fourth, let us beware of any proposal by a party whose leadership does not believe in less Federal Government in Washington, DC, and the leadership of a party who thrives on your dependence on a bureaucracy.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute 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. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I speak for seniors and working families, children and the most needy. Already the State of Texas is burdened under this very horrible rescissions bill that we are facing with all of these cuts. However, after an extensive late-night review of all of the proposed budgets, the Republicans will certainly force greater hardships on poor, working, and middle-class Americans, without asking for a comparable sacrifice from those Americans who are comfortable and well off.

Mr. Chairman, America's fiscal reality dictates that we begin to take effective action against our deficits and debt, because they represent the greatest danger to the futures of our children, so many of them in our community, and our grandchildren. The political reality is that the Republicans have the absolute wrong budget. It is important that we try to minimize the harm ultimately to the families of constituents that I represent, and throughout America's urban neighborhoods.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] has expired.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. We must be in on the process. This budget process is going on, and we must save Medicare, education, science, and research, legal services, student loans, and major job training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] has expired.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. We must support a fair budget. Support the Stenholm-Orton budget to be as fair as we can to all Americans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] will confine her remarks to the time that has been yielded to her.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I am doing so, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I really want to, first of all, say that a lot of the people that are involved in this project are people that I like and respect, and I am hoping that at the end of the day they will be constructive partners with us, but there are some things that I have to point out.

For those who are trying to understand why this is not a good proposal, first of all, I want to commend this group for using essentially the CBO economics that we have felt is the most conservative economics. They in fact have used it.

What is the problem with this bill? The problem with this bill is this spends $233 billion more than the Domenici proposal. We are trying to figure out precisely how much more that is than our proposal. What I will tell the Members, though, Domenici does not save as much as we do, and this is $233 billion more in spending than Domenici.

Of course they cannot afford tax cuts, because they take this money and they spend it on more programs. That is what they do in this proposal. They have $140 billion in interest savings, all of which they take and they spend. It is a hybrid of Clinton, essentially. This does not even get close to Domenici. This proposal takes all the interest savings, which is $140 billion. They spend $80 billion in spending more than Domenici, so that is $220 billion, plus $13 billion and more cuts in defense, it is $233 billion.

Rather than taking the $233 billion and giving it back to the American taxpayers in tax relief, which they say that we should not do, they take the $233 billion, and instead of saving it, they spend it. Of course they cannot afford both tax relief and this proposal, because they do not have any money left over for tax relief, because they spend it all. That is the problem with this proposal. It is $207 billion more in social spending than what we have in our bill. That does not even count all the interest.

The simple fact of the matter is that this does not do the job. This is warmed-over status quo. They made an effort to make some changes in some programs, and I compliment them.

Frankly, I think if the conservative Democrats had been able to put together this proposal on their own, without having to reach out and moderate the proposal, frankly, I expected something much different than this. I expected a proposal that was going to be pretty much like the Senate budget proposal in terms of fiscal discipline, but that is not what we have here.

Therefore, when Members are wondering about why there are no tax cuts, and the refrain is, ''We should not do tax relief until we balance the budget,'' of course we cannot do tax relief when we are going to spend $233 more on every program sprinkled throughout the Federal Government in order to attract the maximum number of votes.

What I would suggest is, Mr. Chairman, we defeat this proposal, we come to the floor, we actually get to a balanced budget, we give people some of their money back in tax relief, and we will do precisely what we promised and precisely what the American people want. We do not need to keep pumping up the programs and refusing to pull any wasteful programs out by the roots. What we really need to do is to make some hard choices to get this budget on the path toward being balanced over the long haul by making necessary decisions. This simply falls short.

If Members want to cut spending first, downsize Government, and give people some of their money back, then vote ''no.'' If they want to add $233 billion in additional spending over where the Senate plan is, then go ahead and vote for it. That is not where the American people are.

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds to point out that our budget balances and actually reduces the debt by $160 billion more than the Kasich budget over the same 7-year period.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER], a member of the Committee on the Budget and of our task force.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, first let me congratulate my friend on the other side for changing the nature of the debate that we are having around here, but also let me thank him for allowing us to come forward in response to his budget with what is a better budget.

Mr. Chairman, I want to give the House today my top 10 reasons why the Coalition budget is better for America and my constituents than the other budgets being offered today.

Reason No. 1, why our plan is better is that the Coalition plan balances the budget by 2002 with a sensible glide path, a deficit decline in every year to 2002.

Reason No. 2, Medicare is not abused to balance the budget. Medicare savings are set at $174 billion, an amount sufficient to extend solvency of the Medicare Part A trust fund for 10 years.

Reason No. 3, Medicaid is turned over to the States as a block grant, but we restore $50 billion to help the States adjust to this new responsibility, without raising local taxes.

Reason No. 4, the coalition plan does not eliminate in-school interest subsidies on student loans, and has sufficient funding to continue the impact aid program.

Reason No. 5, it makes responsible cuts in farm programs, so we do not unilaterally disarm our farmers, who must compete against heavily subsidized foreign producers.

Reason No. 6, it does not eliminate the Appalachian Regional Commission and Economic Development Administration, which support planning and industry in rural areas, allowing these areas to compete for jobs, and restores community development block grants that help small cities upgrade and provide services for their citizens.

Reason No. 7, it does not require the sale of the power marketing administrations, an action which would require rural rate increases, and would make rural areas less attractive to new industries.

Reason No. 8, it does not break faith with American working people on trade adjustment assistance training, which is designed to help areas that lose jobs to foreign competition.

Reason No. 9, it does not make severe cuts in NASA funding, which would threaten the space industry and our high-technology economy.

Reason No. 10, finally, it does not raise the retirement contributions from those people who work for our Government, but does call for congressional pension plans to be scaled back, to be in line with other Federal pension plans.

That brings me back to No. 1, which is the most important reason: our budget balances the budget by 2002 with a sensible glide path.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman I want to commend the other side for helping us with an argument that we have been having with a number of people on their side of the aisle relating to the CPI. While we may disagree about what the number might be, apparently they have adopted and do not question the fact that the CPI is incorrect.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield for 5 seconds?

Mr. HOBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, we assume a five-tenths of 1 percent reduction in CPI.

Mr. HOBSON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I understand we disagree about the number, but obviously

those on the gentleman's side who have demagogued on this thing, not you and the other people who put this up, the gentleman is helping us, and I want to thank him for that argument, because we agree that there is a problem and it needs to be fixed.

I think this brings the legitimacy across the aisles to this argument that we need to get it done, even though we do not agree as to what you wind up with in your budget, but I want to thank the gentleman for doing it. I think it is going to be helpful to get us on the road.

□ 1115

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for this substitute offered by Congressmen STENHOLM and ORTON.

As my colleagues know, I believe it is essential for us to balance the Federal budget.

Today we have the opportunity to adopt a plan that moves us toward a balanced budget.

The Stenholm-Orton plan is not perfect. But it makes real choices—difficult choices to balance the budget and, without any doubt, is a better alternative than the plan prepared by Chairman KASICH and the Republicans of the Budget Committee.

The Kasich plan is an attack on working class Americans.

Education would be severely slashed. Under this resolution, when needy students from Waldorf or Lexington Park in my district go to apply for a Perkins loan they would be told, ''Sorry—the Republicans have ended the low-interest loan program for needy college students.''

Some 40 percent of Pell grant recipients come from families that earn less than $12,000. The Republicans have not left that program alone either.

Even grants to help illiterate Marylanders learn basic work skills to become employable, taxpaying citizens would be terminated by the Republicans' proposal.

The cuts in programs to educate, train, and prepare Americans for productive work are staggering. If I were in the majority party, I would be embarrassed to be associated with these extreme proposals.

Health programs have fared little better. Over the past 20 years, a bipartisan commitment to funding the National Institutes of Health has put the United States on the cutting edge of global biomedical research.

The economic returns—and the improvements in our Nation's health—as a result of this investment are immense. The Republican decision to cut NIH and preventive health resources are shortsighted and will cost us dearly down the line.

Veterans programs, a priority for many of my constituents, would also be severely cut by the Kasich resolution.

The Kasich proposal continues the assault on Federal employees by assuming that these civil servants will contribute an extra 2.5 percent annually to the Civil Service Retirement System and the newer Federal Employees Retirement System.

As I have said time and time again, this proposal is not fair. It violates the contract we made with these employees when they were hired.

Essentially, what this provision does is impose increased taxes on Federal workers to pay for a tax cut for the wealthy.

The House should not have included these provisions in the Archer tax bill and we shouldn't have them in the budget resolution either.

A lot has been said about the Republican cuts in Medicare—a total of $283 billion over the next 7 years.

Mr. Chairman, all of us know that changes must be made in Medicare to ensure that it remains a strong program well into the 21st century. But the arbitrary, unspecified cuts included in the Kasich resolution will clearly have a devastating impact on the seniors that depend upon this program for basic health care.

My question to every Member of this body is, ''will you join me in opposing a budget that will force seniors to pay an extra $1,060 a year for Medicare by 2002 simply so that those with much will have more?

Let us not forget, Mr. Chairman, that more than 80 percent of Medicare recipients have incomes below $25,000 a year. I would suggest that some of my colleagues talk to their constituents, as I have in Maryland's Fifth District, about how tough it is to be retired and live on a fixed income.

I want to take the rest of my time to say what is right with the substitute that we are now debating.

There are changes I would make in the Stenholm-Orton substitute. I don't approve of the provisions included that would cap Government contributions to the Federal employee health benefit plans and base Federal retirement on employees' high-5 years.

I remain concerned by the cuts in health and education funding that is included in this alternative.

Mr. Chairman, the choices are hard. There is no easy way to balance our budget—a goal that must guide us as we consider this year's budget resolution.

But it is my view that the Stenholm/Orton substitute is the best way to achieve that goal. This resolution actually results in a surplus of about $1 billion in 2002.

Yet, in sharp contrast to the Republican plan, the Democratic substitute does so without the same draconian impact on the most vulnerable Americans.

The Stenholm substitute rejects the proposed cuts in guaranteed student loans and sets more reasonable levels for Head Start, job training, and other education programs.

Yes, it does not give a tax cut, but these programs are important for those in America who are going to rely on those young people being able to participate in the workplace.

As a Democrat who believes that national defense must remain one of our highest priorities, I am pleased that the Stenholm bill actually raises defense spending starting in the year 2000.

This Democratic alternative does not provide for tax cuts for the wealthy or for any other American until the budget is in balance. It remains my strongly held belief, as I have stated before on the floor, that deficit reduction must be our primary goal.

I support language in the Stenholm substitute that calls for tax cuts to stimulate savings and investment once our Federal budget is in balance.

That is the appropriate time to consider tax cuts. To do so now would be irresponsible, especially when you recall that the House-passed tax bill gives almost half of its benefits to the wealthiest 10 percent of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I came to this House at the time of another Republican-prescribed revolution. The formula is much the same today as it was in the early 1980's.

Tax cuts and easy spending cuts right away. Postpone the tough decisions and deepest cuts until after the next election.

That is the strategy of the Kasich resolution. We do not know how Medicare and Medicaid savings will actually be achieved.

What we do know is that their plan pushes the most severe cuts in domestic spending off to the last 3 years. In contrast, the Stenholm plan is a true and realistic glidepath to a balanced budget. The Kasich plan has what I think has been correctly characterized as a cliff in 2000 and 2001.

Mr. Chairman, we all know the disastrous results of the easy road taken in the 1980's even though some still do not like to admit it.

I urge my colleagues to reject a repeat scenario. Vote for the Stenholm substitute—the best alternative for realistic yet fair achievement of a balanced Federal budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I can't believe that the other side of the aisle can, in good conscience, vote today against balancing our Nation's budget. I can't believe that they are able to look their families in the eye after so carelessly playing partisan politics with their futures.

The other side sees more importance in pitting Americans against Americans in class warfare than they do in securing the fiscal future of the Nation and its people.

And they can stand down here all day long and talk about what the Republican budget will do. But, I have said it before and I will say it again, don't try to fool the American people into believing that balancing the budget and cutting taxes will hurt them—they know better.

They know that the Government spends too much money. And they know that the only way to stop the Government from spending too much is to not give them too much money in the first place.

And I want to remind you that this is not our money. This money belongs to

the taxpayers that get up every day and work hard for a living.

So I have to ask how you can justify voting today to take more of that person's money to support your out-of-control spending habits—which will drive the debt out of control and leave our children with nothing? I can't imagine what reasonable thinking person would vote that way.

We need to remember what this vote is about. It is about the American people—it is their future that is on the line here. I challenge everyone in this body to make the most important vote in history—vote to balance the budget and restore security and prosperity to America—vote against this substitute and for the Republican balanced budget plan.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER], a member of our task force.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the coalition budget substitute.

The coalition budget is a responsible budget alternative that meets all the deficit reduction requirements for a balanced budget by 2002.

In order to balance the budget, we must all support some cuts in valuable programs. However, cutting programs and eliminating them are two totally different alternatives. The coalition budget is much kinder on many programs important to all Americans than the Republican bill.

We make no cuts in guaranteed student loans, while the Republicans cut student loans a drastic $18.7 billion. The coalition budget cuts $52 billion less in education, Head Start, rural health and economic development than the Republican bill. We cut agriculture $10 billion less than the Republican budget.

We have $109 billion less in Medicare cuts than the Republican budget. We have $50 billion less in Medicaid cuts than the Republican bill. And, in addition to that, we save $160 billion on the debt over the Republican substitute.

Mr. Chairman, this substitute reaches the same goal as the Republican budget—a balanced budget by 2002. And yet the coalition substitute provides more money for those in need.

Mr. Chairman, whether or not you support tax cuts is not the issue today. Many of us in the coalition support tax cuts, and our bill will provide for tax cuts after we are on a path to balance our budget.

I have long been an advocate for the capital gains tax. And, I strongly support the AMT tax relief which greatly helps our oil and gas industry. However, I firmly believe you ought to cut spending first before you give the money out for tax cuts.

The coalition budget substitute, however, treats tax cuts in a much more responsible manner. If deficit targets are met and we are on the glidepath to a balanced budget, the coalition bill will allow tax cuts to be targeted to encourage savings and investments and stimulate jobs and growth.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the coalition substitute.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the Republican whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to add all my congratulations to the chairman of the Budget Committee and all his members and particularly the staff for an incredible piece of work and being part of history.

Mr. Chairman, a great scientist once said, ''All truth, in the long run, is only commonsense clarified.''

The Republican budget, in the long run, is common sense clarified.

Everyone who has spoken today knows the truth.

Our country faces a crisis. Our budget deficit threatens the security and stability of America's future. Our Medicare system nears bankruptcy. Interest payments eat up more and more of our discretionary spending. Entitlements, if unchecked, will break our financial backs.

And if we do not change fundamentally our Government, our Nation may not remain prosperous and free into the next century.

This substitute amendment does not fundamentally change government. This continues government, just at a little less cost.

The substitute amendment we have before us is a flawed choice, but at least it is an alternative.

I look to the leaders of the opposition, and wonder where they have been. I hear Mr. GEPHARDT may not vote for his own alternative. That is a shame.

President Clinton worked to defeat the balanced budget amendment while refusing to submit a fiscally responsible budget alternative. That is a shame.

It is a shame, because to get our country out of this crisis, to successfully change government to meet the needs of all the American people, we need their help.

This debate should not be about politics. It should not be about class war. It should be about Democrats and Republicans coming together to make commonsense changes to save America's future.

But Mr. Chairman, when it comes to the battle to balance the budget, Democrat leaders have been conscientious objectors, sitting out this fight instead of finding ways to stop crippling deficits and runaway spending.

Republicans and many responsible Democrats reject that passive policy.

Republicans offer a plan that faces this budget crisis head-on.

It will balance the budget by 2002.

It changes programs, agencies, and bureaucracies to not only save money, but to also make government more efficient and more effective.

Some of my Democrat friends have come to the floor with photographs of people they say will be affected by our budget reforms.

I don't need photographs to remind me of the people who will be hurt by the inaction advocated by the Democrat leadership. I only need to look out into the gallery today, or walk down the street, or go home to my constituents.

Because if we refuse to act today to save our future, every single one of us will be adversely affected. Our seniors will be hurt by a bankrupt Medicare system. Our children will be hurt by impossibly high tax rates. And our grandchildren will be hurt by limited economic opportunity.

Inaction may be the choice of some of my colleagues. But that is not my choice.

Yes, we will provide tax relief to people who need it the most.

We have all heard the charges about our tax cuts. But who among us can say that families with children, taxed at rates approaching 50 percent, do not deserve a tax break?

Who can say that we should not have an adoption tax credit? Who will claim that our seniors deserve to be taxed at a rate twice that of millionaires if they choose to work? I dare my colleagues to make those claims.

Tax relief is not about giving people something they don't deserve. It is about letting our citizens keep more of their own money to spend as they see fit.

It is about freedom, not about giveaways. I hope someday, the Democrat leadership will finally get the message. But I'm not holding my breath.

Mr. Chairman, today we make a historic choice. We can take the path of least resistance. We can please the interest groups and the bureaucrats. We can continue to spend at the present destructive rate. We can protect the status quo.

Or we can take a courageous stand for America. We can make the Government work for people, while cutting out wasteful spending and cutting down painful taxes.

If we make the first choice, I fear that America will become fiscally frail, economically weak, a land of limited opportunity awash in a sea of tax troubles and Government waste.

But if we take the responsible course, I am confident that this great land of ours will awaken to limitless opportunity, abound in free market creativity, spurred on by low interest rates and low taxes.

And in the final analysis, when our budget is balanced, when our Government is stable, and when our people are free, we will see that this choice was in fact common sense clarified.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this flawed substitute and vote for the Kasich budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message from the President.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. CASTLE] assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee will resume its sitting.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1996

The Committee resumed its sitting.

□ 1130

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] had 8 minutes and 50 seconds remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] had 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD two letters of support for the amendment, one from the American Council on Education, the other from the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators.

The letters referred to are as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, May 16, 1995.

Hon. BILL ORTON,
U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ORTON: The American Council on Education, on behalf of our 1700 college and university members, urges all members to support the Stenholm-Orton substitute to H. Con. Res. 67—the FY 1996 Concurrent Budget Resolution. The Stenholm-Orton substitute achieves the goal of deficit elimination, while maintaining the critical federal student loan, grant and work programs that ensure access to college for students from middle- and lower-income families.

In stark contrast, H. Con. Res. 67 would increase the cost of college by more than $24 billion over seven years, subjecting middle-class families to the largest tuition hike in the nation's history. This burden will be borne by students currently in college, as well as by children as young as thirteen years of age who will reach college age during the period of time governed by this resolution.

Earlier this month, the Census Bureau released the results of a detailed survey of American business commissioned by President Bush, documenting that increases in workers' education levels produce twice the gain in workplace efficiency as comparable increases in the value of tools and machinery. According to this study, for each additional year of schooling in their workforce, employers gain an 8 percent increase in productivity, rising to 11 percent in the nonmanufacturing sector.

The Stenholm-Orton substitute recognizes the strong linkage between higher education and future national productivity and economic growth. We urge you to vote to defeat the seriously flawed H. Con. Res. 67, and to adopt the Stenholm-Orton substitute.

Sincerely,

TERRY W. HARTLE,
Vice President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS,
Washington, DC, May 17, 1995.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA) representing over 3,200 postsecondary institutions across the country, we urge passage of the Stenholm/Orton substitute amendment to the House Budget Resolution. We are supporting the Stenholm/Orton substitute because it restores $35 billion in Function 500 for education programs from levels contained in the committee-reported resolution. It also retains the in-school interest subsidy for student loan borrowers.

Our members are well aware of the need to constrain federal spending and are fully supportive of responsible efforts to reduce the deficit. However, we respectfully urge you to consider that the federal student aid programs have been essentially frozen since FY–93 and are not contributing to the deficit. To the contrary, research shows increased educational attainment, made possible for millions because of these programs, has accounted for 27 percent of the growth in the national economy during this century. Some will argue that eliminating the interest exemption on student loans will not prevent students from obtaining the loans and will be an additional expense which borrowers can easily repay because they will have higher future earnings. But the fact remains that such a policy will result in significantly higher yearly payments for these individuals and will reduce their ability to purchase other goods and services and save for their children's education. Federal student aid expenditures are an investment in the nation's future, and the monies spent on these programs today are returned by the program recipients many times over in the future.

Public opinion polls show that there is overwhelming support by Americans from all income categories and of all political persuasions for federal spending on programs to help students go to college. These polls clearly show that 75% of Americans do not want to see federal student aid programs and benefits sacrificed in the name of deficit reduction or tax cuts. We therefore strongly urge you and your fellow House members to consider all of the consequences before voting to reduce federal student aid programs below existing levels, or imposing mandatory reductions in spending which would result in a loss of benefits to current and future recipients.

It is for these reasons that we urge you to vote for the Stenholm/Orton substitute.

Sincerely,

DALLAS MARTIN,
President.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER], a member of the coalition.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman KASICH for bringing a bill to the floor that we think we have an opportunity to make better. I would like to thank our minority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, for giving the coalition this opportunity to be on the floor.

All of us here in this House in the coalition that many of us belong to here came to Washington to try to get something done. People are tired of partisan political bickering. They are tired of the gamesmanship that is being played in this town while the country does not do very well.

Our group, the coalition, has tried to make a difference, a commonsense difference, and I would suggest that this is a defining moment for us in this budget document.

Let me say why I think that. Any business person in this country, man or woman, faced with a $4½ trillion debt and wondering how to right the wrongs that have been done in the past would say if only this would say this. It makes no sense to add another $160 billion on the debt as we go to ground zero. At 6 percent that is almost $10 billion more in interest payments alone that will have to be made if we adopt the Kasich approach.

I can go home to Tennessee through West Virginia or Kentucky or I go home to Tennessee through Virginia and Tennessee. We both get to ground zero. There is a businesslike, commonsense way to take our deficit down in a way that makes sense, that spends less money, that ties revenues to expenditures, as any business person would do, and that is exactly what this commonsense, businesslike proposal does. I would recommend it to my colleagues. I hope they will consider it and I hope they will give it their independent thought and judgment. It deserves that.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] has 6 minutes and 50 seconds remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has the right to close.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Let me congratulate Messrs. ORTON, STENHOLM, BROWDER, and other Members who have presented this budget. I intend to vote for it. It represents a vary substantial improvement over the Republican base bill, both as it relates to basic fiscal policy and as it relates to dealing with fundamental problems of the American people. I congratulate the gentleman on this amendment and wish him well. I hope his amendment prevails.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, we have a tall order before us, $1.2 trillion in spending reductions to get to 2002 in a balanced budget.

The problem I have with the Kasich resolution to start with is it adds $400 billion to that problem. It makes tough choices even tougher, $70 billion more for defense and $350 billion more out of revenues.

Second, these spending increases in defense are going into effect right now. They will be fully implemented in 2 fiscal years. We are marking up the defense budget $9 billion now. Tax cuts will be implemented, but what do we do? We get spending out of Medicare and Medicaid.

If there is any lesson learned from the fiscal history of the last several years it is we have found these goals of reducing Federal health care entitlements very elusive, and if we do not reach those goals, this will make the deficit worse, not better. So Kasich is not a disciplined resolution. It is dangerous. The disciplined, doable resolution is the one before us, and we should all support it.

We have before us a tall order: according to CBO, we will need $1,210 trillion in spending reduction to get to a balanced budget by 2002. This calls for tough choices, tougher than we have ever attempted in our efforts to get rid of the deficit.

The first problem I have with the Republican budget resolution is that it makes these choices even tougher. Over 7 years, the Kasich resolution adds $70 billion to defense spending and takes $350 billion away from revenues. So, instead of having to dig $1,210 billion into spending, we have to dig deeper. We have to make $1,600 billion in spending cuts over the next 7 years.

That's my first problem with the Kasich resolution. Here is the next. The tax cuts the Kasich resolution supports go into the Tax Code this year. The capital gains tax cut dates back to January 1, 1995, for example. The revenue losses are backloaded; and grow exponentially over time, but they begin immediately, in fiscal year 1995.

The plus-up in defense spending also begins immediately. Indeed, it goes into the defense authorization bill we are marking up right now, increasing defense spending $9.5 billion beyond what the Pentagon sought for fiscal year 1996, and $15.9 billion beyond what is programmed for fiscal year 1997.

With the $70 billion plus-up in defense spending and the $350 billion in tax cuts in the Kasich resolution, the deficit becomes worse and the solution gets harder. Stenholm-Orton is more likely to reach the target, because it forgoes tax cuts and holds the line on defense spending.

Stenholm-Orton is the conservative choice because it follows the lessons of history. If there is any lesson to be learned from history of the budget, it's that our efforts to cut or contain entitlement spending always fall far short of the goal. And here the Kasich budget resolution is bolder—some would say rasher—than anything anyone has ever proposed: $288 billion in Medicare cuts, $187 billion in Medicaid cuts. Can cuts on this order be achieved? Who knows? All we have before us are the numbers, not the policies.

If these huge numerical goals are not reached, what happens? Well, first of all, it will take 2 to 3 years to realize that the entitlement numbers are not tracking; and by that time, the defense spending increases will be in place, and the tax cuts will be buried in the code. Both will be hard to root out and reverse. And the deficit—the deficit will be worse, not better.

That's the near-term risk, as I see it, with the Kasich resolution. Stenholm-Orton lowers that risk greatly by forgoing tax cuts, by holding the line on defense spending, and by targeting far more conservative savings on Medicare and Medicaid. So, Stenholm-Orton is better, because it's more likely to succeed.

There is a longer term problem with Kasich that has hardly been mentioned in this debate. Assuming the unlikely, assuming that in 2002, the budget is in balance, under the Kasich resolution, it does not stay in balance. It is not in equilibrium. That's because the tax cuts are back-loaded, and the wedge they take out of revenues keeps getting wider and wider in the out-years. In 2003, 2004, 2005, the revenue losses increase by over $300 billion. So, under Kasich, when we get to 2002, we are not home-free, even if the budget that year is in balance; we have to got to keep on cutting Medicare and Medicaid and student loans, and so on, by another $300–400 billion to make up for the additional revenue losses.

That is why Kasich is not a disciplined resolution; it's a dangerous resolution. It could lead us down the path to deeper deficits. Stenholm-Orton is not perfect, but it is disciplined and doable, and should be supported by all us.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Chairman, I will make my comments brief. I applaud the coalition plan for coming forward. I appreciate that at least now there is something we can have discussion about. There has not been a Democrat alternative there, and I think that is a great failing on the part of the other side, so I am pleased we can now have at least a discussion about options.

One critical thing I would point out, and that is simply that if we are looking at growing this country and growing our way out of this debt, we have to have some growth built into it, and that is why we have to have the tax cuts, particularly the capital gains tax cuts, so we can grow the economy. The last two times this Nation has cut capital gains rates, under the Kennedy and Reagan administrations, revenues to the Federal Government actually grew. We need that in this plan. That is not in the alternative, the coalition plans, and it is one of the failings against it, and it is one of the reasons I will be voting against the coalition plan.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD].

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

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Orton-Stenholm substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the leadership budget resolution and in favor of the approach offered by Congressman STENHOLM and other conservative Democrats.

I have been in Congress since 1989, and have tried my best during that time to learn about the budget process and help people in Illinois understand the choices we face. I have held hundreds of town meetings where we have gone over the difficult decisions about which programs to cut and which must be spared. I have learned that while the issues are complex and the process highly technical, we reached this point today, where we run $200 billion deficits and have a debt approaching $5 trillion, by operating on a prescription for economic disaster.

For far too long, we've had leadership in the executive branch which opposed tax increases or even supported tax cuts, leadership in the legislature which refused to eliminate programs we couldn't afford, and a public which came to expect the best of all worlds—no tax increases, no program cuts and a balanced budget.

The Nation can no longer withstand this approach to spending. I have long sponsored a balanced budget amendment, knowing full well that at some point in time, I would have to vote on how to get us there. I am prepared to do that.

In any budget proposal, you can select one line and make a case for or against it. One of the key questions in this debate will be Medicare, so let me spend just a moment discussing why I oppose the leadership plan and support the budget offered by Congressman STENHOLM and other conservative Democrats.

You will hear a lot about Medicare cuts, and whether a reduction in growth is a cut or whether it's an increase in previous year spending. Let me try to address this question in a fairly simple way, using round numbers which are meant purely as a way of explaining the issue.

Suppose this year a certain medical procedure costs $50. Medicare, using Federal tax dollars, pays the health care provider $40, leaving the patient with a $10 responsibility through a copayment, deductible or other expense. By the year 2002, suppose the same procedure costs $75, and Medicare pays $55, requiring the patient to make up the $20 difference, a difference between provider cost and Government payment which has grown since 1995.

Any responsible budget proposal will require us to slow the growth of Medicare and ask beneficiaries to help us keep pace with the costs of the program. But the difference is the leadership proposal asks the elderly American to make up more of the costs in Medicare in order to finance $350 billion in tax cuts for the wealthiest citizens of this country. In the Stenholm approach, we do ask folks to help us keep pace, but we don't ask them to subsidize tax breaks which this country can't afford.

There are items in every proposal we consider today which I strongly support and strongly oppose. But these proposals must be considered on balance and in their entirety.

The Stenholm proposal meets my broad standards for a good budget—tough spending cuts which occur early in the process and a recognition of priorities in health care, education and job creation. Most importantly, it does not cut programs for the average Americans to fund unwise and unnecessary tax cuts for the wealthiest of Americans. The best tax cut we can provide the American people is deficit reduction. And the best prescription for deficit reduction and economic growth is to cut Federal spending and balance the budget.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, balancing the budget is like trying to take a sip out of a fire hydrant. Every time you try to do something like that, you get pushed back. It is very difficult to do. Mr. ORTON's bill that I strongly support does it. Mr. KASICH's bill that I will not support today does it as well, and I would explain why. I salute the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and have voted for most of his amendments to cut spending over the last 4 years.

First of all we have to make tough choices, but they have to result in fair cuts. The Kasich bill does not. It cuts Medicare by $283 billion because it provides a tax cut. The best tax cut we can provide for all Americans, whether they make $200,000 a year or $20,000 a year, is to balance the budge and reduce the deficit.

Second, the budget on the Republican side cuts student loans by $18 billion. Many students will not go to college, many of them will be forced to pick in a two-tiered process between some of the more expensive schools and a different set. We think all students should be able to provide open choices and not be limited by those choices by a $18 billion cut.

Finally, I would say we need to even go further. I will support amendments and offer amendments to cut the space station, to cut star wars, and to cut the Central Intelligence Agency, but I salute both Mr. KASICH and Mr. ORTON.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

(Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Democratic substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Gephardt substitute and in support of the Republican budget resolution and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

For years, people in this body have talked about balancing the budget. But nothing happened. Deficits keep rolling along. The debt kept climbing.

But now, we can change that. We have a budget resolution before us that will actually put us on a path to a balanced budget. We cannot afford to pass this opportunity.

Because of the election results last November, we have a window of opportunity that may never happen again. We have to do it now.

The Republican budget resolution we consider today is not perfect. It is definitely not easy. But it puts us on a path to a balanced budget and we have done it in a way that makes spending reductions as fairly and as honestly as we could.

Make no mistake about it, Congress is going to be forced, under this budget, to make some very hard choices. That's what leadership is all about.

Unfortunately, the administration provided nothing in the way of leadership. The Clinton budget was nothing more than status quo—business as usual in large letters—and large numbers—$200 billion deficits as far as the eye can see. As a result, no one on the minority side even plans to offer the Clinton ''deficits forever'' budget as an alternative today.

On the other hand, we promised that we would produce a proposal that would lead to a balanced budget by the year 2002—we did it.

We promised the American people that we would produce a budget that provided them much needed tax relief—we did it.

And finally, we promised that we would produce a budget that protects the Social Security trust fund and protects Social Security benefits.

And as the chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee, I am proud to say, we did it.

So, we have a window of opportunity to provide the kind of leadership our Nation deserves—the kind of leadership the next generation deserves. Honest leadership—leadership that keeps its promises. our budget fully preserves and protects Social Security. Our budget assumes absolutely no changes—no changes of any kind—in the Social Security Program. No COLA cuts. No benefit cuts. No tax increases.

Unfortunately, there are those who prefer the status quo and who are willing to resort to all sorts of fear-mongering and false statements designed to frighten senior citizens.

They used these tactics to help kill—at least temporarily—the balanced budget amendment in the Senate. They suggested that a balanced budget amendment would result in cuts in Social Security benefits.

Our budget resolution today proves them wrong. We can—and we will—balance the budget without damaging Social Security.

In fact, the majority proposal today would actually strengthen Social Security.

As it stands right now, the greatest single threat to the long term solvency of Social Security is continued runaway Federal spending.

A balanced budget is the greatest guarantee possible that the promise of Social Security will be kept.

A balanced budget is the best long-term protection that we can offer for the Social Security trust fund. And our budget will put us on a realistic path to a balanced budget.

If you want to vote to preserve and strengthen Social Security—you can vote for the majority budget and feel confident that you are doing the right thing.

This is the right thing to do.

Unfortunately, some of our colleagues here in the House have chosen to demagogue the issue. They are distorting one of the economic assumptions in the Republican budget resolution to suggest that Republicans are trying to cut Social Security COLA's or to raise taxes because of anticipated adjustments in the Consumer Price Index.

This is pure hogwash. It is totally dishonest.

Our economic assumptions do assume that the Bureau of Labor Statistics will make a correction in the way the Consumer Price Index is computed. Every 10 years the Bureau of Labor Statistics does review the CPI and does make adjustments to make sure that it measures inflation correctly.

Economists generally agree that the CPI currently overinflates the rate of inflation by any where between .5 and 1.5 percent. It is generally assumed by honest Republicans and Democrats that the Bureau of Labor statistics will correct this problem in 1998 when they make their next round of CPI adjustments.

For this reason, we included, in our budget, an estimate of a .6 percent adjustment in the CPI to take effect in 1999. This is not something Republicans in Congress will do—it is something we assume that the BLS will do.

Some people are characterizing this as a Republican COLA cut for Social Security and a tax increase. This is totally dishonest and hypocritical.

I would like to point out that in 1987, when the Democrats controlled Congress, the Bureau of Labor statistics made a .4 percent downward adjustment in the CPI. No one called that a Democrat COLA cut. It was a technical correction.

And I would also like to point out that Mr. GEPHARDT'S substitute budget today includes economic assumptions that also include a .5 percent downward adjustment in the CPI in 1999—almost identical to the Republican estimate.

If you vote for Gephardt, you are voting for virtually the same CPI adjustment as the one included in the Republican budget.

So my friends, don't play fast and loose with the truth and try to scare senior citizens. We are not cutting COLA's—we are not cutting benefits.

The fact of the matter is that, no matter what the Bureau of Labor statistics does in 1988, the Republican budget does nothing to change Social Security law, Social Security benefits or Social Security COLA's.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 67, the House budget resolution, and in opposition to the Gephardt substitute. Let me just say I think it is a tremendous effort by those who believe in the necessities to cut budgets that they have put this forward, but I happen to believe that the right vehicle is the Kasich budget which we are working on here today.

As one who has balanced budgets eight times, as one who has seen the States of the United States of America address this problem of deficits and realize that the only way to manage the economies of the States and the economies of the United States of America is to balance the budgets, I stand here pleading with each and every one of us to support the budget resolution, which we are ultimately going to go to today.

We all talk as politicians about tough choices and setting priorities, and then when it comes down to it and you really are starting to make tough choices and you really are starting to set priorities, people start to say well, we are cutting too much. It hurts the young people too much, it hurts the old people too much, it hurts the colleges too much, or whatever it may be. The bottom line is what has hurt the United States of America is the tremendous

deficit each year and debt we have accumulated, and all of the payments on that debt and the impact which that has on the economy of the United States of America.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] last year, to his everlasting credit, came forward when a lot of Republicans said do not do it and presented a budget that would eventually have us in balance by the year 2002. This year he is in the majority and he has done so again, and he has put some very tough choices in there, and I recognize that and I think that is vitally important.

There is discussion of taxes. And as some Members know, as the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] knows, three of us got together and worked with others to make absolutely sure that we would not have tax reductions until such time as we had the full budget reconciliation in place, and there has been some question raised about that. But I want to assure the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] in particular that I have talked with our leadership on a number of occasions about the importance of that, the enforcement of that, and that it should not happen and will not happen regardless of how we separate reconciliation. So I am convinced that there will be no tax cuts until we have the balanced budget in place.

I congratulate the gentleman. I do not stand in support of what the gentleman is doing today because I do support the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH]. I think it is the way to go. But I congratulate the gentleman's side for coming forward with this, but I think we need to move forward with the process that well could go for 4 or 5 more months, and hopefully at the end of this we will have done what we were sent here for, to start to balance the budget of the United States of America, and if we do that I hope we receive the credit we deserve for it.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 67, the House budget resolution and in opposition to the Gephardt substitute.

First, let me say that I have the highest respect for Mr. ORTON and Mr. STENHOLM, the authors of the Gephardt substitute. I believe they are truly committed to balancing the budget. Their work is a good faith effort to put forward an alternative budget resolution.

However, I find it very troubling that this is the first time that Mr. GEPHARDT and the Democratic leadership have endorsed a balanced budget plan. I cannot help believe that if the old leadership were still in control of this House that the Stenholm-Orton budget would not have had the support of the Democratic leadership and probably would not have been permitted to be offered.

The fact of the matter is that the Republican Party has listened to the American people and has put forward a real plan to balance the budget. The Democrats have been forced to scramble to say "me too" to the American people. I applaud Mr. STENHOLM and Mr. ORTON for their alternative, but does it have the honest support of the Democratic Party? Let's remember that the 1993 Democratic budget resolution relied overwhelmingly on tax increases to achieve deficit reduction and that the President's 1996 budget simply gives up on deficit reduction and would accept $200 billion deficits for the next 5 years and higher deficits after that.

Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with every aspect of the House budget resolution. There are some areas of the budget I would allocate more funding to and some I would cut more from. I may even agree with some of the proposals in the Stenholm-Orton budget. But, JOHN KASICH and the House Budget Committee have been true leaders in the effort to put forward an honest budget that gets us to balance in the year 2002. This is a historic and tremendously difficult task and they have done it.

Politicians love to talk about making the tough choices and setting priorities. Now we have finally arrived at a point when tough choices are being made and priorities are being set. Now what we hear from the other side is that the choices are too tough and the priorities are wrong. The House budget resolution is an honest plan to get this Government to a balanced budget by the year 2002. I do not agree with every part of the budget, but am willing to take up the task of making these decisions and finding alternatives to the choices I do not agree with. I support the Kasich budget resolution.

There is another issue I would like to address. I am one of the authors of the Castle-Upton-Martini amendment to the recent tax relief bill. This amendment commits the House to ensuring that no tax cuts will become law until Congress passes budget reconciliation legislation to put the directions of this budget resolution into effect. Our commitment to that process has not changed. Despite the assertions of some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, no tax cuts will become law until all parts of the budget reconciliation process is completed. While the reform of the Medicare Program will take some additional time this year, the other budget decisions and potential tax cuts will not become law without action on Medicare. I will work with all interested Members on this issue as the reconciliation process proceeds.

Mr. Chairman, the House budget resolution is the first step on the vital journey to a balanced budget. I urge its approval and rejection of the proposed substitutes.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Orton-Stenholm coalition budget and in opposition to the Republican budget. The coalition budget just proves everybody that if you do not cut taxes, you do not have to kill Medicare and our senior citizens. It is proof that you can have a balanced budget by 2002 without making the massive cuts in Medicare and our senior citizens.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 3 minutes and 30 seconds, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in extremely good conscience in support of the coalition balanced budget bill amendment before us today.

There has been a lot of good, in fact, excellent debate during the past few days and few weeks, and in those cases of elevated debate, my respect for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has grown considerably, and I consider them two of the most conscientious and philosophically honest leaders in this body.

There has also been some less-than-excellent or honorable debate during the past 2 days and some of which I have heard in the past 1 hour; much fuzzing the truth around the edges, much exaggeration, much failing to treat the opinion of others with respect.

That is why I want to reiterate a few simple facts about the amendment we are about to vote upon. These facts imply an undergirding philosophy as pertains to people, real people, from the philosophy of the committee resolution.

□ 1145

These are honest differences of priority. And they should be dealt with honestly.

First, this budget not only reaches a surplus in the year 2002, but it does so on a glide path that means we will borrow $160 billion less over the next 7 years than the committee resolution, $160 billion less.

No one needs to convince this Member of the urgency of reducing our debt and deficit. To those Members on the other side who have focused their message on the gospel of debt reduction, I urge you to consider that this substitute is the one which provides the greatest debt reduction.

Second, I have heard many on the other side say we Democrats cannot ever bring ourselves to support spending cuts. Let me point out this substitute cuts $18.2 billion more in the first 2 years, coincidentally, 2 years before the next election.

Granted, the committee bill makes many more cuts from rates of increase, most notably $109 billion more in Medicare and $50 billion more in Medicaid over these 7 years. Those and other cuts are necessary to balance out the tax cut.

Make no mistake, our cuts are there, but they are there in a way, we believe, that avoids the possible destruction of critically important programs to many people of America.

The third and final fact is that our substitute will not encourage us to repeat the mistakes of the early 1980's. We understand that making the Medicare reforms the right way will take some time, and I am not criticizing the motives of the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], for establishing two reconciliation bills.

Motives aside, however, I have tremendous fear the results will be yet one more example of enacting the easy things, the popular things, like cutting

taxes, and never quite getting around to making the tough 218-vote decisions that are going to be required.

We have a great opportunity today to pass the first balanced budget this House has approved in decades. Let us do it the right way. Support the coalition balanced budget amendment.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I say that I do want to compliment the coalition for putting this together, because in 1993 you all know what I went through when I wanted to be specific. I bruised elbows and knees getting tackled in the hallway on the marble when people said, ''Please, don't lay anything down. It is not good.''

My biggest problem with the proposal is the fact, as I had said earlier, that $233 billion in additional spending beyond the Domenici budget, of course, cancels out any possibility of taking that money and giving it back to taxpayers in the form of tax relief. You see, in this proposal it is no longer an issue of whether we can afford it. It really gets to be an issue of whether we can afford to let people spend their money the way they see fit or whether we keep it in the hands of government and let bureaucrats spend it the way they see fit.

Our approach is we ought to take the savings, and we ought to use it to give people their money back and to shrink the size and the scope of the Federal Government and let people spend money on their children, on their nutrition, and on their clothing, and really, frankly, in any way they see fit, as opposed to taking the $233 billion and using it on additional Federal programs.

We have a chance here today to do something historic, and that is to not just get to zero and balance the budget but also to keep our word in terms of giving hard-working American families some of their money back and, in addition to that, to provide growth incentives, growth incentives in the economy so we can create more jobs and more opportunity.

I would compliment the gentlemen and gentlewomen for coming forward with the proposal. It is in the right direction, but in the right direction is not good enough when you are in the middle of a revolution.

I would urge rejection of this proposal and ultimately approval of the Republican Committee on the Budget blueprint.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I supported the balanced budget amendment and, over two Congresses, I have a strong record of supporting budget cuts and budget process reforms.

In doing so, I have not been afraid to stand up to my own party, the President, important interest groups, and, in some cases, my own husband.

I have often sided with the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. KASICH, as he well knows. One example is my support last year of Penny-Kasich, which would cut another $90 billion from the budget. Another is his proposal on baseline budgeting, but I cannot join him today.

The budget resolution as reported from the Budget Committee lacks the fairness and bipartisanship of many prior proposals.

The resolution assaults with equal bluntness programs which nurture investment in technologies for our country and programs which help students and workers acquire skills and knowledge and the tools they will need to succeed in the 21st century. The resolution makes no distinction in targeting investments in infrastructure, science, and health-related research, environmental protection, veterans, or fighting crime. In fact, to some it is a badge of honor that all areas of the budget are targeted. To be sure, current budget constraints force us to make difficult choices, but they should not force us to make stupid choices—choices like cutting taxes when budget savings should go to deficit reduction or critical investments we have too-long delayed; choices that cut Medicare in the absence of reforms to mitigate the factors that drive up costs; choices that retreat from investments in technology and science and the educational resources which will make or break our Nation's ability to compete in the next century, and choices that hurt children.

I have demonstrated that I can take tough votes. But I do so when I feel the option is fair and far-sighted.

I cannot vote for the Budget Committee's proposal.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Stenholm-Orton proposal to balance the budget. It is time that we balance the budget to stop mortgaging our children's future, and we make serious choices about our priorities. I support the Stenholm proposal too because it balances the budget by the year 2002 by cutting spending, does not raise taxes, and does not include a $350 billion tax cut we cannot afford.

This proposal does not attack the Pacific Northwest's future like the Republican plan. I am pleased that the Stenholm proposal does not eliminate student loans for 90,000 Oregon students, like the Republican bill. In addition, the Stenholm plan does not change our labor laws which encourages family wages or include changes in Federal employee contributions. It does not jeopardize the small business and export programs which have helped Oregon increase trade by 40 percent since 1992. It is also far better than the committee bill in terms of Medicare and Medicaid, restoring over $100 billion in funding.

Let me note that no balanced budget proposal will be perfect; there is something to dislike in every balanced budget. While I believe the Stenholm proposal is wise to reject the Republican's overall $100 billion Pentagon spending increase, I believe it is wrong to increase any funding for the Defense Department. Study after study, and report after report confirms that billions of dollars are wasted in unnecessary spending in the Pentagon budget. I have authored amendments and bills to cut up to $8 billion in outdated programs. And my bill to use commercial aircraft to augment our military airlift saves $15 billion—the same amount that is increased in the Stenholm-Orton plan. The Stenholm-Orton plan does delay any increase until after the year 2000, and I pledge to fight any proposed increases in Pentagon spending.

With reservations in the area of Pentagon spending, I believe we all must put our individual objections aside and focus on doing what is right for our Nation's future. Balancing the budget without raising taxes is doing what is right. I urge all my colleagues to support the Stenholm-Orton plan to balance the budget by the year 2002 by cutting spending.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 100, noes 325, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

AYES—100

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bevill
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Cardin
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Cramer
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Eshoo
Fazio
Furse
Geren
Gibbons
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hayes
Hefner
Horn
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Klug
LaFalce
Laughlin
Lincoln
Lipinski
Luther
McCarthy
McHale
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Minge
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Pallone
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Quinn
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Roukema
Sabo
Sawyer
Schroeder
Scott
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thornton
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Watt (NC)
Wynn

NOES—325

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers

Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Kaptur

NOT VOTING—9

Berman
Bono
Hoke
Kleczka
McIntosh
Rangel
Serrano
Smith (MI)
Torricelli

□ 1208

Messrs. STOCKMAN, MARTINEZ, CHRISTENSEN, BUYER, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts and Mr. VENTO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule it is now in order to consider an amendment in the nature of a substitute to be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] consisting of the text of House Concurrent Resolution 66.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. NEUMANN

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. NEUMANN: Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996.

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, October 1, 1997, October 1, 1998, October 1, 1999, October 1, 2000, and October 1, 2001:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $1,056,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,057,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,096,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,138,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,187,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,240,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,300,500,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $13,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: −$26,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: −$38,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: −$48,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$57,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$70,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$80,500,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $101,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $105,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $110,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $115,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $120,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $125,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $130,900,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $1,219,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,236,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,251,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,253,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,275,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,312,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,359,600,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $1,238,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,245,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,251,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,233,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,260,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,302,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,352,400,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $182,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $188,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $154,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $94,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $73,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $62,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $51,900,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $5,214,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $5,470,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $5,697,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,896,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,081,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,157,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,216,000,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, October 1, 1997, October 1, 1998, October 1, 1999, October 1, 2000, and October 1, 2001 are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $18,200,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $170,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $17,200,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $167,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $16,200,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $165,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $15,200,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $162,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $14,200,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $159,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $14,200,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $159,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $14,200,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $159,400,000.000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1996 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $261,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $260,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $260,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $260,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $260,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $265,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $263,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $270,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $10,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $9,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $6,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $4,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $4,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $4,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $14,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $14,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $3,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $3,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $2,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $2,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $2,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $2,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $18,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $20,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $17,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $20,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $17,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $20,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $17,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $20,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $17,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $20,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $17,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $20,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $20,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $12,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $11,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $9,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $2,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$7,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $97,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $110,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $97,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $80,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$9,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $97,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $50,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $−2,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$9,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $97,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $25,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$9,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $97,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$9,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $97,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$9,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $97,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $29,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $32,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $31,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $31,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $30,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $31,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $32,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $6,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $6,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $6,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $7,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $7,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $43,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $40,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $40,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $41,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $41,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $42,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $44,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $118,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $116,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $120,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $123,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $127,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $131,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $130,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $133,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $133,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $136,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $136,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $171,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $170,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $181,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $179,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $191,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $189,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $202,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $200,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $213,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $210,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $223,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $223,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $236,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $236,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $205,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $214,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $208,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $216,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $214,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $218,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $220,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $229,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $229,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $233,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $233,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $237,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $237,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $5,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $5,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $4,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $4,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $4,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $36,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $37,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $37,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $38,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $40,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $41,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $43,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $16,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $16,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $12,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $12,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $297,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $305,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $305,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $309,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $309,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $315,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $315,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $321,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $321,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $326,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $326,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $332,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $332,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$12,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, −$15,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$13,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, −$15,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$13,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, −$33,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$32,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$38,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$38,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$32,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays,

(C) New direct loan obligations, −$32,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$20,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$20,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, −$31,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$31,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, −$31,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$31,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, −$31,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$31,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, −$35,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$35,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$36,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$36,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$35,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$35,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$37,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$37,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) Not later than July 14, 1995, the House committees named in subsections (b) through (o) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the House Budget Committee. After receiving those recommendations, the House Budget Committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $6,200,000,000 in budget authority and $6,200,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $11,500,000,000 in budget authority and $11,500,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $14,400,000,000 in budget authority and $14,400,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $17,100,000,000 in budget authority and $17,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $19,400,000,000 in budget authority and $19,400,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $21,100,000,000 in budget authority and $21,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $23,600,000,000 in budget authority and $23,600,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(c) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $800,000,000 in budget authority and $800,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $800,000,000 in budget authority and $800,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $800,000,000 in budget authority and $800,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $800,000,000 in budget authority and $800,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $800,000,000 in budget authority and $800,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $800,000,000 in budget authority and $800,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $800,000,000 in budget authority and $800,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(d) The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $19,900,000,000 in budget authority and $19,300,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $36,800,000,000 in budget authority and $37,200,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $55,900,000,000 in budget authority and $56,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $80,300,000,000 in budget authority and $79,700,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $100,600,000,000 in budget authority and $100,800,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $124,900,000,000 in budget authority and $124,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $148,400,000,000 in budget authority and $148,400,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(e) The House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $1,600,000,000 in budget authority and $1,600,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $2,500,000,000 in budget authority and $2,500,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $2,600,000,000 in budget authority and $2,600,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $2,800,000,000 in budget authority and $2,800,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $2,900,000,000 in budget authority and $2,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $3,100,000,000 in budget authority and $3,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $3,300,000,000 in budget authority and $3,300,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(f) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $1,800,000,000 in budget authority and $1,800,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $2,600,000,000 in budget authority and $2,600,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $2,900,000,000 in budget authority and $2,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $2,900,000,000 in budget authority and $2,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $2,900,000,000 in budget authority and $2,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $2,900,000,000 in budget authority and $2,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $2,900,000,000 in budget authority and $2,900,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(g) The House Committee on International Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $0 in budget authority and $0 in fiscal year 2002.

(h) The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $1,000,000,000 in budget authority and $750,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $1,000,000,000 in budget authority and $800,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $1,000,000,000 in budget authority and $900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $1,000,000,000 in budget authority and $1,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $1,000,000,000 in budget authority and $1,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $1,000,000,000 in budget authority and $1,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $1,000,000,000 in budget authority and $1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(i) The House Committee on National Security shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $0 in budget authority and $0 in fiscal year 2002.

(j) The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays

as follows: $4,200,000,000 in budget authority and $4,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $5,800,000,000 in budget authority and $5,800,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $5,000,000,000 in budget authority and $5,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $3,900,000,000 in budget authority and $3,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $4,000,000,000 in budget authority and $4,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $3,400,000,000 in budget authority and $3,400,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $3,400,000,000 in budget authority and $3,400,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(k) The House Committee on Science shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $0 in budget authority and $0 in fiscal year 2002.

(l) The House Committee on Small Business shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $0 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $0 in budget authority and $0 in fiscal year 2002.

(m) The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $5,000,000,000 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $8,200,000,000 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $8,500,000,000 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $8,800,000,000 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $9,100,000,000 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $9,400,000,000 in budget authority and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $9,800,000,000 in budget authority and $0 in fiscal year 2002.

(n) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $1,100,000,000 in budget authority and $1,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $1,200,000,000 in budget authority and $1,200,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $1,300,000,000 in budget authority and $1,300,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $1,900,000,000 in budget authority and $1,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $2,100,000,000 in budget authority and $2,200,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $2,100,000,000 in budget authority and $2,300,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $2,400,000,000 in budget authority and $2,600,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(o) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit, as follows: $45,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $32,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, $39,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, $52,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1999, $66,700,000,000 in fiscal year 2000, $82,100,000,000 in fiscal year 2001, and $97,400,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(p) For purposes of this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and the term ''new budget authority'' has the meaning given to such term in section 3(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

SEC. 5. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING SOCIAL SECURITY.

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that legislation should be enacted that:

(1) Prohibits the use of the surplus funds collected as part of the social security payroll tax from being used to balance the budget or reduce the deficit.

(2) Starting in 1996, sets aside these surplus funds to preserve and protect the social security system.

(3) Establishes a bipartisan commission to oversee the protection of these surplus funds, the primary purpose of which is to establish a safe and secure mechanism to preserve these funds.

(4) Provides that as the Federal debt is repaid, the social security funds that are currently part of the $4,900,000,000,000 Federal debt as well as interest on these funds shall also be repaid and set aside under the mechanism established under paragraphs (2) and (3).

SEC. 6. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING DEBT REPAYMENT.

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that:

(1) The Congress has a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt. The Congress should enact a plan that not only balances the budget but also institutes a regimen for paying off the Federal debt.

(2) After the budget is balanced, spending should be allowed to grow at a rate slower than expected revenues so that a surplus is created which can be used to begin paying off the debt.

(3) Such a plan should be enacted into law so that this generation can save our children and grandchildren from the crushing burdens of the Federal debt.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] and request to be recognized as such.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] will be recognized in opposition for 30 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to yield half of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] and that he would be able to yield to other Members from that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Consequently the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin this discussion by reiterating that this will be a yes or no vote on balancing the budget in 5 years, paying off the Federal debt in 30 years, and restoring the Social Security trust fund.

But it is much more than that, Mr. Chairman. It is a vote about the future of a nation.

Our Founding Fathers gave us a great country, and in doing so, in giving us this fine gift, they have also given us a responsibility. It is a responsibility that we have not handled very well in the last 15 years.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is in the last 15 years this Nation has accumulated a $4.9 trillion debt. If every single American were to pay just their share, every man, woman and child in the country, they would have to pay $19,100 of debt. A family of five like mine would be responsible for $95,000. A typical American family of four would be responsible for $76,000 of debt. And here is the kicker:

The interest alone on that Federal debt amounts to over $5,000 a year. The average households in my district are only earning $32,000 a year. They cannot afford to continue spending $5,000 a year.

The growth in the debt over the last 20 years has been something we all need to be very concerned about. This chart shows that from 1960 to 1980 the Federal debt grew at almost a flat rate. Very little debt growth, but from 1980 forward the debt is on a very, very steep inclining roll.

We cannot let this continue. The budget plan we bring to the floor this morning solves that problem, and here is how we go about doing it:

First, we take Social Security completely out of the picture. We do not use Social Security revenues, nor expenditures, in our calculations of the rest of this presentation. If we do that, the Federal budget, the Federal Government, is literally writing out checks for $1,187 billion. They are making a checkbook deposit of $998 billion. Therefore their checkbook is overdrawn by $189 billion. Our first thing that is very significant in our plan then is that we set Social Security completely aside, completely off the table.

□ 1215

Our plan recommends that we continue spending, writing out the same number of checks, if you like, $1,187 billion through the year 1999. In doing so, the growth in revenue will actually reach $1,187 billion because of both inflation and real growth in the economy. So by the year 1999, we will in fact have a balanced budget. With the tax cuts implemented, which we do in our budget presentation, it pushes it back by 1 year. So our plan balances the budget by the year 2000.

After the year 2000, and this is another very significant change from the

discussion that typically goes on out here in Washington, after the year 2000, we allow spending to rise at a rate 1 percent slower than the rate of revenue growth. In doing so, we accumulate a surplus each year. That surplus, folks, goes to pay off that terrible Federal debt, so that we may pass this Nation on to our children debt free instead of the huge burden that we are currently accumulating, which will otherwise we passed on to our children.

I would point out that by doing a 5-year balanced budget plan, rather than a 7-year plan, we save our children $600 billion. That is the amount of money that will not be borrowed if we implement the 5-year plan versus the 7-year plan.

This also sends a very strong message to the Senate that we are interested in getting this job done, and done sooner rather than later.

My colleagues, this is a plan designed for our senior citizens. It protects and restores the Social Security trust fund. This is a plan for working families in America. It provides a $500 per child tax cut. This is a plan for the future for our children in this Nation. It pays off the Federal debt, so we do not pass on this huge burden to the next generation of Americans. To my colleagues, folks, this is a plan for the future of America, and that is why we are all here today.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in opposition to the plan offered by the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Wisconsin, reluctantly because their plan, like the other plans, lead to a balanced budget at some point in the near or farther future. That is good for the debate and good for the American people. That is good for us as a road map, among many, to try to reach that balanced budget.

Now, some of the plans are better for defense than others. Others are good for our highway system, a little better than some of the others presented. So how do we pick and choose? What is attractive about this current plan, against which I am going to vote, reluctantly, is the funding for the National Institutes of Health. What happens in the current proposition, the one that is before us, is that NIH remains stable in its ability to provide grants for the much needed research, which is, of course, a part of our health care problem.

The more we are able to bring moneys to the NIH for research, the less in the future we will require for health care. That is a logical conclusion to reach, which I reached a long time ago. That is why I am tempted, with all my heart, to vote for this bill, because it treats the NIH, this proposal, better than any of the others that are going to come before us.

Yet, in order to codify, if we will, the move toward the balanced budget by 2002 and because the Kasich approach, the committee approach, brings us there in a more cohesive way, I will vote against the Solomon proposal. But NIH, I am determined, will become a focal point for the appropriations process that is to follow.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to congratulate him as a freshman Member to get out in front and to do the job that has to be done. I want you to know the people that are introducing this resolution are going to vote for this resolution.

I have heard so much about we have got to balance the budget. But you know something, my friends? Time is of the essence. If we are going to balance the budget, we have got to do it the quickest way possible or we are going to lose momentum. That is why I am asking the speaker who just spoke here, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], come and join us. You want to balance the budget? By golly, let us do it. Let walk our talk. We have been giving this speech for a long time. Now is the time to vote for it.

I congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] for the job he is doing. We have not had a balanced budget since 1969, 26 years. How much longer do you want to wait? It is costing us $1 billion almost, a day that we do not get this budget balanced.

This budget that we have got in front of us, this proposal, will balance the budget in 5 years, and it is going to do it with fairness. We act with dispatch, but we also take into consideration what is needed for this country. This budget resolution will save $600 billion in interest payments, $600 billion. This is a big savings for our country and for our children.

Now, the House budget resolution is a good budget resolution, too. I am going to vote for that, as I expect you will. But it is 7 years. It eliminates three Cabinet departments, 14 agencies, 68 Commissions, 283 Programs. Yes, it is a good resolution, but this is the best of all. Why? Because it is going to get the job done in the time required. We cannot stretch it out, or else we will never get the job done.

You know, in Wisconsin, we have a saying, talk if cheap. It costs money to buy whiskey. And the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is following that philosophy. He is getting the job done.

Ther are those who argue that this is an historic day. In 1989, we had historic days in Russia and in Germany. But for 1995, it is going to be a historic day for America if we balance the budget, and we can do it today. I am asking you to vote this way.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT].

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, this debate is not about budgets and numbers and about graphs and charts. It is about human beings like Mrs. Dolly Johnston. She is a 67-year-old woman from Spokane, WA, who had a heart operation in 1993. For 4 months afterwards she had home health care from a nurse. Mrs. Johnston, who was a nurse for 32 years, said if I had not had here, I was too weak to pour my own medicine.

Now, this budget that is being laid out here today is making major cuts in this program that took care of Mrs. Johnston, the Medicare Program. How are they going to do it?

Let me just think about this woman for a second. The plan that makes these cuts will require each senior citizen like Mrs. Johnston to get a voucher. think for a minute. She is 67 years old. You give her an inadequate voucher that will have to be ratcheted down every year in order to make the savings that are proposed over here. She will go out into the street with that voucher in her hand. She has a preexisting condition. She is 67 years old.

You tell me where the loving insurance company is in your district that is going to give her an adequate insurance policy? Now, I have dealt with these people, and no insurance company is going to do that for her.

So, who will pick up the difference between that inadequate policy and what she really needs? Her children. For the first time in 30 years, the young people of this country are going to have to worry about their grandmother or their mother and how they are going to pay for that.

When I was young and my grandmother, back in the 1950's, had no insurance, we paid it around the table. It was figured out among the uncles and brothers. That is going to start happening in this country for the first time in 30 years. And it is not just insurance companies. Remember Mrs. Johnston when you vote ''no.''

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I was hoping to see some pictures, because I brought one, too. This is my family.

The reason we are doing this, folks, is for the families and children all across America. We cannot allow this debt to continue to climb. This is for the future of America. We cannot lose the courage necessary to do our job.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

This initiative is really supported in full measure by the freshman class. We are new to politics but we bring a lot of understanding to Congress with us. We understand if you pay the mortgage off

sooner than later, you save money. That makes sense at home. It should make sense up here.

The real problem I have of waiting any longer is that if a family did what we did every day up here, spend beyond their means, they would wake up one day and they would lose who they are as people. That is what is at risk here. If we continue to be everything to everybody, we are going to lose the character of our people. I think you have seen a decline in character over the last 30 years directly proportional to spending.

Do not wait any longer. If you did to children what we did to this country, giving them everything they want and never say no, you would have a child different than what you would hope to have. We have a country different than what I would hope to have. Let us not wait 2 more years.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker on the other side was talking about the Medicare cuts. But I think it is worth noting, and we have said it before, but it just needs to be repeated, that under our plan the average increase per beneficiary would go up from $4,700 to $6,300. In the State of Washington the total Medicare spending would go from $2.5 billion to $3.7 billion, and the per capita spending would be $3,700 to $4,800, an increase of $1,089.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich budget resolution. The Budget Committee provides us with the itinerary for an historic journey towards a balanced budget. Anyone serving in this body during the last 26 years, will find themselves in uncharted waters. Over the last generation, liberal spenders—who used to control Congress—rushed this country down a roaring river of debt. Currently, we find ourselves submerged under a $5 trillion sea of red and the level continues to rise unabated. By 2010 our debt will reach $8 trillion. Frankly, we are drowning.

Some of you may know that I have a relatively large family—7 children and, as of a couple of weeks ago, 31 grandchildren. Since I began my service in Congress, I have always measured everything I do by one standard—what legacy am I leaving to them and to our Nation's children and grandchildren?

Under Democratic leadership for the last 40 years, this institution promoted the centralized bureaucratic model of government—the ''Washington knows best'' model. The American people have seen the results—fiscal and moral bankruptcy.

My new grandchild, born just a couple of weeks ago, will pay nearly $200,000 over her lifetime if we continue on this path. I cannot leave this legacy to her or to anyone else's kids. People outside Washington know this and have asked us to change course.

The American people want something different for their children. They sacrifice every day to ensure a better future for this country. They work too hard and care too much to see us continue down this destructive path. They know that our economic and social well-being depends on changing not only what we spend but how we spend it.

In November, the voters put Republicans at the helm and asked us to chart a new course that sets us on a glide path towards a smaller Government that spends less, taxes less and regulates less. Chairman KASICH's budget resolution sets us on this new course.

It not only lifts us out of this sea of red, it also provides the framework to take the money and power out of Washington. This resolution forces this institution to do something no one thought was possible—set priorities and rein in big Government.

This budget eliminates three Cabinet departments, 14 agencies, 68 Commissions, and 283 programs. It gives us the opportunity to send our resources back home where people use it productively.

This debate really is about much more than balancing the books. It is about rethinking just what role our Government will play in our lives and choosing just what direction we see this country taking over the long term. Chairman KASICH and the Budget Committee charts a future which gives us less Government, less taxes, and more freedom.

This is a journey I have wanted to take since I began my service here in Congress. I ask my colleagues to join me on the trip and support the Kasich budget resolution.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Neumann budget proposal. While no proposal is perfect, this one does not play politics, and is a no-nonsense attempt to pay off our national debt. In many ways, it is like the district I represent.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I know the difficulties that lie ahead for our farm communities as funding levels decrease. We in the agriculture community saw this coming.

But I want to be able to go back to the farmers, ranchers, and farm-related small businesses in my district having supported a budget that shared the pain.

In fact, because this budget balances our books in 5 years, the savings are compressed. However, after the year 2000, the cuts to agriculture under the Kasich budget are greater.

For those who believe in a free market, the increased level of savings over the Kasich budget exceeds $600 billion which will translate to new growth in all sectors of the economy.

This amazing amount is better spent by farmers, ranchers, farm-related industries, and all other citizens than by their Government.

I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for offering this alternative, and urge my colleagues to vote for the Neumann budget.

□ 1230

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI].

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

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kasich amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 67, the Republican budget resolution for fiscal year 1996. This resolution provides huge and expensive tax breaks for wealthy Americans, and asks America's working families and senior citizens to pay the bill. It calls on older Americans to pay the most for failed policies of the past, hinders the efforts of working Americans to earn higher wages today, and slams the door on our children's opportunities in the future.

Several weeks ago, the Republicans took the first step in their misguided budget proposal when the House approved their Contract With America tax package. Over half of the tax breaks in this package benefit only the top 12 percent of families with incomes over $100,000, and 20 percent of the breaks benefit only the top 1 percent of families with incomes over $350,000. Under this tax package, a lucky 1.1 million taxpayers—whose incomes exceed $230,000—will enjoy an annual $20,000 tax break bonus.

Does this sound familiar? It happened in the eighties, when the deficit soared because of huge tax breaks for the wealthy. These tax breaks for the rich were supposed to trickle down to the rest of America. Instead, incomes stagnated and taxes increased for most middle-income American families.

Like the tax breaks of the eighties, today's Republican tax plan does not come for free: over 7 years, it will cost the U.S. taxpayer more than $354 billion. And guess who pays once again: middle-income working and retired American families.

In order to pay for these handouts for the wealthy, the Republican budget cuts Medicare by $288 billion. These are the largest cuts ever proposed for the Medicare Program. They will escalate the cost of health care for our Nation's elderly, who on average already dedicate 21 percent of their income to pay for out-of-pocket health care costs.

Cuts of this magnitude in the Medicare Program will require seniors to pay more of their limited incomes on health care costs. Over the 7-year period of the budget, the average senior will pay $3,500 in total additional out-of-pocket health care expenses.

But even $288 billion in Medicare cuts is not enough to pay for $354 billion in new spending for the wealthy. In order to fully pay the bill, the Republicans need to raid another program essential to our Nation's seniors—Social Security.

Despite their promise not to touch Social Security, the Republican budget actually cuts cost-of-living adjustments [COLA's] between

1999 and 2002. These cuts take a deeper bite into Social Security checks with each passing year. By 2002, the average senior citizen will receive about $240 per month less than what he or she would receive under current law.

The Republicans deep cuts in Social Security and Medicare amount to huge reductions in every senior's Social Security checks. By 2002, these back-door cuts in Social Security will eat up more than 40 percent of the typical Social Security COLA. About 2 million seniors will have all or more than all of their COLAs consumed by these costs.

The Republican budget's assault on the elderly does not stop with Social Security and Medicare. By slashing $187 billion from the Medicare Program—which currently spends two-thirds of its funds on the elderly and disabled—the Republican budget threatens long-term care coverage for hundreds of thousands of older Americans. These cuts will force many families to use their hard-earned savings to pay for nursing homes costs, which currently average a staggering $38,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, drastic cuts in Medicare and Medicaid will result in higher health care costs and reduced quality of care for all Americans—young and old. Hospitals in my home city of Philadelphia—which already rely on Medicare and Medicaid for more than 50 percent of their revenue—will be forced to shift their costs to the nonelderly, and could even be forced to shut down. This will raise insurance premiums, limit choice, and reduce the quality of care for every American family.

The Republican budget also makes deep cuts in programs designed to help Americans earn higher wages and a better standard of living for themselves, and provide their children with the education they need to succeed in the global economy. The budget proposal cuts $82 billion in education, training, and child care programs designed to encourage work and help people get off welfare. It cuts student loan programs, which will add about $5,000 to the cost of going to a 4-year higher education institution. It also cuts the Head Start Program, which helps young vulnerable children who might otherwise not grow into productive students and workers.

In addition, the Republican budget drastically reduces and eventually eliminates mass transit operating assistance that has been absolutely essential for SEPTA. Loss of these funds for SEPTA, which already has the second highest fare in the Nation, would result in severe cutbacks in investment in new equipment, station reconstruction and track improvements, service reductions or a fare hike to $1.85. The majority budget also proposes cuts in capital investment funds for transit systems that will further delay or eliminate SEPTA's planned system improvements.

SEPTA provides a vital service in Philadelphia and the system must not be allowed to deteriorate. Transit provides the means to reduce congestion and air pollution while improving worker productivity. Cuts in transit funds will make it more difficult for millions of Americans to reach their jobs and will server the elderly's lifeline to medical services.

Transit means productivity, jobs, and economic growth. Every dollar invested in SEPTA returns several dollars to the regional economy.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is fair to slash vital programs like Social Security, Medicare, student loans, and mass transit, while at the same time giving big tax give-always to the highest-paid individuals. Working Americans and senior citizens did not cause the budgetary problems we now face. Our deficits resulted from the failed trickle-down policies of the eighties, which benefited the rich at the expense of the rest. Any serious and fair deficit reduction measure should seek to reverse those policies—not repeat them.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, thus far this debate has been cast as the Democrats looking out for our senior citizens and the poor and the Republicans looking out for future generations. Make no mistake about it. This bill is a stake in the heart of the best medical health care delivery system in this country.

If you have heart disease, if you have diseases like diabetes, if you have Alzheimer's or cancer, this budget guts the very medical research that is required and necessary for us to go out and continue those advances that help sick people in this country today have the hope that they might get well in the future.

If we look at the medical education budget in this particular budget, over half of that money that goes to our teaching hospitals will be eliminated, wiping out the ability of America to go out and train the best doctors in the world. We heard the Clinton health care budget attacked time and time again last year for what it would do to the best medical system in this country. This bill guts that system.

If ordinary citizens are listening, recognize, we are not just talking about defending the poor and the seniors. That is part of what the Democratic Party stands for. But this bill goes well beyond any attacks on the most vulnerable people in this country. This bill eliminates and guts and puts a stake in the heart of a health care system that is second to none throughout the world.

My colleagues, make no mistake, this guts programs that affect our Nation's veterans.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, rural America is prepared to do its share to balance the budget but the Republican budget asks rural America to do much more than is fair or even reasonable by cutting $9 billion out of 5 years, $17 billion over 7 years. It will cause, in my State alone, a 35-percent drop in net farm income, a 50-percent drop in farm values. It will drive thousands of family farmers off the land. We will lose international markets and ultimately pay higher grocery prices, all because rural America gets hit, in fact, killed under their budget.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN].

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed at the rhetoric. As somebody who provides health care in this country and takes care of Medicare patients, to say that we cannot do considerably better is poppycock. The fact is, we do have a good health care system in this country. It can become a lot better when we get the 15 percent of fraud out of Medicare.

This bill increases spending for health care 25 percent over the next 4 years. To say that we cannot provide quality health care to our senior citizens for those kind of dollars is not true. It is untrue. We need to be about efficiency and caring and compassion with our senior citizens. And this budget is short on none of that.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG].

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

This debate is about the change that we need in America versus the status quo. What we hear from one side of the aisle is that the status quo is fine. Indeed, we have just heard criticism of what this budget does to Medicare.

My colleague from Massachusetts happens to not know what it does, because gross spending goes up from $5.5 to $6.7 billion under this budget in Massachusetts. The per capita spending, that is per beneficiary spending in Massachusetts, under our budget, goes up from roughly $5,900 to more than $7,800 under this budget.

That is not a cut by anybody's definition. That is an increase in spending. What we are doing is reforming a system.

Under the proposal that they put forward, under the President's budget, 6 years from now, no one in America will get Medicare benefits because the system will be broke.

This is a debate over sitting with the status quo and burying your head in the sand and doing nothing or moving forward. It is time to move forward in America.

This budget does that responsibly. It takes care of our children by saying to them, we will no longer continue to saddle you with an immoral debt burden because we are unwilling to control our spending. In area after area, while I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] for putting together an excellent budget, I must also commend the Kasich budget. It does a marvelous job of addressing the problem that confronts this Nation and about which its citizens are deeply concerned.

I urge support for the Kasich budget.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Neumann budget because our national debt will exceed $7 trillion by the year 2002. What does this mean in human terms? I, too, have a picture,

a picture of my year-and-a-half-old son John Micah. Over his lifetime, if nothing changes, John Micah will pay over $180,000 in interest alone on the national debt. This is wrong. This uncontrolled spending must stop.

Those who are addicted to deficit spending claim to be protecting groups such as children and senior citizens. Mr. Chairman, how can someone who is willing to suffocate our kids with our debts pretend to represent them? How will tomorrow's children be able to afford to go to college or buy a home if they are forced to pay for this excessive spending? How is someone who is willing to bankrupt programs for seniors pretend to be protecting them? How do the American people benefit if we reject this last, best chance to put our fiscal house in order?

Mr. Chairman, I say, support the Neumann budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, why are the Republicans cutting Medicare to pay for tax cuts for the well-to-do.

I got a letter yesterday from California that says why. The gentleman wrote: You still do not get it; do you? Keep it up; we will win even more seats in 1996. We want tax cuts. Your 80 year old is not our responsibility.

This Republican is entitled to his point of view, but I do not see it that way, because I would like to look at it from Emily's point of view.

Her late husband helped protect our country when he was in the Air Force. Now Emily is elderly and she is sick. Her 40-year-old daughter has MS and cannot help. Today Emily has $17 a month after she has paid for room, board, and medical care. The Republican budget will raise Emily's out-of-pocket Medicare costs by $123 a month.

There has been a lot of talk on the floor that the budget for Medicare is going up, and that is true. But the more pertinent truth is that this will not keep up with the number of new elderly entering the system, and the cost for individuals will go up.

Only in Washington could someone tell Emily that her benefits will go up when it is going to cost her $123 a month more.

After all the charts and rhetoric and angry talk have faded, Emily will still be facing this question. How is she going to cover $123 when all she has got is $17?

The Republican businessman who wrote to me yesterday says Emily is not his responsibility. But when Emily's late husband went off to fight World War II, did he say it was not his responsibility?

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, this has been characterized as an argument between the young and the old. I do have my children here because this budget does address their needs. We must balance the budget in order to preserve their future. My daughter here is the oldest; she is 14, Jessica. I also have John and Luke, but Jessica is 14. By the time we get the budget balanced and pay off the Federal debt, she will be nearly 50 years old. We have literally passed this problem on to the next generation.

It is not just our kids that support the Neumann-Solomon budget. We also have other groups who support it. I have had in my hand here a letter from the United Seniors Association. They are writing the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], and let me read the last part:

> We greatly appreciate your concern and efforts to deal with the fiscal catastrophe that our Nation faces. It is not just the United Seniors Association, it is also the Sixties-plus Organization, the Citizens for a Sound Economy, the National Taxpayers Union, the Citizens Against Government Waste and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, this is a dramatic and historical time. I think we should stand in support of the Neumann budget.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire about the time on all sides.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] has 17½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE].

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding time to me.

I would point out to one of the previous speakers that Medicare spending in the State of California will increase from $21 to $31 billion in this budget, and the per person expenditure will increase from $5,821 to $7,688.

I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] for his courageous budget and visionary approach that he has taken. But I do rise in support of the Kasich budget.

Nine thousand four hundred dollars, nine thousand four hundred dollars. Mr. Chairman, faster than I can actually speak that amount, we are adding $9,400 to our debt every single second. In less than 15 seconds this country will be saddled with more debt than we as Members of Congress make in a year.

If Congress continues to overlook this problem, it will be left to our children to clean up the mess. My wife and son James, my child already owes more than $4,000 as part of his contribution to interest on the debt, and he has not even reached his second birthday yet.

It is wrong. It is immoral. And we must change this ominous future this year.

Many of my colleagues here today are claiming that this budget will somehow retard the quality of life of our children and our seniors. On the contrary, I can think of nothing more negligent than our current spending practices. If you vote against a balanced budget, you are voting to lower the standard of living of our senior citizens and our children.

The blueprint which has been courageously presented to us by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the Committee on the Budget is not perfect. There are many programs targeted for cuts which I strongly support. But if we fail to see the forest for the trees, we will once again fail to put this country on the right path, and the victims will be our children.

Vote for the Kasich budget, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER].

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Chairman, in 18 months we will spend more money on the interest on the debt than we spend for the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marines, the FBI, the CIA, and the Pentagon combined.

Let me give you 10 good reasons to vote for the Neumann-Solomon budget. You can read it in detail in a book, or you can look at it in five pages, and you can understand it all. It gives a Member a choice. You can understand it, and you can explain it to others. It will balance the budget in 5 years.

It includes the House-passed tax cuts. It pays off the debt in 30 years. It does not spend Social Security surplus revenues. It saves $600 billion in additional national debt, and it saves $42 billion in interest payments in the year 2002.

I ask Members to support the Neumann-Solomon substitute, and if that amendment fails, vote ''yes'' on the House Committee on the Budget bill.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, is it fair? Mr. Chairman, that is the one question that Congress and America's citizens must ask about the Republican budget. Is it fair? That is a simple question but a crucial one.

It is a question I asked when I received a letter from Alpha Dunlap of Temple, TX, a constituent of mine. She wrote: ''I do not have good health, and I do not have money. Most of my money goes for prescription medicine and bare necessities. I am widowed and live alone. Please do not let Congress make deep cuts to Medicare.''

To those watching, I ask you this question: Is it fair to cut $1,000 from Alpha Dunlap's Medicare benefits to pay for tax breaks for millionaires such as Donald Trump?

□ 1245

Is it fair? Worse yet, is it fair for Republicans to cut seniors' Medicare benefits to protect tax loopholes for billionaires who would renounce their citizenship to get out of paying their rightful taxes?

That is right, House Republicans want to protect $3.5 billion in tax loopholes for billionaires who would renounce their citizenship to get out of paying their taxes. Members, that is welfare for the rich, paid for by the pain of senior citizens.

Under the Republican plan, 100,000 senior citizens, such as mine, Ms. Dunlap, will have to lose Medicare benefits to pay for tax breaks for just one billionaire under the Republican plan. That is not fair. That is dead wrong, and it is unconscionable. Why should Alpha Dunlap and 100,000 senior citizens like her have to lose Medicare benefits to help those billionaires who would leave this country and not pay their fair share?

The issue is not the future of our children. I point out, Members, the pictures that our Republican friends have not shown today are the millionaires and billionaires who are going to benefit from their budget plan and their tax plans. That is the issue the American people must look at.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, in spite of what we hear in this Chamber, we have been astounded at the lack of negative response to this budget from outside the Beltway. Americans all across the country are way ahead of us. They want the budget balanced sooner, rather than later. Confidence is very low in our country's future, particularly among our young people. Recent polls show that more of them believe in UFOs than believe that they will ever get any Social Security.

This budget is a promise to our young people that in the future we are going to do better than we have done in the past. Restore their confidence in this body and in their country. Vote this gift to our children. Vote for Solomon-Neumann.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to respond to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] that something happened in the Committee on the Budget that has not happened in a long time since I have been there, but under Republican control we adopted an amendment of language in the bill concerning, ''The committee is also greatly concerned about the growing phenomena of millionaire and billionaire Americans renouncing U.S. Citizenship in order to avoid paying their fair share of their tax burden. The committee strongly believes that Congress should take steps to stem the revenue loss of expatriation for tax avoidance.''

That is in the bill and it was a Democrat amendment put up, and we adopted it.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, the point I would make is that earlier this year we had a vote in this House to change and do away with that tax break and that loophole for billionaires, and only five Republicans voted for that change.

I know this is report language, this is not a change in the law itself. If Republicans who previously voted to protect the billionaires' tax break if they leave this country will change their vote, I look forward to working with them to make that change.

Mr. HOBSON. We are working on it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the authority of the Chair to preserve the decorum of the House, the Chair would request that posters and pictures not be displayed except at such time as a Member is actually speaking.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER].

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of America's contract with our children. The gentleman from Wisconsin deserves a great deal of credit for bringing such an honest, aggressive, and thoughtful budget proposal to the floor. This resolution has it all and does it all. This is not an either or situation regarding the Committee on the Budget's version, but it is a real alternative for those of us that are willing to take that extra step toward fiscal responsibility.

I admit, there are things in this budget with which I do not agree. While I support the concept of this resolution, I am concerned about the funding levels for national defense and what I believe is necessary to protect our country's borders, but this resolution is a tradeoff. The tradeoff is between committing an additional $600 billion to the national debt over the next 7 years, and no longer mortgaging the future of generations to come. The interest alone on this $600 billion amounts to over $40 billion in the year 2000. We could ignore the cries from those who claim this budget is unfair, and that we are mean spirited because we care about our children's future, and we should jump at the chance to balance the budget as soon as possible.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, balance the budget? We agree, but not this budget, with its mean and misshapen priorities. Balance the budget and start with a tax cut for the largest, most profitable corporations and families earning over $200,000 a year? Tax cuts paid for with $304 billion of cuts in Medicare and qutting programs important to other working American families? No, that is not the way to balance the budget.

Mr. Chairman, let us talk about four generations of one Oregon family. We have here 74-year-old Doris Wilson. She visited my office last week and talked a little bit about Medicare. She had to leave her $100 prescription at the pharmacist because she is retired on Social Security benefits and she could not afford to take it home with her. We are going to make her pay another $1,000 a year for Medicare? That is what this budget proposes.

Gerri Graff, after she was divorced and her husband walked on the child support, she had a little trouble making ends meet with her secretarial job. She got food stamps for a year and a half, and now has been a productive and taxpaying citizen for many years, without any help from the Federal Government.

Tandi Graff, a teenager single mom, is working in my office today, thanks to the jobs program, with a healthy kid, Jordan, thanks to the WIC Program. She had a little problem with a potential underweight and complicated pregnancy.

These are the people who have benefited by the proper priorities in this country, the people we want to help, the people we want to extend the ladder of opportunity to, so they can climb up and live the American dream. We do not need to help the wealthy and the Pentagon anymore.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to acknowledge that the last speaker who voted ''yes'' on the balanced budget amendment also voted for the Clinton tax bill, which added $431 million in taxes to the citizens of his district. We are trying to reduce those taxes.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. NICK SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am so proud to be a Member of this Congress. We have turned from a nation at risk to a nation with a hopeful future.

How can anybody criticize the Committee on the Budget's budget? it is so reasonable in terms of what this Nation faces.

Just briefly, on this chart we see the President's budget would take us to $7.4 trillion public debt by the year 2002. At the bottom line, we see the Neumann-Jerry Solomon budget that takes us to a public debt of $6 trillion 216 billion. In order to decide how serious the situation is, we need to consider where we are on Social Security, Medicare, unfunded liabilities for both the veterans trust fund and the civil servants Federal employees trust fund. That is another $5 trillion added onto the $5 trillion debt that we have today. We have serious problems ahead of us. We should look at this very seriously.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I want Members to listen to the rhetoric. I would like to quote from President Clinton: ''Today Medicare and Medicaid are going up at 3 times the rate of inflation.'' That is the President. ''We

propose to let it go up at 2 times the rate of inflation.'' That is 6 percent. ''This is not a Medicare or Medicaid cut.'' That is President Clinton.

Now when we are proposing the same thing, it is a cut against the people. This is what the President himself has said: ''So when you hear the business about cuts, let me caution you that we are not cutting, we are reducing the rate of growth.'' This is a direct quote from the President when he defended his 1993 budget cut.

If we take a look at what we are doing, the Senate is reducing the rate of growth to 6 percent. We are reducing it to 5 percent. The President himself wanted to reduce it to 6 percent, and states that it is not a cut.

Look at the fraud, waste and abuse. A lady called up and said ''Hey, I have a Medicare problem with a doctor. He charged me twice for a mammogram. I did not have a mammogram.'' The doctor said ''Yes, you did,'' and she said, ''No, I did not, I had a mastectomy.'' The doctor's reply was ''Who cares, Medicare will pay for it.'' There is $44 billion per year in just fraud, waste and abuse. We can manage the system better and reduce the rate.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Neumann-Solomon budget proposal, which is an idea whose time has arrived. This budget proposal will in fact balance the budget in 5 years, it will pay off the debt in 30 years, it protects Social Security, and ensures its long-term stability. It preserves Medicare and the best health care system in the world. It in fact will save $600 billion in additional national debt.

It is endorsed by the National Taxpayers Union and the Citizens Against Government Waste. America is tired of tax and spend. They want a budget that is going to work. I rise to support Neumann-Solomon.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, the Republicans who wrote this plan continue to talk about the tough choices they have had to make when crafting their budget. I agree. Choosing to take health care away from our seniors in order to pay for special interest tax breaks is certainly a tough choice, and I cannot understand why they made it.

But the choices that the authors of these Medicare cuts have made are nothing compared to the choices that Lucy Forest will be forced to make if Republicans are successful in their assault.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Members of this House to meet 75-year-old Lucy Forest from Santa Rosa, CA. Lucy has an income of $800 per month. She has to pay rent. She has to pay the heating bills. She needs to eat. Lucy also wants to visit her daughter in Tucson, AZ, this year, but Lucy says she may have to cancel this trip if Republican proposals are passed.

Lucy understands a lot of things about people and politics, and she understands Medicare. She knows that if these cuts are made, there will be lower payments to doctors and hospitals, higher premiums, higher deductibles, higher copayments, and fewer choices of doctors. She also understands that the families of Members of this House can afford health care while coverage for 7 million kids will be eliminated.

But, Lucy Forest does not understand how the Republican budget proposals can eliminate $300 billion of health care benefits for our Nation's seniors, without telling us how the savings will be achieved.

She also does not understand why pork barrel military spending on cold war weapons continues to go up, while Medicare for seniors is going down. She wants to know why the military budget is ''off the table'' in the Republican budget.

Finally, and most importantly, Lucy questions why the Republicans are proposing to slash Medicare in order to pay for tax loopholes for the wealthy special interests.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, neither do I. Only in Washington would people call taking Medicare away from Lucy Forest ''A reduction in the rate of increase.''

I urge the House reject these efforts to slash health care for seniors.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODLATTE].

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, what a new day we have in this Congress. Mr. compliments to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] who last year, for the first time in 8 years, even offered a balanced budget. The budget has not been balanced in 25 years, but no one had even tried for 8 years.

Now, here today, all we have are 4 different alternative balanced budgets to consider. This is what the American people want to see, and this budget, the Neumann-Solomon budget, is the fairest and best of them all. It is not a battle between seniors and young people. This is fair to everybody, because this is the only budget that restores the trust funds for the Social Security trust fund, and does it the quickest of any. It restores the most.

It also is fair from the standpoint of reducing, eliminating this deficit the quickest in 5 years. That helps people right now, not just our young people in the future, which is important, but it helps right now.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker, the gentlewoman from California, spoke about Lucy Foster not being able to travel to my district, to Tucson. I just want to assure her that she is going to be able to make it, because Medicare spending is not going to be slashed. In fact, in California it is going from $21 billion to $31 billion in the year 2002. That is a 46 percent increase per beneficiary, from $5,800, to $7,688 under our plan. That is certainly no cut. Lucy, welcome to Tucson.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH].

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the contract with our children, the Solomon-Neumann budget. I think it is a tremendous effort, because it moves forward in not only ending the deficit spending, but paying off the debt that we owe in this country. Right now, every family in America owes $50,000 of debt when you divide up the national debt for a family. That means that we pay in taxes $2,000 per family just to pay the interest on that debt.

The time to act is now, to start paying off the debt, so that we do not leave a terrible legacy for our children of a debt that they can never recover from. We need to do more work on this. We need to make sure that as we cut farm subsidies, we also provide regulatory relief so they can continue to make a good living. As we cut defense spending, we need to have procurement reform so we are not spending excess and wasteful amounts of money. I rise in support of this budget.

□ 1300

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I do not have a picture of the woman I want to talk about today. She came to see me yesterday. Her name is Ms. Betty Glass. She and my husband and I lived in the same neighborhood for many, many years, where my husband and I raised our children.

She is a woman who is bright; she understands things. She read the Republican budget. She looks at the figure $280 billion and change in Medicare money. She knows you cannot just get there by efficiency, new technology, by getting rid of fraud. She knows what is going to happen.

We talked yesterday about what is going to happen with fees. That neighborhood we live in, people used to be municipal workers, teachers. They are on small pensions. If the fees are increased, it is going to be very difficult.

We talked about getting a doctor to take care of somebody who is elderly.

Geriatrics was never very popular in the medical profession, but if you squeeze down the fees doctors get, people are going to have a harder time getting that doctor.

Then we talked about our town hospital, St. Francis Hospital, that we both go to, and we talked about Mt. Sinai Hospital, and St. Francis and Mt. Sinai had such a hard time, they had to merge. If Medicare is cut back they are going to be squeezed and we don't know if that hospital will stay in business.

This woman is like President Clinton. She knows that we have to reduce the rate of the growth of Medicare and she will accept that. She came in because she was representing the AARP, the American Association of Retired People.

She is willing to take what they have to have to make sure we balance the budget, but she does not think it is fair that you take $280 billion out of Medicare and say you are not reducing anything. She knows better.

I wish I had her picture here because she represents a lot of people across the Nation. Medicare people over 65 want to do their fair share, but what they do not want to do is have the one universal system we have in this country—we did not do medical health care last year—we have a universal system in Medicare, and we should not hurt that system.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER].

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for his leadership in the last Congress and over the years.

I am particularly proud also of my freshman colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN]. He came here to Congress as a businessman and said this is not the way you run a government. You do not put the Social Security surplus in the budget. You do not try to talk just about how we are going to get to a balanced budget on an annual basis. We have to look at the long-term debt.

He worked at it, rounded up others and was persistent in all of our meetings, through the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Appropriations, and in our class. I want to commend his leadership particularly because while I have my mother and father-in-law who are struggling in their health care and in Medicare, and I do not have any desire to hurt them, which is why we are not cutting it, we are increasing it at a slower rate, but I am also concerned for my three children. It is a balance that we have to achieve because if we do not achieve that balance, there will be no future Medicare for me when I get there or Social Security for my children.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support today of both the Neumann budget and the Kasich budget that are going to be coming in front of this body. These are both good bills, and they are both going to do a good job and something good for America that we have not seen for 25 years—balance the budget. These are important things, and this is an incredible and historic debate that the people are watching take place that we have not had in 25 years.

Let me tell you the specific reason why I am also voting for the Neumann budget. That is simply this: It pays the debt off in 30 years, something we can all identify with. Most of us have mortgages on our homes that are 30 years in length. It pays the mortgage on America off in 30 years.

It is tough medicine. this is a tough thing to do. This is difficult, but I would submit to you it is very analogous to going to the doctor's office, and going to that doctor and getting a shot that would protect you against a future disease.

If you went in to that doctor and you got a shot and you asked the popularity of that doctor that day, I would guess that the people that got the shot, they would say he is not a very popular doctor. But ask 6 months or 1 year later when somebody does not get that disease, and can live a healthy life and grow and prosper in this country, and they will say that is a good doctor.

This is tough medicine. It is good medicine. It is what we need to do for the country. Vote for Kasich. Vote for Neumann.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] for giving me something I can be proud of.

We see charts up here we cannot really understand, most people cannot, but I want to show you a chart that is real. This is the generation that President Clinton talked about that would have an 82 percent tax rate. I was fighting for the women in the 1960's to have freedom. That little girl in the middle is going to have no freedom. She is going to have an 82 percent tax rate. Tell me how much freedom she has with 18 percent left.

What we are doing is taking the biggest, most expensive credit card, our voting card, and we are determining the future of those little people. I want to tell Members, I am going to be proud to vote for a balanced budget so I give people like my little Dallis or my little Heather back their freedom, and that all the women who fought for freedom all those years will know that we still have freedom.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about today is really restoring the American dream. Time Magazine had a great article in this week's issue about the importance of balancing the budget. We start talking about the specifics. We have to think about the future. This is the American dream, by going to the balanced budget by the year 2002.

I will probably not be voting for the substitute we are talking about now because I think it may be going a little bit too fast. But we have to think about the future of our children, of our grandparents today. It is so important.

To think that we have a debt of $19,000 for every man, woman and child in this country that we are paying interest on every year, that the interest on the national debt in 2 more years will be greater than the entire Defense Department debt, it is obscene the amount of money we are paying on the cost of this debt. We must balance this budget.

That is what we are talking about, increasing the standard of living of Americans, making it available, the American dream, for all Americans. I am excited about that opportunity, that today we are going to start that process of going to that balanced budget.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP].

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I too will support the Kasich plan and the Neumann-Solomon budget. I call the Neumann budget the why-not budget because my constituents back at home say to me, ''Why can not we just freeze spending at last year's levels?'' People in Washington say it can not be done. My constituents say, ''Why not?''

They ask me, ''Why can't we just bite the bullet and pay off the debt while we're at it?'' People in D.C. say it can not be done. My constituents say, ''Why not?''

People back home say, ''Why can't a guy go to Washington and immediately make a difference?'' The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] has proved you can. He is a freshman. This is the why-not budget.

I came here to defend the programs in my district but I came here most importantly to defend freedom in this country. In this world, in fact. We are the last best hope for freedom in this world, and this is the first step toward saving the United States of America from an economic train wreck.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, the budget that the Republicans are supporting and will probably pass today is the greatest raid on the wealth, the income and the assets of working people in this country.

It is going to mean that their day care is going to be more expensive

when they have small children. It means that there are going to be fewer school books to teach their children when they enter school. It means that nutrition, as we have already seen, is going to go up dramatically for those working families that have their children in child nutrition programs.

Student loans are going to be more expensive. If they are trying to take care of their elderly parents in nursing homes, that is going to become more expensive because of the Medicaid cuts and quite certainly, as we have all heard here now, a $1,000 increase in the Medicare to the elderly.

Why? Because Republicans simply chose not to address the tax breaks for the wealthy that they insist on clinging to. They chose not to address, as we read in this morning's paper, the $25 billion in corporate welfare where huge corporations, wealthy corporations are taking the taxpayers' dollars from working families.

One of the previous speakers said they could pay off the debt in 30 years. Yes, working families in their country will shoulder the burden for paying off the debt, but the billionaires will not, the corporations will not, and the wealthy of this country will not share that burden, because you have chosen to put the burden on working families of this country.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HILLEARY].

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

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, you can't say a whole lot in 30 seconds, but I just wanted to rise today in support of the substitute amendment of my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin.

In the freshman class, ever since we have been elected we are the closest to the people by definition. We were only elected a few months ago.

The freshman class has tried time and time again to show that we are different, that we can push this Congress and this country in the right direction. this budget does it. I rise in support of it today.

I ask every one of my colleagues to rise and support this. We can save $600 billion off the debt if we balance the budget in 5 years.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] has 5 minutes 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute of my remaining time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 6 minutes 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a lot of rhetoric out here on both sides of the aisle. It seems we spend a lot of time talking back and forth here as Democrats and Republicans. The Nation was formed by a group of people who passed on a country that was great to us. With that they gave us a very great responsibility.

We have got fiscal problems, folks. Let's get past the Democrats-and-Republicans part of this thing and let's join together today voting yes on a package that balances the budget in 5 years, pays off the debt in 30 years, restores the Social Security trust fund, and saves our children $600 billion. Let's do this not as Democrats, not as Republicans, but let's do this as Americans who care a lot about our country so that together we can pass this Nation on to our children in a form that we are very proud of.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT].

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, this is a wonderful mythological event today. The Republicans are trying to sell the idea to the American people that you can make massive cuts in programs and give big tax breaks to the wealthy in this country and nobody will feel it.

This budget takes health care away from 7 million children in the Medicaid Program. I do not know all about agriculture and defense and all the other things, but I do know about this budget with respect to health.

The idea that the Medicare is not a cut, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] today, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] yesterday stood up over and over again and said it is not a cut. The Republican plan mandates growth of 5.4 percent and says that is all right because private insurance is only increasing at 4 percent.

The 4 percent growth rate from the private sector health insurance premiums claimed by Republicans is a made-up number. There is no study, no one can bring a study on the floor that shows that, because it does not exist.

□ 1315

It is made up, and everyone agrees that the private health insurance rates, at least CBO and Medicare actuaries say it is going to grow at 7.6 percent.

That means that for the Republican Medicare voucher plan put forward by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] and the Committee on the Budget, if that is adopted, senior citizens will be paying one-quarter of their benefits which Medicare now provides in its entirety, and the erosion will continue and continue.

If Members believe that the American people believe that they can have a free lunch and they can all be for free, and it will not hurt anybody, keep pushing this budget, because there will be another vote here, it will not be only on this floor, it will be in November 1996. You will find out the result then.

The CHAIRMAN. All time controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has expired.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HANCOCK].

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

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would state I fully support and hope we can balance the budget and welcome in the next century.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 5 minutes, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Look at this chart. Look at this newspaper ad. They describe free money from the Federal Government. Free guide reveals how people can get their hands on billions of Federal tax dollars. Free. Nobody has to pay it back. That is what this debate is all about.

Ladies and gentlemen, today is a truly historic day. It is one I have waited for for so long, because 1 hour from right now this House will pass a visionary blueprint that will finally lead to a balanced budget in this Government. It will put an end to the drunken spending spree that this Congress has been on for so many years, a tidal wave of debt that has turned this great country into the debtor nation. What a shame.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have almost reached the point of no return. But today we can and we will reverse the irresponsible spending habits of Congress by finally enacting a balanced budget blueprint. The question before us today is not whether we will balance the budget, it is how we will do it.

Mr. Chairman, I am the chairman of the Committee on Rules. I am privileged to chair that committee, and with our Members we have written a rule that says no budget alternative on this floor today will be unbalanced. Members are going to vote today for a balanced budget, and they have no choice. And the only remaining question in this debate is how do we do it, in 5 or 7 years.

Mr. Chairman, our balanced budget task force and a large number of freshman Republicans that I am so proud of, led by MARK NEUMANN, have before us today a 5-year budget plan. It is almost identical to the plan of the Committee on the Budget, including the House-passed tax cuts.

The big difference between these two excellent plans is the additional debt added to the accumulated national deficit of $5 trillion. Our plan accumulates $600 billion less to that astronomical debt than does the committee plan.

Why is that so? Because our plan begins to make the cuts in years 1 and 2 instead of years 6 and 7. Look at this

chart. It explains it all. By making the same cuts early instead of late we save $600 billion in deficits, including $42 billion in interest that we pay out to foreign countries that hold our debt.

But most of all, we guarantee, ladies and gentlemen, that a balanced budget in 5 years is going to happen. Members of this House, I am sure you all know as I do, and many of you were here, that after passage of the landmark Gramm-Rudman legislation back in 1985, and which would have balanced the books in 1991, we began, just like we say we are going to do here today, we began to meet those deficit-reduction targets in the first 2 years.

But do Members know what happened? In 1987 there was a new Congress just elected, and that is liable to be what happens a couple of years from now. And back then we found it too difficult, even though we were in an economic recovery with billions of dollars rolling in in new revenues for the Federal Government, we found it impossible to meet the Gramm-Rudman target dates, and later on the balanced budget goals were extended and later they were abandoned entirely.

Members, we cannot let this happen today. The Neumann-Solomon substitute begins restraining the growth in spending right now. Next years we dramatically alter the infrastructure of the Federal Government so as to ensure that it will not grow back, and that is the difference between our budgets. If Members will look at this, our budget cuts in the first 2 years, not in the last 2 years.

Members, balancing the budget is more than a game of numbers or even an act of fiscal responsibility. It is a moral imperative given to us by the people who are here today in this audience, the people who are watching, the American families, my children, my grandchildren, and children to come. We have to balance this budget, and we have to do it now. Today we have a historic opportunity to choose between a 7-year plan that in fact will lead to a balanced budget, but it does so in the next century, 7 years from now. Or we can vote for our 5-year plan that balances the budget in this century. It does it right, Mr. Chairman. If Members vote for a 5-year plan and it fails to get 218 votes, they can do as I will do. They can put their heart and soul behind final passage of whatever is the standing amendment before this body at the end of debate.

Please do it. America wins. Our budget is a better one. But regardless, if we pass either mine or the one from the Budget Committee we will have done the right thing. I urge Members to please vote for this one, and if it fails, vote for the committee budget. We will do it for America and our children.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] is recognized for 2 minutes to conclude debate on this amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from New York for their contribution to this debate. This has been a historic debate.

I also want to respond to the last speaker on the other side who talked about again, we have heard it over and over again, the cuts in Medicare and in Medicaid, and yet under our plan Medicaid spending would increase from $444 billion that we spent over the last 7 years to $668 billion over the next 7 years, and Medicare spending would, on a per beneficiary basis, go up from $4,700 per beneficiary to $6,300.

Mr. Chairman, only in Washington, only in Washington, not the State of Washington where the gentleman comes from, but only in Washington, DC, can we call that cuts. Only in Washington would we consider that kind of increase to be cuts.

The gentleman also talked about the assumptions, say it simply is not true. You can have a 4.4-percent private health insurance increase, but HCFA, the health care financing agency, says that is exactly what it is; that is their document, not ours.

We have a lot in common in this debate on this amendment versus the committee's amendment or the committee's budget. Both of us got to a balanced budget, and both of us call for debt reduction following that. And that, after all, Mr. Chairman, is what this is all about, not just getting to zero deficit, but to get that huge burden of debt off of our backs and off of the generation that will follow us, off of their backs. And both of us call for doing that.

Surely this debate is about our future. We say reduce spending, get to a balanced budget, do it by reducing spending, return some of the tax dollars, the hard-earned tax dollars that belong to the American citizens, return it to the people of America, return it to the people of America.

We can and we will achieve a balanced budget at the end of 7 years, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appear to have it.

RECOREDED VOTE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 89, noes 342, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

AYES—89

Allard
Baker (CA)
Bartlett
Barton
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Burr
Burton
Chabot
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ensign
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fox
Frisa
Funderburk
Geren
Gilchrest
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hayworth
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kingston
Klug
Largent
Manzullo
McInnis
McIntosh
Metcalf
Mica
Moorhead
Myers
Neumann
Norwood
Petri
Pombo
Quillen
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Stockman
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Waldholtz
Wamp
White
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—342

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cremeans
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dornan
Doyle
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume

Miller (CA)	Rahall	Stump
Miller (FL)	Ramstad	Stupak
Mineta	Rangel	Talent
Minge	Reed	Tanner
Mink	Regula	Tate
Moakley	Reynolds	Taylor (NC)
Molinari	Richardson	Tejeda
Mollohan	Riggs	Thomas
Montgomery	Rivers	Thompson
Moran	Roberts	Thornton
Morella	Roemer	Thurman
Murtha	Rogers	Torres
Myrick	Rose	Torricelli
Nadler	Roukema	Towns
Neal	Roybal-Allard	Traficant
Nethercutt	Rush	Tucker
Ney	Sabo	Velazquez
Nussle	Sanders	Vento
Oberstar	Sawyer	Visclosky
Obey	Saxton	Volkmer
Olver	Schiff	Vucanovich
Ortiz	Schroeder	Walker
Orton	Schumer	Walsh
Owens	Scott	Ward
Oxley	Serrano	Waters
Packard	Shadegg	Watt (NC)
Pallone	Shaw	Watts (OK)
Parker	Shays	Waxman
Pastor	Shuster	Weldon (FL)
Paxon	Sisisky	Weldon (PA)
Payne (NJ)	Skaggs	Weller
Payne (VA)	Skeen	Whitfield
Pelosi	Skelton	Wicker
Peterson (FL)	Slaughter	Williams
Peterson (MN)	Smith (NJ)	Wilson
Pickett	Smith (TX)	Wise
Pomeroy	Spence	Wolf
Porter	Spratt	Woolsey
Portman	Stark	Wyden
Poshard	Stearns	Wynn
Pryce	Stenholm	Yates
Quinn	Stokes	Young (AK)
Radanovich	Studds	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—3

Berman	Bono	Kleczka

□ 1344

Mr. DICKEY, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HORN, and Mr. RANGEL changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. COMBEST, CRAPO, FOLEY, QUILLEN, and MOORHEAD changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider an amendment in the nature of a substitute to be offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16, 1995.

□ 1345

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. PAYNE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996.

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, October 1, 1997, October 1, 1998, October 1, 1999, October 1, 2000, and October 1, 2001:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $1,060,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,113,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,199,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,290,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,361,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,495,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,576,520,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $17,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $30,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $64,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $103,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $115,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $183,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $195,520,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $103,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $109,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $114,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $120,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $126,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $133,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $140,400,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $1,305,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,351,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,418,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,477,601,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,554,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,635,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,705,270,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $1,310,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,360,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,406,588,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,473,786,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,532,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,586,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,657,024,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $249,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $247,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $206,988,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $183,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $170,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $99,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $80,504,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $5,195,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $5,516,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $5,810,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $6,100,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,374,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,614,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,806,000,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, October 1, 1997, October 1, 1998, October 1, 1999, October 1, 2000, and October 1, 2001 are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $37,600,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $193,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $40,200,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $187,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $42,300,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $185,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $45,700,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $183,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $45,800,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $184,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $45,800,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $186,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $46,100,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $187,600,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1996 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, $226,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $215,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $242,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $220,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $236,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $223,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $230,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $244,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $250,867,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $244,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $250,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $244,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $18,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,689,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $18,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,540,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $19,106,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,248,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $19,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,752,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,596,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $21,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,596,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $21,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,596,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $16,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,840,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $15,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,427,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,349,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $15,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,194,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,942,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,943,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,940,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,942,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $4,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,941,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $3,314,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,645,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,424,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,744,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,099,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,475,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,540,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,585,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $22,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,212,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $22,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,498,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $21,874,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,206,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $21,368,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,775,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $20,753,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,134,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,134,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $20,815,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,134,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,713,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,309,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $12,598,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,247,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $11,144,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $9,993,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $9,936,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $8,718,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,600,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $9,207,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $8,060,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $8,953,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $8,066,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $8,960,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $8,072,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, $4,191,000,000.

(B) Outlays, minus $6,339,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $4,104,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$4,016,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $3,631,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$5,151,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $4,419,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$2,927,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $6,504,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$2,320,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $11,739,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$1,381,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $12,420,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$345,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, $33,369,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $34,480,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $39,515,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $35,429,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $41,038,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $36,590,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $42,677,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $37,965,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $44,360,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $39,519,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $43,327,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $39,519,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $42,389,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $39,519,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, $10,780,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,325,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $10,749,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,540,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $11,181,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,599,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $11,658,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,226,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $12,062,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,486,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $13,374,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,573,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $13,468,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,661,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, $61,801,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $59,939,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,600,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $62,853,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $62,114,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $16,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $64,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,732,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $19,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $67,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,894,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $21,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $69,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,238,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $21,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $71,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,366,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $22,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $73,011,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,366,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $22,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $128,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $127,946,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $140,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $140,282,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $154,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,746,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $168,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $167,729,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $183,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $182,276,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $198,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $198,036,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $215,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $214,736,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $184,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $181,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $202,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $200,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $221,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $219,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $243,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $241,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $266,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $292,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $290,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $321,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $319,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $235,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $232,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $252,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $274,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $281,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $301,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $310,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $306,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $329,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $325,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $5,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,593,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $8,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,763,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,795,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,512,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $9,561,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,921,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $466,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $11,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $584,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $734,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $40,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,275,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $26,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $40,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,875,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $21,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $41,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,277,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $43,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,396,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $44,897,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,182,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $46,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $47,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $20,182,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,711,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $20,869,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,430,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $21,788,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,455,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $22,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,215,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $23,371,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,015,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $23,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,015,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $23,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $14,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,170,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $14,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,796,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,855,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $13,980,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,796,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,582,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,625,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,974,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,625,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,964,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,625,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $295,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,828,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $304,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,289,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $308,696,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $308,696,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $314,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $314,655,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $319,862,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $319,862,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $320,646,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $320,646,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $323,331,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $323,331,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $−1,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−1,195,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $−1,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−1,195,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $−1,258,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−1,195,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $−1,258,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−1,195,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $−1,258,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−1,195,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $−1,258,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−1,195,000,000

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $−1,258,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−1,195,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, $−31,293,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−31,293,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $−35,961,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−35,961,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $−37,148,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−37,148,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $−38,127,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−38,127,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $−40,276,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−40,276,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $−41,614,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−41,614,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $−42,937,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−42,937,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) Not later than September 1, 1995, the House committees named in subsections (b) through (o) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the House Budget Committee. After receiving those recommendations, the House Budget Committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $2,250,000,000 in budget authority and $2,061,600,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $2,250,000,000 in budget authority and $2,061,600,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $2,250,000,000 in budget authority and $2,061,600,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $2,250,000,000 in budget authority and $2,061,600,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $2,250,000,000 in budget authority and $2,061,600,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $2,250,000,000 in budget authority and $2,061,600,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $2,250,000,000 in budget authority and $2,061,600,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(d) The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $5,100,000,000 in budget authority and $5,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $5,100,000,000 in budget authority and $5,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $5,100,000,000 in budget authority and $5,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $5,100,000,000 in budget authority and $5,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $5,100,000,000 in budget authority and $5,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $5,100,000,000 in budget authority and $5,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $5,100,000,000 in budget authority and $5,100,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(h) The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $43,000,000 in budget authority and $43,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $43,000,000 in budget authority and $43,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $43,000,000 in budget authority and $43,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $43,000,000 in budget authority and $43,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $43,000,000 in budget authority and $43,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $43,000,000 in budget authority and $43,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $43,000,000 in budget authority and $43,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(j) The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $1,250,000,000 in budget authority and $1,250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $1,250,000,000 in budget authority and $1,250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $1,250,000,000 in budget authority and $1,250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $1,250,000,000 in budget authority and $1,250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $1,250,000,000 in budget authority and $1,250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $1,250,000,000 in budget authority and $1,250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $1,250,000,000 in budget authority and $1,250,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(l) The House Committee on Small Business shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $14,285,000 in budget authority and $14,285,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $14,285,000 in budget authority and $14,285,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $14,285,000 in budget authority and $14,285,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $14,285,000 in budget authority and $14,285,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $14,285,000 in budget authority and $14,285,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $14,285,000 in budget authority and $14,285,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $14,285,000 in budget authority and $14,285,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(m) The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $1,340,000,000 in budget authority and $1,340,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $1,336,000,000 in budget authority and $1,336,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $1,336,000,000 in budget authority and $1,336,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $1,336,000,000 in budget authority and $1,336,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $1,336,000,000 in budget authority and $1,336,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $1,336,000,000 in budget authority and $1,336,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $1,336,000,000 in budget authority and $1,336,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(o) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues, as follows: $17,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $30,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, $64,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, $103,130,000,000 in fiscal year 1999, $115,930,000,000 in fiscal year 2000, $183,774,000,000 in fiscal year 2001, and $195,520,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(p) For purposes of this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and the term ''new budget authority'' has the meaning given to such term in section 3(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. KASICH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am proud to join my colleague MAJOR OWENS in bringing before the House of Representatives a sound, responsible budget plan.

While members of the Caucus are committed to fiscal responsibility, we do question the strict, inflexible 7-year

deadline for producing a balanced budget which we were forced to abide by in order to bring this resolution to the floor. Most families in America could not balance their budgets if they were banned from getting mortgages and had to pay cash up front for their house, or their car, or their children's braces.

Ours is a blueprint which reflects our belief in the United States of America as a land of opportunity, not just for the affluent, but for all of us.

We call our plan the Caring Majority Alternative Budget, because we believe in this country as a place where the majority of people care about their neighbors, care about our older people who have sacrificed so much for the freedoms we enjoy today, care about the children and young people who want and deserve a chance to succeed. Our budget recognizes the crucial link between education and success. We recognize that no nation can build a strong economy when we have 40 million illiterate Americans, when children are going to schools with leaking roofs and outdated books, when college costs increased and student aid decreases. To reinvest in America, our budget increases funding for education and job training by 25 percent. We continue highly successful programs like Head Start, which has given valuable early learning experiences to youngsters from low-income families.

Our budget reflects our concern for the quality of education our children are able to enjoy and the job skills they are able to develop. We continue President Clinton's successful National Service program, which has given young people a renewed sense of community spirit as well as an opportunity to succeed. We support school-to-work programs and one-stop career centers to help prepare young people for the work force. We include innovative ideas such as providing access to computers and the information superhighway at local libraries to ensure that no one is left behind as we race towards the 21st century.

Our budget protects Medicare and Medicaid, two crucial programs to safeguard the health of older Americans and low-income families. Efforts to reform the health care system of our Nation were met with vigorous opposition by special interests fearful of losing profits, yet we have seen no workable alternative plan. Health care should not be a luxury. Too many Americans are only one paycheck or retirement check away from losing everything in the event of a major illness or accident.

Our plan also responds to the new global realties and the end of the cold war. We recognize that we can provide for a sound national defense without pouring huge amounts of money into weapons we don't need and for which there is no justification or rationale. Funneling valuable resources away from our most pressing needs threatens to make our Nation weaker, not stronger.

As a superpower, the United States must also exert moral leadership. Our budget provides humanitarian, education, and development assistance for struggling nations, some of which have been plagued with starvation and other life-threatening crises.

As we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the great Allied victory in World War II, our budget keeps our promise to our Nation's veterans by maintaining their benefits. Our budget keeps our promise with Federal workers and retirees.

In the wake of the tragedy at Oklahoma City, we recognize the contributions of our public servants.

We refuse to go along with the Republican plan to single out Federal workers for a tax increase and a pension cut. Instead of punishing our own workers, we have sought to raise revenue by requiring corporations to pay their fair share of the tax burden.

We protect small farmers, who work so hard to supply our Nation with an abundance of food. We protect the rural areas of our Nation, which were neglected for too long.

Whether everyone wants to admit it or not, we all know what happened to the Federal budget deficit the last time we tried trickle down economics. In the 1980's, when the Republican Party controlled the White House, the Senate, and was able to put together a working budget coalition in the House, the deficit began growing at an alarming rate. It grew in leaps and bounds.

It has finally begun to fall and our economy has gotten back on track under President Clinton's leadership.

The Congressional Black Caucus plan produces a balanced budget in a fair and responsible manner. I urge my colleagues to support the Congressional Black Caucus Caring Majority Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify a provision in the Budget Committee report accompanying House Concurrent Resolution 67 with the gentleman from Ohio. As you know, language in the report concerning NASA's core missions is located in two sections of the report and was intended to be identical in both. Am I correct in my understanding that the language on page 63 of the report is the correct text and should replace the text on page 26?

Mr. KASICH. Yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I want to, first of all, congratulate the Black Caucus on coming forward with a specific proposal in pointing their vision. To a large degree I may be a little biased in this, but I give my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], an awful lot of credit because he started this process years ago, not just with the budget process, but with the defense process as well.

At the end of the day, Mr. Chairman, America has got to be one, and we have got to reach across the aisle, and reach across philosophies, and make sure this thing works for our country. We will talk about that as we get to the close, but I want to really praise the group for putting a vision forward, and frankly I am going to spend time over the next couple of weeks looking closely at that vision because there is no question that there are parts of this plan that ought to be listened to, respected and adopted as we go down the road, and I want to congratulate the chairman of the Black Caucus, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kasich balanced budget resolution and in opposition to the Owens budget. My reason for doing so is simple: our children. Balancing the budget is no longer just fiscally responsible, it is a moral imperative.

My two daughters will each pay $115,000 in interest payments on the national debt in their lifetimes. When they enter the job market, they will negotiate a salary knowing that half of what they earn will be taken away in taxes. Whether or not they can realize the American dream of home ownership may well be affected by the 2 percent higher interest rates caused by the deficit.

The Kasich balanced budget is the most responsible and equitable plan before us today. It recognizes our constitutional duty to provide for the national defense and it lays the groundwork for a plan to preserve, protect, and improve Medicare. It will reduce the size, scope, and cost of the Federal Government, and ensure that our children have the future they deserve.

I urge my colleagues to support the Kasich plan.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], in support of the Congressional Black Caucus' alternative budget.

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus [CBC], Mr. PAYNE, for his steadfast support of the development of this caring majority budget. I also want to thank the chairman of the House Progressive Caucus, Mr. SANDERS, for the steady stream of ideas and positions that have flowed from the Progressive Caucus since January. I also would like to thank all of the members of the CBC and their staff for

their help in completing this very worthwhile project. Particularly, I would like to thank members of my staff: Paul Seltman, Braden Goetz, and Jacqui Ellis, for the herculean effort they put forth to produce this budget.

This caring majority budget of the Congressional Black Caucus and the House Progressive Caucus meets the mandate that we produce a balanced budget. But this budget does not oppress the poor and the elderly in order to favor the rich and the privileged. This budget is balanced by eliminating corporate welfare and closing corporate tax loopholes. This caring majority budget is a budget for the benefit of all Americans.

Why is the Republican majority cutting Medicaid and Medicare to give a tax break to the rich and the privileged? Why are American taxpayers angry about the gross mismanagement of their Government? Why are American individual and family taxpayers being forced to shoulder 44 percent of the current tax burden while corporations are asked to cover no more than 11 percent of the tax burden? Since 1943, why has the corporate share of the tax burden dropped from a high of almost 40 percent to the present 11 percent? Why is the national deficit careening out of control?

The deficit is not out of control because we are spending too much on vital safety net programs. The deficit is out of control because the tax policies of the past few decades have dumped more and more of the tax burden on families through the personal income tax while those same tax policies have succumbed to massive pandering to the corporate sector. There is no fairness, no justice, and no balance in our present tax scheme.

The unique feature of this caring majority budget of the Congressional Black Caucus and the House Progressive Caucus is that it is a budget balanced by closing abusive tax loopholes and cutting corporate welfare. We offer a tax cut for all personal income taxpayers in order to begin the progress of restoring tax justice. We propose to end the personal income tax as we know it.

At the same time, we move to systematically begin decreasing the taxes on individuals and families, we must insist that the irresponsible corporate sector pay its fair share of the Nation's budget. This mandate for greater balance in the revenue area is the policy key to a balanced budget without reckless budget slashing. More balanced revenue collection policies can produce more balanced budgets.

And balanced is exactly what our plan is, in every sense of the word. Our plan has nearly a 1 to 1 ratio of spending cuts to revenue increases, while the Republican plan relies solely on spending cuts that hit the working poor and middle class the hardest. Our plan includes $500 billion in corporate welfare cuts, while the Republican plan includes a mere $18 billion.

I must also point out that the Republicans eliminate extended unemployment benefits. While that would save $1.2 billion in 1996, so much more could be saved by instead doing what we have done in the caring majority budget: invest in the creation of jobs and thereby save the Federal Government money in the form of transfer payments, such as unemployment insurance and AFDC. In fact, by putting 13,000 more people to work, the Republicans could save that same $1.2 billion. Our budget puts nearly 1 million more people to work by the year 2002, saving the Government $110 billion.

In conclusion, I think it is pretty clear where the priorities of the caring majority are, as opposed to the priorities of the Republican Party. We do not protect the rich at the expense of the poor, or the powerful at the expense of the vulnerable. Our balanced budget is truly balanced in that it: provides a tax cut for hard-working Americans; invests more than 27 billion new dollars in education and job training, increasing that portion of the budget by 25 percent; creates at least 1 million jobs; completely protects Medicaid and Medicare at their current levels; completely protects Social Security, with no extensions of the age for eligibility or COLA cuts; and provides a more sane defense budget which offers a peace dividend to the taxpayers who have so diligently shouldered the burden of massive modern military costs.

The Republican budget is a budget for the rich and the privileged. It is a budget that is mean and extreme. It is a budget that abandons large segments of America. This caring majority budget of the CBC and the Progressive Caucus is a budget for all Americans.

□ 1400

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the budget for which the gentleman is arguing. It is important to balance the budget, but there are more important things than even balancing the budget. It is important to keep in effect some of the programs for which we have fought over the years. For example, I noticed two items in the paper this morning. One indicated that $60 billion is going to be spent for a new class of submarines. I do not know who our enemy is that would justify the expenditure of another $60 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] has used 5 minutes, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has used 30 seconds.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, today is a time for truth. Today is a time for courage. Not too long ago on this floor a huge majority of this House voted in favor of a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and most of those who voted against the balanced budget amendment said that they too were in favor of a balanced budget, merely against a constitutional amendment to reach that objective.

Well, today we have the opportunity to show that we have the courage of our convictions by moving beyond the easy rhetoric of balancing the budget to the difficult reality of actually achieving a balanced budget. We have talked the talk. Now it is time to walk the walk.

As for those who say that this cannot be done without a massive tax increase, those who advocate the status quo, those who offer no constructive alternative, I suggest that we not waste our time in condemning them, because they have condemned themselves by their timidity, just as they condemn future generations to a nation that is less prosperous, less secure, and less competitive, with less opportunity.

Instead, America should recognize that the new majority in this Congress has the courage, has the leadership, and has the commitment to live within our means, to stop spending money that does not belong to us, so that we can allow future generations to live in America with more opportunity, with more prosperity, and with more hope.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] and ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to yield said time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] to finish his thoughts.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the other item I saw in the paper was that the National Institutes of Health, in which we have spent so many billions of dollars over the years in making it into one of the great research institutions of the country, is going to suffer tremendously in its research function because its budgets are being cut. I think there are more important things, that it is much more important to protect the health and welfare of the people of our country than cutting an agency like the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS].

(Miss COLLINS of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget. This budget demonstrates a commitment to the American people. We will not sit idly by and cringe at the possibility that money

will be taken out of the homes and food off the tables of millions of Americans. The CBC budget calls for spending much less on defense than the Republican proposal. Believe it or not, we are at peace. Those who can least afford cuts, the poor, children, and the elderly, should not be required to bear the brunt of the Republican agenda. I ask, Mr. Chairman, is human life not more important than big business?

The CBC alternative budget will invest in programs people really need. Funding for Medicare and Medicaid will be maintained. In addition, education and job training will take high priority.

I stand before you today on behalf of the tens of millions of Americans who cannot stand for themselves. I ask my colleagues to balance this country's need with compassion for those who are unable to care for themselves.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

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

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment and in favor of the committee resolution. I want to commend, first of all, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, Mr. KASICH, and his committee, for crafting a very bold and courageous and, most importantly, an honest budget resolution. They have tackled a very difficult and certainly I not need add a politically dangerous task of balancing the budget in a responsible and professional manner, and I would applaud them for what I think are Herculean efforts.

Second, I wanted to remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and supporters of this substitute who seem somewhat squeamish about the Republican budget proposal in that it is making some significant cuts, that it is only the first step in a very long process. Of course, the budget figures laid out by function are binding, but the menu of the specific program cuts and eliminations are nonbinding. There is plenty of room for adjustment I think in all of the authorizing committees and improvement.

So I too am concerned about some of the suggested cuts, but I plan to work to reform the programs that I believe are most critical to my constituents and the country and develop alternative means of delivering some of these critical services and benefits.

Third, as chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, I am excited about this budget proposal because it is the first major step in fundamentally transforming the Federal Government and redefining the roles of Federal, State, and local governments. I am one Republican who is not afraid to say I think the Federal Government does have important roles to play and some important responsibilities. In some circumstances the Federal Government can and has improved the lives of Americans.

However, I fear we have come to the point where out of control Federal spending and unyielding monolithic bureaucracies have become a threat to American prosperity. The budget we have before us proposed here continues what I think has been a counterproductive movement over the past years.

It is time to redefine the Federal Government's role in society and establish a true partnership. We must recognize the different States and different regions have varying needs, concerns and priorities, and we in Washington do not understand and cannot possibly address. So I would urge defeat of the substitute and support of the Kasich amendment.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], the chairman of the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] and other members of the Black Caucus for the excellent work they have done.

Mr. Chairman, at a time in which the rich are getting much richer, the middle class is shrinking, and poverty is increasing, the Congressional Black Caucus has come up with a budget that moves us toward a balanced budget, but does not do it on the backs of working people, the middle class, or the poor. At a time in which the rich have enjoyed, over the last decade, huge decreases in their tax burden, the Congressional Black Caucus does not give more tax breaks to the wealthy or the large corporations, but, in fact, provides tax breaks for the middle class and says to the wealthy that it is about time you start paying your fair share of taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the cold war is over. Our standard of living is declining. We have the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world. It is absurd that the Republican budget proposes to be talking about significant increases in military spending. Now is the time to lower military spending so we can reinvest in this country and provide for the needs of our people.

Mr. Chairman, instead of giving huge tax breaks to corporations and the wealthy, the Black Caucus budget has the guts, uniquely, to demand an end to corporate welfare. When we talk about welfare, most people say that is poor folks. What the Black Caucus budget understands is that large corporations and the wealthy end up with much more in welfare and subsidies. Let us support the Black Caucus budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA], a distinguished member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, this week I celebrate my son Clark's 16th birthday. I remember the joy and excitement years ago when he was born on May 16, and I felt the same excitement when our daughter D'Anne was born 20 years ago.

I tell you about my two children, my colleagues, because for my wife Pat and I they are the most important things in our lives. When we made the decision to bring them into the world two decades ago, we were optimistic about their future. We had special dreams and hopes for our children. But those hopes for a better life and for a more promising future began to fade several years ago.

That is why 3 years ago I decided to run for Congress. I believed then, and I believe now, that we must change the way this Congress is spending away their future. This week we have an opportunity to change the future direction of our Nation. During my 28 months in Congress I have learned firsthand of the dire straits that I only suspected were the condition of our national finances.

Today, my colleagues, I can confirm that the very financial stability of our Nation is at stake. Every fund has been depleted. We have borrowed against every reserve. Even our Nation's Capital City is in receivership. Every cookie jar has been robbed; every dollar tucked under the mattress has been spent.

For our senior citizens, I believe there is no greater threat to their Social Security or Medicare than to further ignore our responsibility to balance the budget. So now, my colleagues, I urge you to cast a courageous vote, to vote for the Republican alternative, and defeat this amendment, if we are to restore hope for our children and hope for our future.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA], chairman of the Urban Caucus.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, we have heard so much from the speakers over the last couple of days, talking about future generations and what we must do to protect the future generations and their lives.

Well, I am concerned about the future generations, but I am also concerned about the young people living today, especially people living in our cities, the poor and middle class, people yearning for a good education, a good home, and for food to eat.

I believe we should be trying to balance the budget. No question about that. But I also believe that we have an obligation, yes, a moral obligation, while we are trying to balance the budget, to provide an education for young people, to provide health care for young people and our senior citizens, to provide mass transportation, food, housing. Yes, we need these things. We need a balanced budget, but we have to, at the same time, provide for the people and fulfill our obligation, our moral obligations, to the people in this Nation, especially the poor,

especially the senior citizens and the middle class of our country.

□ 1415

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus substitute budget for fiscal year 1996. The CBC substitute is a caring budget, it shows compassion for the American people, and is one that the American people can be proud of. It not only balances the budget, the measure is responsive to the housing, health, education, and employment training needs of the American people.

Unlike the Republicans' budget proposal, House Concurrent Resolution 67, which holds our elderly hostage to their compromised health care condition and economic status, the Congressional Black Caucus substitute treats our elderly with the dignity and respect that they not only deserve—but have earned. Adequate funding is provided for the older Americans' programs including essential nutrition programs, low-income home-energy assistance, and assisted housing. Medicare is preserved.

Unlike the Republicans' budget proposal which forces our elderly to choose between food and heat, under the CBC alternative their quality of life is enhanced.

The CBC substitute is also kind to our Nation's children including those yet to be born. It provides adequate funding for Healthy Start, Child Care, and Head Start. Mr. Chairman, our children are our future. They have placed their future in our hands, we cannot sacrifice that trust.

In addition, the CBC substitute budget strengthens support for higher education, student aid, trio, education for the disadvantaged, school reform, biomedical research, and community infrastructure. The CBC has heard the voice of the American people, and responded with a sound budget that is fair, responsible, and overturns the Republicans' assault on our Nation's most vulnerable citizens—the children, the elderly, the veterans, and hard-working families.

Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus substitute budget stands on its own merits. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this budget which establishes our fiscal policy and priorities in a responsible and compassionate manner.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in 26 years that we are actually taking the first step toward balancing the budget. That means your grandchildren will not be paying $187,000 in interest payments to the national debt during her lifetime, if she is born today, if we start today. This budget is more of the same. More spending, more taxes, more power in Washington.

We need a capital gains tax, not as a tax for the rich but for those who will create jobs and bring revenue to Washington.

We need the tax relief for the young families, both parents working, so that they can spend not someone else's money but their own. That is what a $500 tax credit does for families with children. We have got to stop the growth of power in Washington. We have got to stop the centralization of regulation in Washington. That is what returning power to local governments is all about. That is what the unfunded mandates bill was all about. We have to stop the overtaxation.

In 1960, we only paid about 10 percent of our income to the government. We are now paying 30 percent. Vote no on this relief. Vote ''yes'' on the Republican budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to announce that I oppose the substitute we have before us now and that I will vote in favor of the Kasich budget, even though I have great concern about the transportation parts of that budget.

Most importantly, to announce that the Speaker today has authorized me to announce that he is forming a task force to address the issue of taking the transportation trust funds out of the general fund budget, that the Speaker himself will chair that task force. And as the Speaker says in the letter making this announcement, ''As you know, I have consistently stood with you in support of moving the transportation trust funds off budget.''

So this is not the end but, rather, the beginning. I salute the Speaker for his dedication to our finding a way to remove these transportation trust funds from the general fund budget. It is really an issue of honesty in budgeting. We have 206 cosponsors now, I might say a majority of Republicans in the House cosponsoring the legislation. It is time we get on with doing it. I certainly want to compliment the Speaker for deciding that he will chair the task force to find a way to make this happen.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer, get ready, because after 4 months of blue smoke and mirrors, the Republican budget proposal is getting ready to pick your pockets. It gives a new meaning to the term ''out of luck.''

If your are on Medicaid or Medicare, you are now out of luck. If you receive unemployment benefits, you are out of luck. If you happen to be a college student or the parent of a college student, you, too, are out of luck. If you believe in the importance of the National Endowment for the Humanities or the National Endowment for the Arts or the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, under the Republican budget proposal, you are out of luck. It gives tax breaks to the wealthy and gets away from the whole notion of trying to do anything about corporate welfare. Spends more money on weapons during a time of peace and plays games under the guise of balancing the budget.

We were given the task to balance the budget also and we have one we believe that is more humane, more dedicated to principle, more honest, more equitably distributed and more, quite frankly, American in many respects because it does not do unto people things that we would not have done to us.

And so I would ask Members of this body, as you watch this debate and as you come to the floor to cast this vote, recognize that we are talking about years of fiscal policy and ask yourself, when you juxtapose these two balanced budget amendments, which one comes the closest to where the American people do?

We believe that the proposal offered by the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from New York that has the support of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus, meets that challenge. And we are prepared to debate that issue with anybody from the other side on any day and in this debate at any time.

I urge support of this and rejection of the so-called balanced budget amendment by the Republicans.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI].

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Let me remind our guests in the gallery that they are there as guests of the House. The rules of the House specifically prohibit any expressions of support or opposition to any of the speakers on the floor. The compliance of our guests in the gallery would be appreciated.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I want to join here today in congratulating the Black Caucus for their exercise. They bring not pretty photographs but ideas, ideas that challenge the majority of Members on the Democratic side and, in fact, ideas that challenge the status quo.

We on the Republican side stand here today to challenge the status quo also because the status quo is a killer. It murders any chance that our young people have of grabbing that brass ring, of dreaming of hope and opportunity, and it cheats everyone of their potentials right in the heart.

Take a look at this chart. This is the chart that we have been talking about,

and look at this bottom line. A child born today will pay in taxes on the interest rate close to $200,000 over the course of their lifetime.

The Republicans believe in Robert and Mary and Sally. We believe that, given a fair chance, they can realize their American dream. Congress stands ready to challenge the status quo. Today the Republican Party will do what is right because this chart, this reality is not good enough for any one of your children.

Shame on anyone who fails today to seize this historic moment. Challenge the status quo and balance our budget for all of our children's future.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER].

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I thank my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus for producing this budget. It is a budget for all Americans and we all thank you for it.

This budget puts people first. It has been said that the moral test of a government is what it does for those who are in the dawn of life, that is its children, those in the sunset of life, its elderly, and those who are in the shadows of life, its sick and its disabled. The Republican budget fails this moral test. The Payne-Owens budget passes this test with flying colors.

My colleagues, let us support a budget that does, in fact, put people first. Let us support a budget for the caring majority. Let us vote yes on the Payne-Owens substitute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ].

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Chairman, for reasons that are becoming ever more apparent for the last several months, I find even more than usual about family and about what kind of legacy this Congress is creating for families.

I thought about my parents, about their 75 years of sacrifice for their family, their children and their country. They have worked hard and saved and they have paid their taxes. They have paid their Social Security. They have paid their Medicare. And I wonder what kind of retirement this Congress envisions for our parents and grandparents with a mountain of debt that threatens Social Security and a Medicare system that if we stand back and do nothing goes bankrupt in 7 years.

I have thought about my child and all of our children, and I wonder what kind of future this Congress wants to leave these children. How will they educate their children and pave their roads and feed their needy and clean their water when they have to pay off the debt we ran up for programs and services we use now but we do not pay for?

Today we have the chance to protect families, to do what we have to do to protect Social Security, to improve and preserve Medicare so our parents and grandparents are secure and safe. We have the chance to ensure our children's future, to end decades of piling debt on our children's head.

My baby and every baby born this year will pay $187,000 in their lifetime for interest on the debt alone. Is that not enough?

It is time to balance this budget for our parents. It is time to balance this budget for our children.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members of this House join me in voting for the Kasich budget for our families.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus adds some truth in packaging for each of you. Each of you has been here all week talking about balancing the budget, but you have not thought about balancing the budget with compassion and with truth to the people of this country. You have not told, as the Congressional Black Caucus has done in their budget, to the senior citizens of this country that they are going to have to pay more than you are telling them.

You have not told them the truth. You have not shown them truth in packaging. The Black Caucus has. It did not cut the Medicaid and the Medicare funds. It did not cut the student loan funds. It did not cut all of these things you cut that you did not have to cut to give tax cuts to the rich.

What they did, they faced reality and showed that this budget could be balanced with compassion, and many of you have said forget about compassion. The CBC did what it should have done. It is highlighting education as its top priority, when we have people in this country who cannot read and write and who are poor because we have kept them there.

Face your conscience. The Black Caucus, I congratulate you.

□ 1430

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODLATTE].

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this substitute, and urge every Member of this House to vote for this historic opportunity to vote for a real balanced budget, and that is the Kasich balanced budget amendment. That is what is going to solve the problems of this country. It is going to return more money to the hard-working taxpayers of this country. That is what is going to be fair to all people all across this country. It does so in such a way that it does not create the kind of division that the Democrats on the other side would like to create in this debate.

Mr. Chairman, this is not about class warfare, this is about protecting the future of our children, our grandchildren, and about what is happening right now in this Congress, and what is happening right now in this country.

The fact of the matter is that with interest rates rising, the fact that the Federal Government borrows $200 million a year means that interest rates continue to rise, and we can save a substantial amount of money if we can balance the budget and go about the business of this country.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], the distinguished deputy whip.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the pending substitute and in strong support of the Kasich budget.

I have the greatest respect for the Members who bring this alternative to the House, and I appreciate the work they have done to make this substitute in order under the rule.

It is not easy to balance the budget.

If it were, the Congress would have done it years ago.

This budget alternative underscores the differences between Republicans and the more liberal members of the Democrat caucus.

The Payne substitute raises taxes by $700 billion, while cutting defense by $108 billion.

Clearly, this is not the path Republicans or most Americans are willing to take to a balanced budget.

My constituents believe they are taxed too much, and they also understand the necessary role the Government plays in promoting national security.

The Kasich budget provides tax relief, not tax increases.

I am especially pleased about its tax relief to senior citizens, who are now taxed at rates that discourage their active participation in job markets.

The Kasich budget also guards our national defense by keeping our defense spending at levels necessary to keep our people safe.

Mr. Chairman, cutting defense and raising taxes is not the best way to a balanced budget.

The Kasich budget is not painless. It is not perfect. But it is the best way to reach a balanced budget while maintaining a strong defense and providing tax relief to middle-class families.

I urge all Members to vote for the Kasich budget and vote against the Payne substitute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2-½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kasich budget.

Mr. Chairman, we hear over and over again that the Republican Kasich budget cuts spending to pay for tax cuts for the rich and the privileged, even though the other side of the aisle knows that we are increasing spending by $1.2 trillion under our budget, and

even though they know that we are increasing spending on both Medicare and education.

Mr. Chairman, this class warfare argument pits Americans against Americans. In 1993, even though the President campaigned on a middle-class tax cut, he gave us the largest tax increase in history, $240 billion. All we are trying to do in our Kasich budget is give Americans back some of the hard-earned dollars that the Clinton tax increase took away 2 years ago.

Let us look at the facts. In our Contract With America, we provide much needed tax relief to 42 million middle class Americans. Mr. Chairman, 75 percent of tax cuts go to families. Seventy-four percent of these families eligible for the $500 per child tax credit earn less than $75,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, the second biggest falsehood levied by the other side is that the wealthy do not pay enough in taxes. Make no mistake, the better off in this country do carry a heavy share of the tax burden. I ask Members to judge for themselves.

According to the latest data available, the top 1 percent of income earners paid 27.4 percent of all Federal individual income taxes. The top 10 percent of wage earners paid 57.5 percent of total taxes, and the top 50 percent paid almost 95 percent, the top 50 percent paid almost 95 percent of total income tax.

Mr. Chairman, the question can be asked ''Whose money is this? Are these Washington dollars?'' No, this money belongs to the American families, the small business owners, and the family farmers that make up this great Nation of ours.

All we are trying to do in the Republican Kasich budget is give back to the American people a portion of what the Clinton tax increase took away 2 years ago. Vote ''yes'' on the Kasich budget.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, do I understand correctly that this side has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. No. The Committee has the right to close.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise in strong support of a truly alternative budget. This proposal offered by the CBC balances the budget by making those responsible for the deficit pay for a change.

Working families have been paying more than their fair share of taxes all along. While the Republicans scapegoat Medicare and student loans as the culprit, the fact of the matter is that corporate welfare stars have been sponging off the American taxpayer family for decades.

The CBC budget closes the tax loopholes and giveaways, from which the Rupert Murdoch's of this country have benefited since the trickle-down years of the 1980's. Moreover, the CBC budget strengthens the programs which educate our children and heal our elderly.

Mr. Chairman, the CBC alternative budget does not cut Medicare to give the biggest tax grab in history to the privileged few. It is time to go after corporate welfare, not Medicare. Vote for the CBC budget alternative.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I rise in opposition to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, on what I consider to be the most important vote of my entire political career, I rise in the strongest possible support of this budget resolution. I have waited for the day when Congress would pass a truly balanced Federal budget through 40 years of public service at the State and Federal level, including leadership roles in both the Democratic and now Republican parties. The rising national debt and interest on that debt have created a crisis which Congress must face now. It is truly a matter of saving our country from financial ruin. Our children and grandchildren will either inherit a declining standard of living or gain freedom from the financial excesses of our generation.

Everyone in America will benefit from the long-term effects of balancing the Federal budget. Many Members have already highlighted much of the rationale for supporting this resolution so I will not repeat those arguments. As chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, however, I do want to address the concerns of Members worried about potential impacts on veterans and the VA. Dire predictions of numerous hospital closings and other consequences have been circulated in an effort to generate opposition to this resolution. Let there be no doubt, balancing the budget will be extremely difficult and the VA will share in those difficulties. But this is the beginning of the budget and spending process, not the end. I can assure all Members that the Veterans' Affairs Committee will remain committed to achieving adequate funding for the VA health care system. I am proud of my record of support for veterans during the time I have been privileged to serve in the House of Representatives. I thoroughly intend to continue that record of support for those who have worn our Nations uniform. When I leave political life and retire from public service, I believe I will be able to look veterans straight in the eye and honestly say I fulfilled my responsibilities to them. Every election campaign, I have promised veterans in my district that I was on their side, and in my heart I know I have been true to that promise. Voting for this resolution will not break that promise.

But, every election campaign I also promise that I am absolutely committed to balancing the federal budget and reducing the national debt. Yes, veterans are important to me. But in the context of this balanced budget debate, I must honestly say there are people more important to me than veterans. When I consider all the ramifications of whether we balance the budget by the year 2002, the most important people that come to mind are my own grandchildren and all the children of America.

For years, I have been very apprehensive about the legacy my tenure in Congress would leave to the children growing up in America today. The runaway national debt and the mounting interest payments needed to service that debt are stealing their future economic opportunity and prospects for a better standard of living than we are enjoying.

If I vote against this resolution, for any one parochial or political reason, how can I ever look my own grandchildren in the eye and honestly say I fulfilled my responsibilities to them?

The votes we cast today begin the budget process not end it. The House will work all summer on authorizations, appropriations, and reconciliation. I would say to all Members that I will work with them to identify the best possible way to help the VA health care system continue providing access to quality health care for eligible veterans over the next 7 years and beyond. I believe the dire predictions we are hearing about VA health care are premature. Administration officials know this is only the beginning of the budget process. As a matter of fact the Presidents' budget proposal projected about the same spending level for VA health care over the next 5 years as is proposed in the House budget recommendations. It is totally inconsistent for the administration to argue that the House budget forces hospital closures and theirs does not.

Mr. Chairman, I would conclude by saying to my colleagues, we can either pass a balanced budget and work to protect high priority veterans' programs. Or we can continue business as usual, ignore our national financial crisis, and add to the debt our children will have to repay. Vote for a balanced budget and leave a legacy to America's children that we can all be proud of.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], the chairman of the Republican Conference.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, today is the proudest day of my career here in Congress. When I came here 4½ years ago, I came here to try to change the direction of this Government to ensure that my children and the Members' children have a better opportunity in the future than what we have today. Fourteen years ago when I first got myself involved in Government service, it was not for me that I got involved. It was because a Government that was out of control and out of touch with the American people needed to be reined in.

Today truly is a historic day in not only my career, but the career of every Member that is here, and a historic day for the American people, because today we are taking the first step in our effort to balance the budget and to restore the American dream for my children and every child in America.

I am also very proud of my colleagues, who today will cast their vote in favor of going down this path to not just balance the budget, but to renew the American dream; that the actions that we take today will decide the future for our children and theirs.

The question today that we have to ask ourselves is do we have the courage to change; do we have the courage to do the right thing for our children and yours; or are we going to shrink from the battle, shrink from the pressures of today, and sell our children and yours down the road as we have done for the last 25 years?

Mr. Chairman, I know that I am proud of my colleagues who today will cast their vote to do the right thing for their children, the right thing for their grandchildren, the right thing for senior citizens in this country who are threatened from a Government that is near fiscal bankruptcy and a country that is near moral bankruptcy. Therefore, the votes we cast today are important. Again, they are not about us, they are about our children and yours.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Owens-Payne substitute.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, 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. Mr. Chairman, the Black Caucus budget has been an indispensable part of this process, because it demonstrates that we can balance the budget without robbing grandmothers and parents and kids and the pensions of Federal employees.

However, I want to challenge the assumption of this entire 2-day debate. Mr. Chairman, I balance my budget, but that is because I did not pay cash up front for my house. I balance, as businesses do their budgets, because they do not pay up front for equipment the way we pay up front for bombers and submarines.

We have been on an insane path to balance the budget with cash money, in a way that must make States and localities and businesses laugh at the top of their voices, because they do not have a unified budget the way we do; they have a capital budget, and an operating budget. We can never balance the budget fairly this way.

We are trying to balance the budget in a radically destructive, uniquely damaging way. The people who sent us here did not expect us to go stupid on them.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM].

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Owens budget, and in support of the Budget Committee's budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the budget alternative offered by Mr. OWENS and in support of the Budget Committee's balanced budget resolution.

While I disagree with almost all of the specifics of this budget, I commend the author for having the courage to put on paper what the President and leadership on the other side of the aisle only dream about.

Massive tax increases, massive spending increases on virtually every part of the Federal budget, dismantling cuts in national security.

However, at least you have had the courage to participate in the debate. It is a sad commentary that the leadership of your party has chosen to stand on the sidelines.

I would like to say a few words to my colleagues who have produced this budget and the earlier coalition budget as you consider whether to support final passage of a balanced budget.

After 25 years the time has come to stop pouring ever-increasing debt obligations on our children and grandchildren.

During the recent district work period, at every one of my 16 town meetings, the voice of the people of Iowa's fifth district was clear—the time has come for us all to stop worrying about our parochial interests and put this country's future first.

Why should we work to balance the budget?

A recent article in Time Magazine noted these likely benefits from balancing the budget.

Through lower interest rates, more than $28,000 saved on the purchase of the average home.

Boosts the average family's take-home income by $1,000 per year.

Creates 2.4 million additional jobs by 2005.

Reduces our projected national debt by more than half a trillion dollars.

Brings our national savings rate in line with economic competitors, and

Provides a $500 per child tax credit for virtually every American family and tax relief for older Americans.

What do the opponents of the balanced budget offer?

We have yet to see a balanced budget proposed by the White House or the leadership other party.

Some are even now saying we should never balance the budget—that our children's future is less important than preserving the status quo.

They have offered only fear, class warfare, empty slogans, and criticisms that ring hollow in view of their failure to offer an alternative.

There is no easy way to balance the budget, and not one Member of this House supports every single item in this bill.

But, for 25 years, Congress has failed to own up to its obligation to be fiscally responsible. Today, we can make history and restore to this institution.

Vote ''yes'' on final passage of the Republican balanced budget. Vote ''yes'' to control spending, cut taxes and, once and for all, end deficit spending.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

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

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Payne-Owens amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 67 and in support of the Payne-Owens substitute, offered on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus. The CBC alternative stands in stark contrast to the proposal presented by the Republican majority.

The Republicans offer tax breaks to higher income Americans in exchange for reductions in medical care to older Americans; dramatically cut Federal spending under the guise of saving the next generation, while reducing education programs critical for the success of millions of that generation; and assume block granting and funding reductions in safety net programs, while reducing opportunities for training and self-sufficiency. In contrast, the Payne-Owens substitute recognizes the need to protect America's most vulnerable and invest in its people.

While I have reservations about aspects of the Payne-Owens substitute, the CBC has been forced to draft its budget under the Republican-imposed constraint of balancing the budget by the year 2002. I understand the virtue of a specific timetable to accomplish a goal. However, when faced with the magnitude of cuts necessary to achieve that goal, it is unconscionable that the majority will neither consider compromising on that time table nor scaling back on their fiscally irresponsible and unfair tax cut proposal.

The crisis facing this Nation is not the one envisioned by the Republicans if we fail to agree to the arbitrary goal of balancing the budget by 2002. The true crisis resides in our educational system; in our inability to train Americans and move them off welfare; in our decaying urban centers; and in our inability to ensure affordable health care to all Americans. The Republican budget exacerbates these crises by assuming drastic reductions in programs which seek to address them.

Republicans insist they are not cutting Medicare to finance their tax cut proposal. Yet the Congressional Budget Office projects that the level of Medicare spending allowable under the GOP budget is significantly less than the amount necessary to maintain benefits under current law.

Rather than address Medicare and Medicaid in the context of comprehensive health care reform, the GOP budget reduces Medicare spending by $288 billion over the 7 years between 1996 and 2002. It is estimated that this cut will produce an increase in out-of-pocket expenses for recipients of $3,500 over the next 7 years.

Funding for Medicaid is reduced by $187 billion over 7 years—a cut of about one-third. Medicaid serves a diverse population of about 33 million people—60 percent are children, four million are elderly. Nearly 60 percent of health costs for the 2.9 million long-term care patients in America are paid for by Medicaid. Under Republican budget plans, nearly seven million children and one million elderly and disabled persons could lose coverage.

The Republican budget assumes reductions in welfare spending, while cutting job training funds by $1.4 billion between 1996 and 2002—undermining their rhetoric about the need to transform welfare recipients into productive citizens.

Reductions in Federal education programs include some of the most short-sighted provisions in the Republican budget resolution. The cycle of dependence decried by the majority must first be addressed in our schools. Yet the Republican proposal reduces Head Start by $209 million. The budget assumes elimination

of title 1 concentration grants—providing supplemental funding to assist low-achieving students, drug abuse and violence prevention programs, and the five TRIO programs. The latter programs have successfully encouraged young people from disadvantaged backgrounds to enter and complete college.

For the average college student receiving loans, the elimination of the in-school interest exemption will add over $3,000 to the cost of a college education. These middle- and lower-income students and their families already face a rising financial burden in the quest for higher education. The budget cuts funding for libraries and numerous higher education grants, fellowships, and scholarships.

While the Republican budget reduces funding for education and training programs, the Congressional Black Caucus substitute calls for a 25-percent increase in education and training over the current funding level. This is an investment of $154 billion more than the GOP budget over 7 years. The substitute provides full funding for the Head Start program by fiscal year 2002, increased funding for the Summer Youth Employment program, and more funds for Job Training Partnership Act programs.

If these programs need reform, then let's reform them. Elimination of these investments is a poor and cynical alternative to reform.

I have strong reservations about specific proposals included in the CBC alternative. While defense spending must continue to be scrutinized in the post-cold-war era, we must also take care to ensure our military readiness in the face of continued uncertainty around the world. I am also concerned that revenue proposals included in the alternative may be too harsh in their treatment of the business sector. Notwithstanding these reservations, I support the CBC budget as a symbol of the Caucus' continued commitment to inject into budget debates the importance of investing in the human capital of this Nation.

Republicans contend that unless we balance the Federal budget by 2002, we risk the well-being of the next generation of Americans. I do not dispute the need for fiscal responsibility. But I do strongly dispute the notion that an expanding American economy will benefit millions in that next generation if they are denied the tools to share in prosperity. It has not happened in the past, and it will not happen in the future. Overcoming poverty, dependency, and illiteracy requires compassion, investment, and creativity. The majority's budget is absent these ingredients.

I urge my colleagues to support the Payne-Owens substitute, and oppose House Congressional Resolution 67.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, 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. Chairman, I rise to support the Congressional Black Caucus and the Owens and Payne amendment budget resolution.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to once again support the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget, along with the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus budget and to urge my colleagues to vote in support of this balanced, caring approach to Federal spending.

Unlike the Republican budget, which fufills their ''Contract with Corporate America'', this budget fufills our contract with the American people. This budget is a caring budget that does not unfairly balance the budget on the backs of our Nation's children, elderly, poor, or working class. Our budget is evenhanded, it meets the economic and social needs of everyday Americans, and it promotes fiscal responsibility by balancing the budget by 2002.

The most important distinction between our budget and the majority's budget is our investment in our future. The majority wishes to balance the budget by 2002 so that our children will not have to pay for our excesses—but then the GOP goes on to deny children the very thing that will allow them to be competitive in the global market: A complete education.

We completely reject the notion that eliminating the Department of Education and reducing funds for libraries, Head Start, and the TRIO Program for first-generation college students will improve America—and the American public is on our side.

In addition, unlike the GOP budget, our budget does not give tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans. In fact, our budget cuts taxes for working people and closes corporate tax loopholes. Now is the time to end corporate welfare, and our budget does this.

We have also protected important job training and job creation programs, and have proposed targeted increases. It is foolhardy to believe that eliminating job training and creation programs will make our economy stronger. We must continue to dedicate resources toward expanding our economic foundation.

Finally, the CBC budget continues the tradition of advocating a saner defense budget. It is immoral to propose cutting education, workers' assistance, and other social programs without making substantive cuts in military spending.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD].

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Payne-Owens Congressional Black Caucus substitute, for their leadership and courage to say that the Members of this House ought to look at corporate welfare and how we ought to balance this budget, and not on the backs of everyday people in America, and let us get on about the business.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON].

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], if he would have any time he could yield to this side of the aisle.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, we are not quite sure. If the gentleman wants to come over here, I am happy to talk to him.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I hope Members can see this picture. This is a picture of Claude Pepper from Florida, a true champion of the elderly. He would be outraged over the attempt to reduce Medicare and Medicaid to a second-rate health care system so Republicans can pay for a $355 billion tax cut for the wealthy. Veterans fare no better in this cruel Republican budget, which destroys the heart of the VA program, especially in Florida, where almost 100 new veterans arrive daily.

□ 1445

The Congressional Black Caucus budget is good for America's majority, for the elderly and veterans. It includes increases for Medicare and homeless programs. This caring majority budget remembers veterans and not just on Memorial Day. It also remembers the elderly and would be a tribute to Claude Pepper.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate Members on the other side for taking the time and being dedicated enough in our single objective of moving to a new America, and drawing up this budget and offering it on the floor.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of budget we are trying to move away from. We are moving away from the concept of increased taxes, of job-destroying taxes. We are moving toward a world in which there is job growth and opportunity.

Our budget, the Republican budget, seeks to cut spending. It seeks to do that by restraining the growth of spending. In doing that, we are trying to provide opportunity for the next generation.

The answer to this is not to defend the status quo. The people of American are ready for the tough choices. The Republican budget in fact does not punt when it is asked to deal with the tough choices. It takes them head-on.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget is projected to cost about $12.75 trillion over 7 years. That is almost $850 billion above the House Budget

Committee proposed level. It is spending that will be a sure recipe for disaster.

I congratulate my friends on the other side of the aisle, but I tell you that our children cannot afford this budget. It is a recipe to diminish hope and opportunity. It is not a budget that will restore growth. It will not put us on a path toward growth.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this CBC budget alternatives. This budget is about jobs. It is about job training, job security, and job creation.

There is a lot of discussion about homelessness. If you want to get the homeless off the street and the dole, we need to provide them with jobs and job training. This budget funds job training for the homeless.

We can get rid of crime and youth violence with jobs and job training. This budget funds a variety of programs to train young people. The young people of this Nation truly need these jobs this summer. We fund the Youth Fair Chance Program, a program that will get troubled young people back into the mainstream with education and jobs.

We have the best welfare reform in this budget for welfare recipients. Welfare recipients need jobs and job training. This budget does that. It also funds rent reform so that public housing recipients can go to work and get off welfare.

Many formerly middle-class workers now work in entry-level jobs because they have not learned new skills. This budget would invest in retraining and economic conversion so laid-off workers can learn a skill and return to jobs which provide a decent standard of living.

If you believe the private sector must lead the way in economic development, this budget would restore and expand funds for community development banks. Community development banks create small businesses. Small businesses create jobs. The best social program in the world is a job.

Finally, the Republican budget is the budget that protects the big corporate welfare interests, the Wall Street robber barons and the big corporate tax manipulators. The CBC budget is a budget of working people, the middle class, of children and the poor. Let's bring hope, not despair, to America. Support the CBC budget.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, we are down to two plans for balancing the budget, and one fundamental choice—Medicare, or CorporateCare. Do we fund tax breaks for the corporate America and the wealthy, or preserve health benefits for the elderly? The Kasich budget chooses the wealthy; the caring majority budget chooses the seniors and working families.

The Republican budget rolls back Medicare benefits, ends college aid programs, and slashes spending for child nutrition.

Who gains—the rich. They get almost $300 billion in tax breaks.

The caring majority budget stands on the side of the American people. It fully funds Medicare and Medicaid, stops backdoor attempts to cut Social Security, and invests billions more in education, job training, and job creation.

How do we do this—by closing tax loopholes for the rich, ending corporate welfare programs, and drafting the first sane, post-cold-war defense budget.

Republicans and Democrats both have plans for balancing the budget. The only difference is who benefits—the wealthy, or the working people of this country.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the budget proposal of the Congressional Black Caucus.

I am voting for this budget, not because I favor every detail, in fact there are choices that the authors of this budget have made to which I strongly object. However, the general trust of this budget is on target.

This is a balanced budget. It gets to balance through reasonable cuts in corporate welfare and reductions in waste at the Pentagon.

This budget protects Social Security and Medicare. And it provides for an increase in the most important investment we as a nation can make—education.

The Republican budget, on the other hand, gives a huge tax cut for profitable corporations an the wealthy. It actually increases military spending, while making deep cuts in Medicare. What's worse, it cuts Social Security cost of living adjustments, violating the promise made by Republican leaders.

The Republican budget is a prescription for the continued decline in living standards for working American families.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH].

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the CBC alternative budget.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, to close debate, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is yielded 4 minutes by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for their generosity on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, we come to the closing moments of this debate. Let me say, as I have said on more than one occasion, that today we engage in perhaps the most important function that a public servant can engage in, and, that is, the adoption of our national budget. Because I believe that our national budget is the best reflection of our national values. For one can determine the nature of our commitment to our future, to our populace, to our children, to our unfortunate, to our disadvantaged, to the less fortunate people in our society by a simple examination of our budgetary priorities.

The second point I would make, Mr. Chairman, is this: Every single budget that has come to the floor today, including the one before us now, balances the budget by the year 2002 that was the prerequisite that allowed any budget alternative to come to the floor.

Thus the debate, Mr. Chairman, is not whether one budget or the other balances but what road, what route, which direction, what values, what priorities are embraced by that national budget.

I am pleased to rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus budget because it is the only budget before this body that simultaneously does three things:

First, it provides for a comprehensive approach for the effective maintenance of our national security. Second, it provides for a civil investment program that allows all of us here to carry out our significant and important constitutional responsibilities to provide for the common good and to promote domestic tranquility. Third, it places us on the path of tax equity and tax fairness for all of our people.

In the moments I have remaining, let me focus on the issue of an effective national security strategy.

Mr. Chairman, it goes beyond simply placing billions of dollars in a huge military budget. I would submit that there are three elements of an effective national security strategy:

First, a healthy vibrant and vital economy and an able citizenry that is well-educated, well-trained and highly motivated to participate in the political process, allowing us to continue to struggle over the health of our economy, the quality of our lives and the vibrance of our institutions.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to how we address that, we must then fund, more than adequately, education, health, and job training. There must be a commitment to technological and infrastructure development. We must continue to remind ourselves of the significant contribution that comes to us by virtue of our investment in physical and social research, just to name a few.

The second element of an important national security strategy is a comprehensive, thoughtful, well-thought-out, well-funded foreign policy that does several things: promotes regional and international stability by working with our allies and other nations in the world. Second, to promote democracy and human rights, precluding internal conflicts that danger and threaten the security; and, third, to deter war, not by violence and militarism but by the use of diplomacy and other significant nonviolent tools that are at our disposal in the international arena as we carry out our international discourse.

Mr. Chairman, the third element is a sufficient military force to carry out our responsibilities in a rapidly changing world, to address the threats and the challenges that are out there.

I believe that the Congressional Black Caucus budget has done all of that.

Let me place this latter point in proper perspective: We are now, Mr. Chairman, in this country spending as much on our military budget, almost as much as every other Nation in the world combined spends on its national military budgets.

If you add our European allies and our Asian allies into that equation, our friends and the United States spend in excess of 80 percent of the world's military budget. Thus less than 20 percent can be designed to finance any of our potential adversaries.

Question: Why do we need so much money when the cold war is over?

To conclude quickly, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Congressional Black Caucus effort. It is magnificent as we move to enhance the quality of life for our children and our children's children.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, it is my distinct honor to yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], our majority leader.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is recognized for 6½ minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by paying my respects to my friends in the Congressional Black Caucus. Once again as they do every year, they have brought together a budget; they have risen to the occasion and they have put good work into their effort.

Let me assure my friends, it is with a certain amount of regret that I must encourage Members not to vote for your budget, but my statements are made nevertheless in total respect for your good effort.

Mr. Chairman, this debate, this great debate over how and whether we balance the budget, should conclusively prove to America that real and fundamental change has come to the people's House.

For the first time in more than a quarter century, we are actually going to balance the budget of the United States.

Some here today have suggested that we should not; others have argued that we cannot, that the task is too difficult, the choices too tough.

I say to my colleagues, now is the time to stop robbing our children and grandchildren; now is the time, at last, for us to give up the false promise of big Government and deficit spending.

Now is the time to do what is right, to restore the American Dream.

This Republican Congress will neither gamble with the future of our children, nor break our bond with our seniors.

Today is an historic day, but we must keep it in historical perspective.

We just finished celebrating the 50th Anniversary of V–E Day. We honored the courage, the heroism, and the sacrifice of a generation that guaranteed our freedom, and restored liberty to Europe.

They faced far, far tougher foes than simple red ink.

Compared to their sacrifices on the beaches of Sicily, the cliffs of Normandy, and in the forests of the Bulge, our task pales by comparison.

Those brave Americans risked life and limb so that their children would live free. Today, that freedom is at risk again—not because of the military muscle of a foreign power, but because politicians didn't have the courage to do what we will do today.

This debate is about much more than dollars and cents or dueling charts and graphs.

It is about morality; about whether or not one generation will continue cheating the next.

If our children are to live as freely, as proudly, and as happily as we live, then it is time to quit the political posturing and balance the budget.

Will our task be difficult? Things worth doing usually are.

Will it cause discomfort? Freedom sometimes does.

Will it require courage? That is what being American is all about.

Let us suffer no illusions. Those who fear change, those who profit from the status quo, those who have ruled Washington for decades, will fight us at every turn.

Today, the party that once rallied the Nation with ''we have nothing to fear but fear itself,'' has nothing to offer but fear itself.

But the politics of fear never works in America, because America is a Nation of optimists.

Americans want a smaller Government. They demand tax relief. And they reject business as usual.

Now it is up to us. For, today we must decide what kind of a Nation we will be.

We can, as some in this body and in the White House have suggested, do nothing. We can keep on spending, and spending, and spending, giving no thought to what it will do to our future, our families, and our Nation.

Or we can pass the Kasich budget, restore the American Dream, and head into the 21st century with our heads high, our fiscal house in order optimistic, and full of hope.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to vote for freedom, hope, and vote for responsibility. Vote for the Kasich budget.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget. This budget demonstrates a commitment to the American people. We will not sit idly by and merely cringe at the possibility that money will be taken out of the homes, and food off the tables, of millions of Americans.

The CBC budget calls for spending much less on defense than the Republican proposal. The disproportionate ratio of defense spending to domestic investment is outdated. Believe it or not, we are at peace. We must have the courage to go further in investing in our human capital.

Those who can least afford cuts—the poor, American children, and the elderly—should not be required to bear the brunt of the Republican agenda. I ask Mr. Chairman, is human life not more important than big business? The CBC alternative budget calls on corporations to bear their fair share of the burden.

The CBC alternative budget will invest in the programs people really need. Funding for Medicare and Medicaid will be maintained. In addition, education and job training will take high priority.

We must again invest in our people and their institutions. This investment will stimulate economic growth and promote the democratic ideal of human dignity. Our conscience mandates that we do no less.

I stand before you today on behalf of the tens of millions of Americans who cannot stand for themselves. For them, I ask my colleagues to balance this country's need for fiscal responsibility with compassion for those Americans who work hard every day but who are still unable to provide for their families; elderly Americans who have worked hard their entire lives only to be told by members of the majority party that Medicare is being abolished to provide tax breaks for the wealthy; and the millions of American youth who rely on summer jobs to help care for their families and keep them off the streets.

I stand today to plead with my colleagues to consider the severe consequences of failing to provide for important programs like Headstart and Summer Youth Employment. Headstart helps ensure that million of poor children in this country will receive the opportunity for a basic education. And Mr. Chairman, I don't have to remind this body of the critical state of education in America. Headstart is the best start we can give to our youth, who alone will determine the future course of this great Nation. By providing our youth with summer jobs, we provide them with an alternative to the tragic influences of crime that so terribly plagues our Nation's cities. I would remind my colleagues that it costs million less to offer summer jobs than to build and maintain prisons. This is a program that just plain makes sense.

I further plead with my colleagues to remember that this Nation's greatest asset is compassion. As we vote on the most important piece of legislation in this Congress, I ask my colleagues to not only show compassion but vision, for without this vision, Mr. Chairman, our Nation shall surely perish.

I urge my colleagues to support the Payne-Owens/Black Caucus substitute.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget for the caring majority offered by Mr. PAYNE and Mr. OWENS.

As I mentioned yesterday, this entire process is flawed because every alternative presented to the House must balance the budget by fiscal year 2002, which some economists fear would pull resources out of the economy too abruptly. The Payne-Owens substitute was developed within this artificial restraint.

But the Payne-Owens substitute is by far the best of the proposals before us today. Its assumptions are far fairer than those behind the other proposals, increasing revenues as well as cutting spending and putting defense on the table along with domestic programs. It protects essential Federal functions from the budget axe and makes needed investments in our Nation's future.

On the revenue side, the substitute would give individuals an income tax credit to offset 20 percent of Social Security payroll taxes—a major, if necessary, burden on working families.

Revenues would come from increasing certain corporate and business taxes, eliminating certain tax subsidies for businesses, and raising the tax rate on capital gains.

On the spending side, the Payne-Owens substitute would cut defense spending to a level more in line with the world we're living in today, while providing the resources to continue our role in international affairs.

It would protect Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid and increase our investments in education and training programs.

It would continue the crucial Federal role in public health and biomedical research and further our commitment to a cleaner environment and to biological diversity.

It would address the failings of our welfare system by maintaining Medicaid, AFDC, and school lunch as entitlements, creating jobs, and increasing support for child care.

It would balance violent crime enforcement programs by strengthening prevention and increase funding for juvenile justice, weed and seed, drug courts, and ounce of prevention.

Mr. Chairman, this is the best alternative before the House today. It would bring our Federal budget into balance in fiscal year 2002 without making the Federal Government unable to protect the Nation's health, safety, and environment, or provide a safety net for the most vulnerable of our people.

I urge my colleagues to support the Payne-Owens substitute and, if it does not pass, to oppose the Republican budget.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of veterans and the elderly and in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

Our seniors who rely so heavily on Medicare and Medicaid will be especially hard hit by Republican budgets. Hurting seniors and destroying veterans health care is the Republican plan for America. Claude Pepper, a true champion of the elderly, would be outraged with the attempt to reduce Medicare and Medicaid to second-rate health care systems so Republicans can pay for a $355 billion tax cut for the wealthy.

Veterans fair no better than seniors in the cruel Republican budget. Republican budget cuts destroy the heart of VA programs. VA's health care system suffers from years of underfunding; many of its facilities are old and in need of repair. Gutting construction funds to update VA's infrastructure will destroy veterans's health care—especially in Florida where almost 100 new veterans arrive daily.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget is good for America's majority, for the elderly, and veterans. It increases the President's fiscal year 1996 budget for veterans by $175.3 million. It includes increases for medical care and homeless programs, and recommends new construction funding for VA medical centers to meet increasing needs. This caring majority budget remembers veterans—and not just on Memorial Day. It also remembers the elderly.

☐ 1500

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 56, noes 367, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—56

Becerra
Bonior
Brown (FL)
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
DeFazio
Dellums
Dixon
Engel
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Green
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Jackson-Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (GA)
Martinez
McDermott
McKinney
Meek
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mink
Nadler
Oberstar
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Rangel
Reynolds
Sabo
Sanders
Scott
Serrano
Stark
Stokes
Thompson
Torres
Tucker
Velazquez
Waters
Watt (NC)
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—367

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wyden
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Bishop

NOT VOTING—10

Archer	Livingston	Towns
Berman	McNulty	Waxman
Flake	Mollohan	
Kleczka	Rush	

□ 1522

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Rush for, with Mr. McNulty against.

Ms. PELOSI changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BONO. Mr. Chairman, on today I missed the following votes: On rollcall No. 342, Gephardt, substitute, I would have voted ''no,'' on rollcall No. 343, Neumann substitute, I would have voted ''no,'' and on rollcall No. 344, Payne substitute, I would have voted ''no.''

The CHAIRMAN. The only further amendment in order under House Resolution 149 is an amendment in the nature of a substitute by the minority leader or his designee, based upon a revised budget submission by the President, if printed in the RECORD by the minority leader not later than May 17, 1995. Such an amendment was not so printed. Consequently, no further amendment is in order.

Pursuant to the rule, a final period of general debate is now in order.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the measure.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and in opposition to the alternative budget resolutions to be offered on the floor today.

I congratulate the chairman of the Budget Committee for his outstanding, groundbreaking leadership in putting together this budget resolution, helping all of us carry out our promises to bring our budget into balance. None of us want to leave our children and grandchildren an inheritance of debt; we want to leave them a better way of life and we will.

As Chairman KASICH knows better than any of us, this is not easy work and in many ways it is painful. Despite my support for the international affairs function programs, I also support this resolution, even though international affairs spending will go down, sharply, over the next few years.

The leadership has come together in this agreement resolution to support the same funding levels for international affairs.

Those levels are realistic: we are supporting programs that are necessary to the national security and the overall national interest of the United States. We will all stand together against further cuts in spending on those programs in the course of voting on this resolution. We've been facing these same issues in our Committee on International Relations, where appropriations for most of these programs are authorized.

Last Monday night, our committee ordered reported legislation that reduces—I repeat reduces—fiscal year 1996 spending on programs within our jurisdiction by $1 billion compared to fiscal year 1995 appropriations, that is, from $18.4 billion to $17.4 billion.

In 1997, it authorizes spending of $15.2 billion, for a cut of $1.6 billion compared to 1995. And it does even more—it steps off the process of cutting back on Government agencies by ending the independent existence of the Agency for International Development, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. When this resolution is adopted, and our American Overseas Interests Act comes to the floor next week, it will be brought into full conformity with the discretionary budget authority targets applicable to our committee.

At that time, we will again stand together with our leadership in support of sharply reduced, prudent, but necessary funding that supports our national interests.

To elaborate further with regard to my reasons for supporting this resolution, it should be underscored that it will provide for a balanced Federal budget within 7 years—by fiscal year 2002—by cutting the deficit by a total of $1.1 trillion. This will be achieved through cuts in both discretionary and mandatory spending programs.

Additionally, H. Con. Res. 67 would allow for an increase in funding to strengthen important defense programs. The cold war may be over, but the world is still a dangerous place.

Although I am voting in favor of the budget resolution, I am concerned about its impact on our Nation's seniors. Though it is important that the Medicare system be reformed due to its impending bankruptcy in the year 2002, the Budget Committee's proposal will cut an estimated $22.5 billion from Medicare in New York State. Accordingly, we must make certain that those reforms do not place undue hardships on our Nation's senior citizens. Therefore, I believe that cuts in the program should not affect current recipients of Medicare. Instead, the changes should be in place for future recipients.

Additionally, I recommend means testing the Medicare Program. Those seniors who can afford to pay more for their health care should do so.

I am hopeful that we can work out a Medicare reform proposal throughout this budget process which can accomplish both saving Medicare from bankruptcy while at the same time protecting our Nation's seniors. I look forward to working with my colleagues in that regard.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of a budget resolution which will provide for a balanced budget for the first time since 1969.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of the Kasich amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on the issue of Medicare and Medicaid, which my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim we are going to cut, I want to read a quote:

> Today, Medicaid and Medicare are going up at three times the rate of inflation. We propose to let it go up at two times the rate of inflation. That is not a Medicare or Medicaid cut. We are going to have increases in Medicare and Medicaid, but a reduction in the rate of growth.

I venture to say you might be surprised to learn that these words were spoken not by Republicans, but by the President last year when he was trying to sell his health care package to the American people.

Thus far the debate on making changes to insure the solvency of Medicare has been less than statesmanlike. In fact, at times it has been just plain nasty and mean-spirited. We live in a high-technology country where words spoken by a major political figure can reach a wide audience. I think we should all pause and think before we make statements that are simply untrue and at times even outrageous.

Those who are quick to criticize and condemn what we are trying to do to save Medicare and Medicaid should exercise a little caution. These is no need to let loose with inflammatory statements that could alarm the most vulnerable segments of the population in our country, namely the elderly, the infirmed, and women and children. It is wrong and think frankly ignoble to do so.

I think it is a disgrace that some of my colleagues have likened what we are attempting to do to the actions of Hitler during the Holocaust. I find it repugnant that they would point an accusatory finger and insinuate that through the Contract With America we are waging a war on our children. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I don't remember hearing this type of rhetoric last year when the First Lady said ''We feel confident—that we can reduce the rate of increase in Medicare without undermining quality for Medicare recipients.'' What a difference a year makes. Now, administration officials are singing a different tune. Recently, Secretary Shalala said: ''Our argument is that if you're slowing down growth here, and that's below what's happening in terms of costs out there, it's a real cut.'' So, when the president proposed slowing down the rate of growth in Medicare and Medicaid it wasn't a cut, but now that our budget contains a similar proposal, it is a cut.

It is ironic that the administration is now saying that Republicans don't care about the poor and needy because we want to reform Medicare and Medicaid. When the administration was proposing similar changes would they have accepted the label mean-spirited?

Regardless of whether there is a balanced budget, there is an undeniable, urgent need to make certain reforms to avert the Medicare trust fund's looming bankruptcy. Let's put our differences aside and work in a bipartisan manner to solve the problems of how to save the Medicare Program and how to reform Medicaid so that it delivers the necessary care in a more cost-effective manner. I believe we

are up to the task and I plan to work with my colleagues in Committee and here in Congress to achieve this goal.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

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

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich budget amendment.

Mr. Chairman, today the Republican Party is following through on its promise to propose a budget that complies with the balanced budget amendment sponsored by my good friend CHARLIE STENHOLM and I, this House passed at the beginning of the year.

This is a serious budget resolution with no gimmicks that calls the bluff of those who said we could not or would not propose a balanced budget.

Now, I doubt there is a single Member of Congress that supports absolutely every provision of this resolution. Personally, I am concerned by the proposal to eliminate the Department of Energy.

The notion that eliminating this Department will result in huge savings is simply not correct. Most of the functions of the Department will have to continue—the nuclear weapons complex, for example, will still have to operate. The Environmental Management Program will still exist. Congress cannot eliminate these functions.

The Reagan administration ran into these same difficulties in the early 1980's. The final analysis of dismantling DOE indicated that there would be little, if any, cost savings in the long run, and that in the short run, it would actually cost more money to shut down the Department than leaving it alone.

Significant savings do exist in the Department's programs. There is no doubt of that. The DOE, by its own estimation, will be able to save over $14 billion over the next 5 years—a significant reduction. It also will have eliminated 27 percent of its work force. These are real cuts, and real savings for American taxpayers. The overall savings, in my opinion, will be greater by keeping DOE whole and accountable than by parceling out its responsibilities to a range of other Government agencies.

Of course, every issue addressed in the budget resolution will ultimately be decided by the appropriate authorizing committees. I look forward to the debate over this matter.

I urge my colleagues to support the Kasich budget resolution.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, on this last vote, I was in the Chamber. I had my card in the machine. I pushed the button twice, but it did not do anything. I ran down here in order to vote, and you closed the vote off. Before I got in, the clerks on the outside yelled, ''One more, one more.'' I came in and yelled again, ''One more, one more,'' and I was not allowed to vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's statement will appear in the RECORD.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would be in order for the gentleman to be given an opportunity to vote ''yes'' on the next vote in order to make up for the ''yes'' he did not get to cast on the last vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair declines to rule on that.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, on this last vote, I would have voted ''yes'' resoundingly.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement for the record. On the last recorded vote on the amendment, rollcall 344, I believe it is, I inadvertently voted ''no''; my intention was to vote ''yes'' on that amendment.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, this vote that we are about to take is perhaps the most important vote of the 2-year period that we will serve in the House of Representatives, and for a moment I would like you to take out of your mind all of the charts and all of the graphs and all of the numbers and all of the statistics that we have flooded the floor with and the airwaves with over the last 2 days and to remember that when we pass a budget, unlike anything else we do here, we affect the lives of millions of our people, all of our people.

I would like you to focus on a picture, 70-year-old Cecil Whitner and his wife Ethel, from Affton, MO. All of his life, Cecil has served his country and his community. He fought five major battles in World War II, and he was rewarded with the Bronze Star for his bravery in action.

For more than three decades, he worked as a meatcutter in a grocery store in St. Louis. He always paid his taxes, he paid his Medicare taxes, he paid his Social Security taxes, he did what this society asked him to do, as did his wife.

□ 1530

Now that he is retired on disability and over 70, he depends every month on Social Security and Medicare, on the money that he paid into these programs for more than 35 years.

I say to my colleagues, this budget that you are about to vote on would take approximately $1,300 by the year 2002 between Medicare costs and this pension from Social Security from their annual income, $1,300. It would be one thing if what we are asking them to do was to simply balance the budget, but it is not. In addition to allegedly balancing the budget, we are taking in $1,300 from these folks so that we can give a $20,000 a year tax break to families earning $350,000 a year or more.

I would like to show my colleagues another picture, a younger family. In this picture we see Gina Stacer, whose husband, Roy, works as a car salesman in St. Louis. They are trying to save desperately for their twins' education as well as for their own retirement, but I say to my colleagues, when you live paycheck to paycheck, as most of our people do, that's pretty hard to do. Gina's parents are both retired, and they pay astronomical medical bills with Medicare and Social Security. But this budget would cut those benefits, and Gina and Roy would have to use their savings, not to build their children's future—they would like to go to college—but to have to protect their parents' lives.

I say to my colleagues, these issues that you vote on today are not just the issues of the elderly. They are issues that affect every American and every American family. Young people who are working have a responsibility to take care of their parents, and they take that responsibility very seriously, and, if their parents are in trouble with medical bills, or they cannot support themselves on Social Security, and if they are living on Social Security, then they have got to step into the breach, and, as all of you know, these middle-income families and families trying to get in the middle income are already pressed without having to do what this budget would ask them to do.

Now in the final analysis this budget is about our values. It is about what we believe is right and wrong, just and decent, and I urge my colleagues to understand that as they vote that they are not voting for just charts, and graphs, and numbers. They are voting for flesh-and-blood people who depend on us to represent them in this most important of all transactions that we do as a people. The value of my party, and I hope of a lot in the other party, is that we must invest in people for the things that they cannot do for themselves.

All of us believe our budget must be brought into balance. All of us believe we have go to get our fiscal accounts in order. It is the question of how to do it, and what I argue to my colleagues is, if we're going to balance the budget, let's figure out how to balance the budget, but in that toughest of all transactions let us not represent a value that says we're going to take money from middle-income people who are already struggling, $1,300 a year, to give a $20,000 a year tax cut to families who are earning $350,000 a year.

I realize the value that says we must invest in people who already have it made, and that investment will make its way down to the middle class eventually, but I believe as public servants we have a duty, a responsibility, in justice and decency and for what is right, to continue to make the needed investment in the people of this country, which is the greatest resource of this country, and let the people who have it made continue to make their contributions to this great society as well.

Defeat this resolution. We can do better.

The CHAIRMAN. All time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has expired.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, to close this historic debate I consider it my great privilege and honor to yield my time to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, a person who has done yeoman work on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, we have seen a lot of pictures. I say, ''I want to show you, America—I want to show you the future. I want to show you who we're doing this for.''

We have seen a lot of pictures. Katie Nunn—a little baby—and her mother who is here says she wants her baby to be able to fly someday like all of us can, spread our wings, and dream and become what we want to become. That is what this is all about today.

The first thing I want to do is I want to talk about the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO]. MARTIN SABO is as class an act as we can find in public life. He is a wonderful human being.

I love MARTIN because he has fought the good fight, and he is a man of conviction, and a man of courage, and a man of principle. He will be a friend of mine forever.

I also want to take a minute to salute the pioneers. Remember when they went over the mountains, and they broke the wheel, and they struggled to make it work in the rain, and against attacks and disease? That pioneer is PETE DOMENICI. He is a Senator from New Mexico.

I want to thank somebody who is not here today. I am sure he is probably watching, and he does not agree with all the details, but he is a guy that proved that two sides can come together, they can reach agreement. It is my dream someday we will all be able to have a bipartisan effort. His name is Tim Penny. Tim Penny is a man of conscience.

I want to thank the Budget staff who worked day and night, 28 of them. I mean 28 of them going through $12 trillion worth of spending. They are phenomenal, and they dream, and they are being rewarded today.

And I want to thank, most importantly, my colleagues on the Committee on the Budget, the tip of the spear for the revolution, and I want to talk a little bit about the revolution, and this is what I said to MARTIN the other night:

''My dad was a Roosevelt Democrat. No matter how long his son was in politics, no matter how long I talked to him, my dad remained a Roosevelt Democrat because he believed that the Democrat Party stood up for folks, and I want to tell you that over the last 40 years, whether it was civil rights and the need for this country to begin to heal itself, and it is still not healed, or whether it was education or Medicare for our senior citizens, frankly the Federal Government giving opportunity for people to fly, the Democrat Party did it.''

I say to my colleagues that life is about balance. Talk about Neil Armstrong going to the Moon; it was about balance. The pendulum has swung so far to Washington solving problems that people in America have been saying, ''I've given too much money, I've given too much control, I've given too much influence to Washington, and frankly I can do it better in my neighborhood. I want to do it better in my neighborhood. I want to educate my children the way I want to educate them. I want to feed them. I want to show compassion to people who are in need.''

Mr. Chairman, where I came from, in McKees Rocks, it was a simple little thing. It was a sin not to help somebody in need. It was equally a sin to help people who should help themselves.

And what our vision is for the 21st century is a vision of taking power, and money, and control and influence from this city and giving it back to the men and women all across this country in every city, in every town, in every village in this country, and saying, ''We believe in you, and we trust you.''

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, ''As we go into the 21st century, and you think that an individual can sit in their home with a magical instrument, a magical invention called a computer, and move the financial markets of the world, doesn't it make sense, as we go into the 21st century, that the 21st century is about the power of the individual, not the power of bureaucracy, not the power of redtape, because frankly the power of bureaucracy, and redtape, and misplaced compassion does not reward individual achievement and, in some respects, takes away the incentives for the individual to fly.''

Look at the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME]. The man came from very tough surroundings, was the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus. Do my colleagues know why? Because America is a place of opportunity, and that is what this is all about. It is about balancing a budget and stopping the flow of red ink because, just like a family, if Government will spend day in and day out more than what it takes in, it will bankrupt itself, it will create no growth, and do my colleagues know what the worst thing about no growth is? The rich get richer and the poor get poorer, and it is my dream for everybody to be able to fly in America.

Alan Greenspan said to us, and I have listened to many hours of testimony, but when Alan Greenspan came before the Committee on the Budget and said, ''If we can balance the budget, we will unleash a prosperity that we cannot even chart with this precious American system, and that gnawing fear in the guts of mothers and fathers and that their children will not be better off than them can finally be destroyed.'' That is what this is about today.

I say to my colleagues, ''It's about facing hard issues, it's about having to stare somebody square in the eye and say, 'I'd love to help you, but I got to put the kids first, and if there is a political risk, I'm prepared to absorb it,' because in the long run we're going to lift this country.''

I mean what is a better quote than John Kennedy saying, ''A rising tide lifts all boats?'' That is what this is.

And about tax cuts let me just say, ''If there is any institution that ought to be reinforced into the 21st century, it's the American family.'' We all know that.

□ 1545

What we are doing is we are saying that as we cut Government, as we end duplication, we are going to reward the family into the 21st century, and all the things that the family represents, value, stability, hope, capital gains, we did not hate rich people where I came from. I have said it before. Only guilty rich people do not like the rich. What capital gains is about is a funnel. Prosperity. You have got a jug of prosperity in one hand and a funnel in another. And when the stem is too narrow, you try to pour prosperity in, and it overflows, and the Fed says raise interest rates and slow everything down.

Capital gains is about widening the stem. It is about taking that jug of prosperity that is jobs and progress and it is pouring it through that funnel as fast as we possibly can, so everyone can share in the bounty of this country. That is what it is about.

I want to say to my friends who may vote against this, we are going to do this now. We are going to bring the pendulum back, and we have our vision for emphasizing the individual. That does not mean the Government does not have a role. It does. And I know how many of you have worked and bled and fought for the things that you believe in. And as we as Republicans begin to put this plan together, as we march down this road to saving America, I am going to urge everybody to keep their minds and their ears and their eyes open about how we can do it right.

But, ladies and gentlemen, it has to be done. We have to preserve this great country of ours. And it is a historic moment, when all of us can stand up for the future, we can all stand up for America.

Pass the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would request the gentleman to remove references to persons in the gallery and on the floor.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, in the early 1950's, Adlai Stevenson quipped that Republicans, in general, had to be dragged screaming into the 20th century. It appears to me, that the President and the Democrat leadership in the House, will have to be dragged screaming into the 21st century if ever a balanced Federal Budget is to be achieved.

It is amazing how the President—in the face of almost $5 trillion of debt and over $300 billion of annual interest accruing on that debt—

can still refuse to even offer a balanced budget for either this century or the next.

And the minority leadership in the House also resists endorsing any such balanced budget plan. For each of the last 25 years, that leadership—representing the majority control of this body, steadfastly piled up nothing but unbalanced budgets. And now—when the only issue being debated is not whether there should be a balanced budget over the next 5 or 7 years—still the President and his party's leadership in the House—fiddle while others present balanced budgets—including a coalition of Democrat House Members who recognize that—like it or not—the hard choices have to be made and a balanced budget must be achieved.

It is ironic that if the Democrat leadership in the 104th Congress had given recognition to Members like Tim Penney and others within their ranks—who tried to change the calamitous fiscal policies of the big spenders of his party, probably the Democrats would still control this Chamber. It is utterly mystifying however that the Democrat leadership can still resist constructing a balanced budget as we prepare to enter the 21st century. Alas, all they can do is to criticize those who are responsibly creating balanced budget plans.

If they will not lead, they must follow; or, more accurately, in the words of Adlai Stevenson, they must be dragged screaming into the 21st Century.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against this bill.

I have important objections to a bill that ties disaster relief—which I support—to slash-and-burn spending cuts.

The Republican strategy is transparent. It's political gamesmanship.

Saving money, cutting the deficit: these are principles I can support.

But we shouldn't tie the wholesale destruction of programs that help students and working Americans to disaster relief for quake-ravaged Los Angeles, bomb-damaged Oklahoma City, and the flood impacted people of my district.

Let's address these issues separately. Let's reject this callous Republican strategy.

Let's vote on disaster aid, then let's get down to business, and see where we can cut spending.

I hope the American people pay close attention to this debate, and this process. The Republicans have developed a bad habit. They say one thing, but they do another.

They promised to address the budget deficit. In fact, the Republican conferees who crafted this bill dropped a Democratic amendment that would have required that the net savings from this bill—$9 billion—be used to pay down the deficit.

Instead, the Republicans intend to use these savings as their private slush fund to finance a tax break for the privileged few.

Instead of cracking down on corporate tax giveaways, and special interest loopholes, the Republicans cracked down on seniors, students, and everybody who didn't have access to high-priced lobbyists.

Let me highlight just one glaring example. The Senate version of this bill included a provision to eliminate a tax loophole that allowed billionaire expatriates to avoid paying taxes. But the Republican leadership rejected this provision and stripped this language from the conference report.

In fact, this bill typifies the callousness with which the Republicans have addressed our Nation's fundamental problems.

The Republican rescissions bill would devastate—if not eliminate—programs that help at-risk, disadvantaged kids.

Republican targets include:

The Safe and Drug Free Schools Program. Because of Republican cuts, our schools and communities will have $200 million less to combat drugs and violence on campus and in the classroom.

The Goals 2000 Program. Higher academic standards help everyone: students, parents, and employers. But this national program takes a $90 million hit in the Republican bill. This was worked out with our Nation's Governors.

The School-to-Work Program. By matching classroom learning to on-the-job training, we can make sure that students get the help they need to enter today's workforce. But wait. The Republicans cut funding from this program—crippling a program that has drawn positive reviews from corporate participants and schoolkids alike.

America can be a strong, productive Nation if we have the courage and commitment to educate our citizens. Without access to education and training, our workforce cannot compete in an economy that demands new skills and sets new rules.

The evidence is compelling. We can't afford to give up this fight.

Since 1979, most working Americans have lost ground. For everybody but the very wealthy, incomes have barely kept up with inflation. Overall household income increased by nearly $800 billion between 1979 and 1993, yet, almost 97 percent of this increase went to the top 20 percent of American households.

We can't raise wages if we don't give students and working Americans the tools they need to succeed.

A recent study prepared by the Census Bureau documents the direct and positive link between education and productivity. The report found that a better educated work-force can significantly increase productivity.

Let's attack the education deficit with the same intensity we attack the budget deficit. Providing educational opportunity and maintaining fiscal responsibility—these aren't mutually exclusive goals.

I urge my Republican colleagues to open a dialogue with the administration. Let's work out a compromise that we can be proud of and the American people can be proud of.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strongest opposition to this budget resolution. This budget proposes to eliminate the Federal deficit by 2002, yet gives a tax cut to the wealthiest Americans. While we must work toward a balanced budget, we must do so responsibly. We must not force those most in need to bear the burden of balancing the budget alone.

In this budget, the House Republicans have chosen to take away health and financial security to seniors in order to achieve tremendous tax breaks to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans. While the Republican budget proposes to make millions of seniors pay an additional $1,060 in out-of-pocket Medicare expenses each year, it provides a tax windfall of $20,000 per year for Americans with incomes over $350,000.

This bill is a direct assault on our Nation's seniors. In addition to the Medicare cuts, the Republicans are also planning to cut Social Security benefits to seniors, which would result in an average reduction of $240 in benefits for individual seniors in 2002.

The Republicans said their budget would make tough choices and they were right—their choices will be tough on millions of seniors who rely on Medicare and Social Security.

But seniors are not the only victims of this misguided budget scheme. The Republican budget would make educational opportunity a thing of the past for many middle class students and their families.

It is appalling that the Republican budget cuts student loans by $18.7 billion by charging students interest on their loans while they are still in school. This will increase the cost of a higher education by approximately $5,000 for every student receiving a loan to fiance a college education. Is this the Republican opportunity society?

The Republican plan to terminate many very crucial programs that provide the most basic assistance to those most in need is similarly appalling. Some of the many programs devastated by this budget include: Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS; the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP], which ensures low-income Americans, including seniors, access to heat during the cold winter months; unemployment insurance extension benefits; and job training and education programs. The list goes on an on. This resolution also dramatically undermines Americas' access to the arts and humanities by cutting the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Endowment for the Humanities.

The inequities in this Republican budget are blatant and outrageous. This budget requires those most in need to shoulder the burden of balancing the budget, while granting the wealthiest of Americans a windfall.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is unfair, it is unjust, and must be voted down. I ask my colleagues to reject the budget resolution.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the budget resolution we are voting on today.

I am particularly appalled that this measure would rob our senior citizens of their Medicare coverage and Social Security benefits in order to pay for tax breaks . . . something we cannot afford.

Mr. Chairman, I supported a balanced budget amendment and I am prepared to make the tough choices necessary to stop the flow of red ink. Indeed I'm voting for the Stenholm alternative budget which would actually cut more than the Republican proposal and direct these cuts to deficit reduction.

We all have to make sacrifices to achieve a balanced budget, but the Republican plan is clearly out of balance when it comes to fairness and protecting the most vulnerable members of our society.

What does this Republican proposal really mean? It means that out-of-pocket Medicare costs for seniors will increase by $1,060 in 2002 and $3,500 over the next 7 years while Social Security payments will be up to $240 less. It means that students will have to pay on average $5,000 more for their college loans. It means less money for our veterans, public hospitals, public broadcasting, and NIH Research.

And guess what it also means? It means that the very richest will have $20,000 more to

spend each year thanks to the Republicans' tax breaks.

Like the Republican budget, the Stenholm budget resolution I support achieves a balanced budget in 2002. The difference is that the Stenholm resolution takes the $281 billion in tax breaks and puts them back into Medicare, student loans, veterans hospitals, and other worthy expenditures which benefit the middle class and needy Americans.

I can't say that the cuts in the Stenholm budget are painless—they aren't. That's why I urge my colleagues to make responsible choices during the reconciliation process because that's where the rubber really meets the road.

In particular, I strongly believe that deep cuts in Medicare and Medicaid should not take place outside the context of systemic health care reform.

The Medicare program will not become insolvent because of mismanagement—in fact, administrative costs in Medicare represent about 3 percent of the overall program, lower than any private payor.

Rather, Medicare costs have increased because the overall costs of health care have skyrocketed and more people are enrolling in the system.

My constituents are concerned about health care costs and the deficit because they know that these issues will only continue to place larger burdens on their children. They support student loans because they know that these are investments in our future. They support nutrition programs, and public television because they provide nourishment for the body and the mind. And they support NIH Research because they see the connection between basic science and cures and treatments for the diseases which plague our society.

We can not blindly slash these programs without giving thought to what these programs really mean for the people we represent.

So in closing, Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to think beyond balancing numbers when they vote this afternoon: They should think about balancing austerity and fairness. By this measure, the Stenholm budget proposal is balanced while the Republican plan is not.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, today we are being presented with four alternative budget resolutions—two offered by the Majority and two by the Minority. For the first time in a quarter century, each of the resolutions before us would result in a balanced Federal budget. Each resolution recognizes that our current pattern of runaway spending is both economically unsustainable and morally indefensible. Each resolution presents us with very difficult, even painful choices; they are not ones that we relish making today or that we will relish making in the future. But the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that we will have to make them—and postponing them won't make them any easier.

Let us consider a few facts. Our national debt stands at $4.8 trillion—that is $18,460 owed by every man, woman, and child in our Nation. Interest on our debt is the fastest-growing part of the Federal budget; in fact, each year, the Federal Government spends 15 cents of every dollar—or more than $200 billion—just on interest on the debt. That is almost as much as we spend on all non-defense discretionary programs combined—on education, job training, medical research, and much more. If current trends are not abated, interest and entitlement obligations will continue to grow exponentially until there is little left for anything else. Our choice today, then, is not about whether to balance the budget; it is about how we balance it.

This morning, I voted on the budget resolution offered by Democratic Representatives CHARLES STENHOLM and BILL ORTON. The Stenholm-Orton budget would have cut defense expenditures by $60 billion more than the committee resolution, and it would have cut domestic expenditures by $60 billion less. In addition, the Stenholm-Orton budget would not have funded a tax cut, would not have increased contributions to civil service retirement, would not have cut the student loan program, and it would have curbed the growth in Medicare more modestly than the committee resolution. Unfortunately the Stenholm-Orton resolution was defeated by a wide margin.

Given the defeat of this resolution, and due to the paramount importance of putting our Nation on a glidepath to a balanced budget, I will support the Budget Committee's resolution. While I have concerns about some aspects of the Committee budget, I believe that these concerns can be addressed in a House-Senate conference, and that the budget process must move forward. In fact, given the prevailing sentiment in the Senate, it is my expectation that the final document produced by House and Senate conferees will be very similar to the Stenholm-Orton budget for which I voted today: It will contain deeper defense cuts, more domestic cuts, and few, if any, tax cuts.

Mr. Chairman, a budget on a path to balance—however imperfect that path may be—is preferable to one that saddles future generations with hundreds of billions of dollars of debt each year. In addition, we must remember that a budget resolution is a blueprint, not a fully binding document, and that the authorizing and appropriating committees will have final discretion in determining how funds are spent in each budget category. That is why I will continue to work with these committees to protect our national priorities—education, health care, equity for our civil service, and much more, as I have done throughout my service in Congress.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today on this historic occasion to express my strong support for the Republican Budget. This budget represents a contract with our children. For too long Congress has thoughtlessly spent away the prosperity of our children to satisfy its appetite to spend.

I see Members get up who are opposed to this balanced budget plan claiming that passage of this plan will result in the end of civilization as we know it. They say that the elimination of this program and that program will cause undue harm to this Nation. Well I stand here today and say that if we do nothing then we will be responsible for undue harm to our children and our grandchildren. How compassionate will we have been to our children when in 30 years there is no money left for student loans, no money left for Head Start, and no money left for anything else. Why? Because every dollar that the Federal Government brings in will be eaten up by interest on the debt.

It pains me to see the Federal Government spend over $250 billion per year in interest payments on the Federal debt. That money funds nothing—no education, no military, no Medicare, and no Social Security. Enough is enough.

We are balancing the budget to ensure that we build a future for our children that is free of debt and full of opportunity. My son and daughter deserve nothing less. I can think of no greater responsibility as a father than to do this for my children. I ask that everyone look inside themselves, think of America's children, and support the Republican budget.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, today is a day that I almost thought would never come in my time here in Congress. Today I will be voting for a budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 67, which will put this Congress on a path toward balancing the federal budget. I have voted for such resolutions in the past only to see them trounced on the floor of the House. What makes today so special for me is that a majority of my colleagues in the House of Representatives will be joining me in voting for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time since I came to this House in 1969, a majority of Members of this House agree that we must substantially shrink the size of government in the effort to balance the budget. We are not going to raise taxes, we are not going to use budget gimmicks, we are actually going to cut spending in an effort to slow the rate of growth of the Federal Government. Congress is finally acting in a fiscally responsible manner. The manner in which Congress has acted in the past can be described as selfish at best and criminal at worst. In my view, the debt that past Congresses have heaped upon future generations has been a criminal act. It can be characterized as criminal because that approach was mortgaging the future of our children and grandchildren. In short, Congress has spent money we did not have and sent the bill to our kids. This new Congress is saying enough is enough, and I could not be prouder than I am to be a part of this historic day in the House of Representatives.

Finally, I would like to commend my friend, the chairman of the Budget Committee, JOHN KASICH, for all his hard work and dedication in making this day possible. I remember campaigning for JOHN when he first ran for office and it was clear to me then that he was committed to principle and committed to the concept of fiscal responsibility. The House of Representatives and the people of this country are very fortunate to have JOHN KASICH as chairman of the Budget Committee, and we all owe him a debt of gratitude for his efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 67 and look forward to the day when the end purpose of this resolution—achieving a balanced budget by restraining spending—becomes a reality.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, the balanced budget resolution before us today is the single most important vote we will cast since I entered Congress.

The American people have waited a generation for a balanced Federal budget. We House Republicans have delivered.

Passage of this historic balanced budget will show the American people and the world markets that we will balance the Federal budget as promised.

Eliminating the deficit will mean more jobs, lower interest rates, and higher real incomes.

It's high time the Federal Government quits mortgaging our children's and grandchildren's

futures. Every child born this year will face a lifetime bill of $187,000 for their share of interest on the national debt.

Our budget redesigns the Federal Government to make it smaller, more cost-effective, and less bureaucratic. We cut Government red tape and return power from Washington to State and local governments and the private sector.

Although I might not agree with each and every spending priority in the budget, we will now have the appropriations and reconciliation processes to modify certain specifics.

The bottom line is that we zero out the deficit by the year 2002 without touching Social Security or raising taxes.

I urge a ''Yes'' vote on the Republican budget resolution.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Republican plan to balance the Federal budget. This is the first time in over 25 years that the Congress has committed to balancing the budget. And, quite frankly, it's long overdue.

Americans across this great country need to know why it is so important to get our federal spending under control and balance the federal budget.

Here are just the numbers. The Federal Government has amassed a debt of over $4.9 trillion. Even though the Federal Government collected over $1.3 trillion from taxpayers last year, Congress spent in excess of $1.5 trillion every year.

So, today, we offer this broad plan for balancing the Federal budget over the next 7 years. Simply put, it ends business as usual and this spend-more-than-you-can-afford attitude that has existed for far too long in Washington.

What does this debt mean to each and every taxpayer? It means that the share of that debt for every American is $17,000. If we do nothing, our children will have to pay $200,000 in taxes over their lifetime to cover this debt.

And, because of this debt, we are wasting over $260 billion a year—a full 16 percent of the total Federal budget—just paying interest. That's money we could be using for more health care, more education, and many other worthy purposes if only we had balanced the budget.

Most important, this debt means that we are playing a high-risk game with our children's future. Saddled with this debt, we threaten their future opportunities.

So today, we lay out a broad plan to balance the budget—while protecting Social Security, as we promised, and while preserving, protecting, and improving Medicare.

As expected, there are those who claim the sky will fall and that we cannot survive without each and every Federal program, without each and every dollar that is spent here in Washington.

Even under this plan to balance the budget, the Federal budget will still increase every year. Let me repeat that. The budget increases every year. In fact Federal spending will increase $1.2 trillion over the next 7 years. Only in Washington can reasonable increases be called cuts.

What is the alternative? The President has failed to provide a plan to balance the budget. While we are taking the lead and making the tough choices, the President has remained on the sidelines during this critical national debate. It is quite clear that the President does not want to balance the budget.

Despite this, we move forward. To honor our commitment to America, the Congress and the President need to work together. We also must work as a nation to discuss openly the choices we face.

Over the past 4 months, I have heard from thousands of constituents with their ideas, suggestions, and concerns. New Jerseyans know how to make the tough choices for their families and their businesses. In New Jersey, our State balances its budget. In New Jersey, we have made government smaller and more efficient. In New Jersey, we have made sure that taxpayers come first, not last.

Over the next few months, the House will debate and make final decisions on each item proposed in the budget. As we debate our spending priorities, everyone needs to participate. There must be national dialog on where we are today and what we must do for our future.

Today's vote marks a historic beginning. We have set our Nation on the path toward fiscal sanity and a solid future for all Americans.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the budget resolution. Now, I want to be clear in that I do not support every single cut that is presented in the resolution. But that is not the issue before us today.

The issue before us is to outline a blueprint from which each authorizing and appropriations committee will be able to work from. It sets guidelines in which we will be able to work from in our own committees where programs can be thoughtfully analyzed and deliberated. I supported a balanced budget amendment and, therefore, support this proposal which would balance the budget by the year 2002. I find it hypocritical that some of those that say they support the balanced budget amendment now oppose any specific plan to do so.

The naysayers complain that the time is not now to save America. But if not now, when? When our debt reaches $5 trillion or $6 trillion? The point is that it is never an easy task to make tough choices. We have well past the time to bite the bullet and pass this blueprint that will put us back onto the road of fiscal accountability.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I oppose House concurrent resolution 67, the Republican budget resolution for fiscal year 1996, and am in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative proposal. Unfortunately, the second 100-day rush to judgment is well underway with the GOP plan before us, best described as the ''balance the budget on the backs of senior citizens, poor children, and working families act.'' This is an absolutely wrongheaded and unconscionable approach and one that the overwhelming majority of American people, including my constituents, find fault with.

Let's not mince words here Mr. Chairman. The Republican budget resolution steals $288 billion from the pockets of elderly Medicare patients, rips $24 billion out of the hands of Social Security recipients, and grabs $18.7 billion in financial aid to college students for the sole purpose of providing $355 billion in tax breaks for the wealthiest in this country. In my State of Illinois, this translates to a loss of over $2,700 in Medicare services per enrollee by the year 2002 and about a $5,000 increase in college costs per child for the average family.

But wait that's not all! The American people also receive as a bonus gift the complete elimination of the Department of Education, which will result in a $141 million reduction in major education State grant programs for my constituents that go to support safe and drug-free schools, vocational and adult training, and our public libraries. Tack on to that drastic reductions of $187 billion in Medicaid funds for the poor and disabled—expected to strip three million citizens of their long-term health care coverage—as well as a whopping 35 percent in overall nondefense discretionary spending by 2002, and we've got a true case of Robin Hood in reverse! Where is the Sheriff of Nottingham when you really need him, Mr. Chairman?

At a time when the threat of a major world conflict is at its lowest point in the last few decades, where is the sense in increasing the defense budget by $122 billion while gouging school lunches, child nutrition programs, Head Start, and job training? Does the leadership of this body mean to say that they value B–2 bombers more than they value A-plus grades? Are shiny new planes of more importance than our children's futures?

How can the majority party expect that the variety of problems such as drug abuse, teenage pregnancy, crime, racism, lack of jobs, and poor health care services which face too many residents of our major urban centers, as in my home city of Chicago, are going to be solved if we simply cut, slash, and burn and absolve ourselves of the responsibility to lead? We always hear complaints about how much it will cost to try and attack all of these matters through government action. Well, my friends, ask yourselves what it will cost if we don't? If we adopt the GOP budget, we will be well on our way to finding out.

On the other hand, the CBC budget alternative will achieve the same goal of a balanced budget by 2002 without unfairly singling out middle- and lower-income individuals, families, and seniors to pick up the tab. Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, through which we do have a contract with America's seniors, are protected from any cuts or alterations.

Additionally, the CBC's reasoned approach recognizes that education and job creation are the keys to increased American competitiveness and a better quality of life across the Nation. In so doing, $27 billion, or a 25-percent increase over the current budget figures, is invested in vital initiatives such as title I and TRIO programs for underserved pupils as well as summer youth employment and mentoring partnerships which have proved of such great benefit to or communities.

To help offset these investment priorities the CBC budget closes several corporate tax loopholes, effectively ending ''corporate welfare as we now know it,'' and raises the corporate share of the tax burden from 11 to 15 percent in order to correct a long-standing Tax Code imbalance which makes working families shoulder the burden of taxes in this country.

Mr. Chairman I urge my colleagues who, as the CBC alternative budget title states, are in the ''caring majority'' to reject the Republican leadership's backwards fiscal priorities and support the CBC alternative that truly accounts for the needs of all the American people and

thoughtfully attempts to strengthen opportunities for average families and their children.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the House Republican budget plan.

This proposal, put forth by House Speaker GINGRICH and Budget Committee Chairman KASICH, would give the very wealthy an enormous tax break while at the same time devastating Medicare and other vital programs.

The goal of this budget proposal is one I share: balancing the Federal budget by the year 2002. In January, I voted for a constitutional amendment to balance our Federal budget. I believe we must end the continued policy of running billion-dollar deficits every year which add to the national debt that must be paid by our children and grandchildren.

But we should not balance the budget by cutting student loans, Medicare, Social Security, funding for veterans and infrastructure while offering a $353 billion tax cut. This outrageous cut will give the wealthiest families a cut of $20,000 while giving middle-income families only $555 in tax relief.

We must also balance our budget in a way which does not put such a tremendous burden on our Nation's elderly. Last fall, during town meetings with my constituents, I talked about the ''Contract With America,'' and its potential impact on Social Security and Medicare. I suggested that if the Republican plan were enacted, our seniors would see huge Medicare cuts, higher Medicare premiums and out-of-pocket costs, and an effort to cut Social Security. If you examine the Republican budget closely, it does all three.

It cuts $283 billion from Medicare over 7 years, meaning that the service currently provided by Medicare will be significantly less in 2002. By cutting the Medicare program by 25 percent in 2002, out-of-pocket costs for seniors will increase by $1060 in 2002. And, this budget begins the dangerous concept of reducing Social Security cost-of-living-adjustments, beginning in 1999, by altering the Consumer Price Index. This will reduce the average benefit by $240 per person.

The Republicans have also suggested this plan will actually balance the budget in 2002. Unfortunately, their proposal relies on unsound economics and budget gimmicks to reach a balanced budget. This budget assumes a $170 billion ''economic bonus'' between 1996 and 2002 for attempting to balance the budget. This is based on a rosy scenario that our financial markets would react to lower interest rates by an optimistic 2 percent in 2002. Without this bonus, the budget is not balanced, and the promises behind this budget remain unfulfilled.

Mr. Chairman, I support a balanced budget. I believe if we got rid of the $340 billion tax cut for the wealthy and used those funds to help keep Medicare solvent; if we asked the very wealthy instead to pay their fair share; restored some funding for some of our most needed initiatives, such as student loans; and did not tamper with Social Security, we would reach this goal. Unfortunately, a majority of my colleagues did not agree with our efforts to make these changes in the Budget Committee.

Therefore, I intend to vote against the Kasich budget plan on the floor of the House.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, support this historic budget resolution which puts us on the path to a balanced budget for the first time in a generation. It is vitally important for the sake of our future economic health that we keep our commitment to a balanced budget by 2002.

I must object, however, to including repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act in our budget assumptions. As a number of my colleagues and I stated in our recent letter to Speaker Gingrich, Davis-Bacon is an important and historic worker protection deserving thorough consideration in the legislative process before any attempt at repeal is made.

The Budget Committee projects $2.7 billion in savings over 5 years from repeal. I don't think all of those savings would materialize because those figures do not take into account the reduced quality of workmanship on Federal projects that could result if the prevailing wage is not paid.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we can produce the needed savings without repeal of Davis-Bacon and I look forward to working with my colleagues who signed the letter and with the leadership to devise a reasonable alternative to repealing the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the House Republican fiscal year 1996 budget resolution. Our budget, as promised, outlines a clear path to the elimination of our national deficit by the year 2002. For too many years the Democrat leadership in the House has irresponsibly increased spending while putting the fiscal future of our children in jeopardy. This budget will ensure that the legacy we leave our children in debt free and full of opportunity, rather an ever increasing Federal deficit and a bloated, more intrusive Federal Government. On another level, our plan marks a shift in power away from Federal bureaucrats to families, States, and communities, who know what works best for them.

Over the coming weeks we will hear many say that our budget calls for dramatic cuts in Medicare. This could not be further from the truth. Under our proposal Medicare spending will increase from an average of $4,700 per recipient to $6,300 per recipient by the year 2002. As a matter of fact, overall Federal spending grows by about 3 percent annually under the GOP budget plan. The simple truth is that the Medicare trust fund will go bankrupt in just 6 years. The Medicare board of trustees has verified this conclusion. In response to this announcement Republicans have designed a plan to save Medicare. By controlling the amount of growth of all Federal spending, including Medicare, we will put ourselves on track to a balanced budget, and at the same time save Medicare from certain insolvency. Let us pass this budget and bring fiscal sanity to this House for the first time in a generation.

On another matter, note that this budget calls for the elimination of the Department of Commerce. While I recognize the significant savings that would result from this and other efforts to streamline and reduce Government bureaucracy, I would just like to state that the elimination of this Department will not be as easy as simply eliminating funding. The elimination of this agency will require the repealing of a number of underlying statutes and the spinning off of several vital responsibilities. As chairman of the Commerce, Trade, and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee, I will work closely with my Republican colleagues to address these concerns and put ourselves on track for a balanced budget in 2002.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget declares war on biomedical research. The Budget Committee recommends that NIH be cut by $566 million and frozen there for the next 5 years to produce a savings of $2.5 billion. Because biomedical research inflation rate is 4.2 percent, the freeze would require drastic reductions of 30 percent in medical research over 7 years.

NIH Director Harold Varmus has testified that this proposal would be a devastating blow to biomedical research. The success rate of research grants would plummet from 24 percent this year to 15 percent or lower in future years. These ill-advised cuts would have a ripple effect on the Nation's science infrastructure. We will lose laboratories, and long-term investments in biomedical research. We stand the risk of losing a generation of new biomedical researchers. What young person would go into a field with such a low probability of success?

America's health and economic competitiveness depend on an adequate level of funding for biomedical research at the NIH. The Republican devastation of NIH will cost us money in the long run. NIH has played a critical role in innovations that have saved 2–3 dollars for each dollar invested in research. Why would we want to reduce our investment by 30 percent?

Mr. Chairman, it is not only the future of NIH that is a stake in this budget, it is the future of most American families. What family in this country has not been touched by heart disease, cancer, Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, mental illness, or substance abuse? What family feels totally safe from AIDS, breast cancer, or genetic diseases?

Why would the Republicans propose to take away hope from so many American families? Apparently to fund huge tax breaks for large corporations and the wealthiest of Americans. This is a bad budget. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman KASICH and the House Budget Committee for recognizing that we should not balance the budget at the expense of economic opportunity. In fact, the whole point of even having a balanced budget is to promote opportunities for the good and the future of the Nation. I am proud to be a Member of the 104th Congress which recognizes this factor. I appreciate having had the chance to testify before the House Budget Committee on this critical issue and for their action.

I strongly oppose the Clinton's administration's Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] budget for including a border crossing fee. The INS fee is an excessive burden to American businesses along the United States border with Canada and Mexico.

Illegal immigration is a national problem and measures to enforce our laws should be financed by all Americans, not only those living on the border, who face the burden of illegal immigration. The American border communities already have the undue hardship of illegal aliens depleting valuable medical and social services.

The Clinton border crossing fee is yet another blow to the economic viability of American border communities already devastated by the devaluations of the Mexican peso and the Canadian dollar. The hardworking, taxpaying Americans in the border towns of Presidio, Del Rio, Eagle Pass, and Laredo are facing ruin.

Already scores of American businesses have closed and thousands of hardworking Americans have joined the rolls of the unemployed because of current economic situations.

To impose an additional levy would reduce commerce and violate the spirit of free trade and economic opportunities and hundreds of thousands of American working men and women.

Taxes assessed by the INS on Canadian and Mexican shoppers will reduce purchases of American goods and services. It is imperative that the administration abandon this proposal and that the House Budget Committee work toward this goal.

The impact of a crossing fee on the average foreign-based shopper is considerable. We must think and take into consideration how this affects the Americans who live and work in our border communities and stop treating them like second-class citizens. It is important that these Americans are not singled out by the administration.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for House Concurrent Resolution 67, the Republican budget plan that moves us to a balanced budget for the first time since 1969. This budget is about America's future—it is a plan that will allow us to enter the next century with America's fiscal house in order. Our country has continued to sink deeper and deeper into debt, and the time has come to restore our Government's economic strength and integrity.

The current budget crisis is taking its toll. Today's $4.8 trillion debt requires annual interest payments of $235 billion. If Government spending is not curtailed, the debt will reach $7.5 trillion by 2005, requiring interest payments of $412 billion. As early as 1997, Americans could pay as much interest on the debt—$270 billion—as we pay for national defense. These wasteful debt payments occupy increasingly large portions of our Federal budget, crowding out money that could remain with the taxpayer or be reinvested in America's neighborhoods, infrastructure, schools, and farms.

In addition to decreasing the amount of money that the Government has to pay for its programs, Americans are adversely affected by the debt each time they borrow money to pay for a home, car, or an education. It is estimated that interest rates are about two points higher than they should be under a balanced budget. The Budget Committee tells me that this adds as much as $37,000 over 30 years to a mortgage on a $75,000 home.

We must meet our budget crisis head-on for our Nation to be strong and prosperous. We cannot continue to mortgage the future of our children and grandchildren. House Concurrent Resolution 67 moves us toward a balanced budget by the year 2002 by eliminating wasteful spending and reducing the growth rate of many programs. In all, this budget reduces the deficit by about $1.1 trillion over the next 7 years.

This budget plan not only balances the budget—it also takes action to protect and preserve Medicare. To save it from bankruptcy, House Concurrent Resolution 67 would reduce the unacceptably high rate of growth of Medicare. I have a special interest in this issue given my position on the Ways and Means Committee, which has jurisdiction over Medicare. As you may know, the Social Security and Medicare trustees have predicted that the Medicare Part A—hospital Insurance—trust fund will be bankrupt in 7 years. That means that by 2002, the funds simply won't be there unless Congress takes some corrective action. In order for Congress to keep its commitment to provide health insurance for the elderly, we must act now to safeguard the system.

The budget resolution recommends three approaches to reforming Medicare, all of which deserve further investigation by the Ways and Means Committee. None of these options would reduce Medicare spending below current levels. In fact, the program would be allowed to continue to grow at a healthy rate, one which is closer to the rate of increase for health care expenditures generally. Under the budget proposal, average spending on a Medicare beneficiary would increase from about $4,800 today to about $6,400 in 2002.

I do not agree with every detail of the budget plan's suggested reforms. But when taken as a whole, it is a well-crafted, responsible and balanced measure. It restores fiscal responsibility to our Government for the first time in more than a generation. It's way overdue. Let's act now to safeguard the future of our children and grandchildren.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support for the Budget Committee's budget resolution. This resolution halts the slide in defense spending for the first time in more than a decade. And it represents the first time the Congress has added money for defense to a President's budget since 1981. On average, this proposal will provide the same amount of defense spending as this year—$270 billion. These additional resources, coupled with a significant reduction in non-defense spending, and an aggressive series of reforms within the Department, are the key components in our Republican plan to begin revitalizing our national security.

After adjusting for inflation, this plan does not increase the defense budget. It does, however, provide $50 billion more than the Clinton administration had planned to spend. And, perhaps most importantly, it is a plan that keeps the promise we made to the American people: we can both reinvigorate our national security posture and work toward balancing the Federal budget.

Mr. Chairman, some of our colleagues may be asking: Why, as we struggle to balance the budget, should defense appear to be exempt from the pain of cuts? I do not minimize the importance of deficit reduction and the goal of a balanced budget. Indeed, putting the Government's financial house in order is an important element of our Nation's overall security. I believe that strong measures are appropriate and necessary if we are to finally force the Government to balance its books. However, the armed forces have already paid their fair share.

But before I describe to you how steep the defense cuts of the past decade have been, let me remind you of one simple fact.

Defense is different.

As my colleague, Representative SAM BROWNBACK of Kansas, explained in presenting our budget plan, ''We've got a whole new mentality: what's the proper role of the Federal Government?'' Perhaps the Congress' most solemn charge under the Constitution is to ''provide for the common defense.'' If a Government cannot protect its citizens and interests abroad as well as at home, all its other good works are futile.

And, in my view, we need to restore a more appropriate balance to our priorities. Even as the Federal Government has expanded into areas of our lives never dreamt of by the Founding Fathers, it has come to shortchange those jobs which they considered it alone could do. When national security counts for just one-sixth of the total Federal budget, that's a sign to me that things are out of whack.

The fact is, while other parts of the Federal budget have grown dramatically, the Defense Department has been paying a peace dividend for more than a decade: defense budgets have declined in real terms in each of the last 10 years. Almost alone among Federal departments and agencies, the Pentagon has paid the price of deficit reduction. This year alone, the Defense Department will spend nearly 35 percent less—$140 billion less—than in 1985. Certainly no other department can come close to those figures. Defense spending now accounts for less than 4 percent of GDP, the lowest percentage in over 45 years.

We are the world's only superpower. And the utility of the Defense Department to the Nation has, if anything, increased. All one has to do is look at the extraordinary deployment rates we demand from our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines: they're simply going more places and doing more things than at any time in recent history, even during the height of the cold war.

In an uncertain and chaotic world—perhaps especially in such a world—we find that military forces retain their currency. The Soviet Union may no longer exist, but there are plenty of people in this world who wish Americans ill. And who will resort to violence to express that ill-will. And, lest we forget the tragedy in Oklahoma City so soon, who have unprecedented access to powerful technology.

So far, I've talked about numbers: budget cuts, budget shares, budget priorities. Let me tell you what these numbers mean in the real world, where the men and women who wear the uniform live.

First of all, it means fewer troops. Today's military is the smallest force since the end of the Korean War. By the end of fiscal year 1995, the military will be down to about 1.5 million active-duty members, from about 2.2 million in the late 1980's. Since 1990, active Army divisions have been reduced by one third. The active-duty Air Force has cut its inventory of tactical aircraft almost in half. The number of Navy aircraft carriers has been cut by 25 percent, but the total number of combatant ships is down by 32 percent. And make no mistake about it, numbers of troops still matter: in fact, our ability to carry out our national military strategy is in jeopardy, simply for lack of certain highly specialized troops.

Second, it means that these fewer troops are having a tough time keeping ready for all the missions they're being given. Every day new signs of diminished readiness are cropping up. In 1993, the Pentagon's own readiness task force discovered pockets of unreadiness in all the services. Most recently—and shortly after the administration assured the Congress and the Nation that readiness was as high as it had ever been—three of the

Army's divisions were reported as C–3, meaning that they had suffered, in the Army's official definition, a ''significant decrease in flexibility and [an] increase in vulnerability''—should they be sent to war? These divisions ''would require significant compensation for deficiencies'' to be made ready for combat. Air Force air crews in Europe are increasingly requiring waivers for missed training. Navy and Marine Corps aviation squadrons have been grounded due to a lack of maintenance funds.

Third, these troops are being asked to accept a lower standard of living. We should not forget that this administration's initial defense budget proposed freezing servicemembers' pay and benefits—at the same time that they proposed dramatic increases in domestic spending. Last year, the Congress began to correct that wrong, but the quality of service life continues to erode. As deployments—and family separations—lengthen, family housing, troop barracks and mess halls are not getting routine maintenance. There are too many substandard living quarters, too many leaky roofs, too much lead paint.

Fourth, these troops are working with tools that soon will show significant signs of old age. Designing and building weapons is a long-term process; the procurement holiday declared after the victories in the Cold War and the Gulf War is turning into an extended leave of absence. As one retired officer told our committee in hearings this spring: ''Our legacy to the next generation is likely to be 45-year-old training aircraft, 35-year-old bombers and airlifters, 25-year-old fighters, 35-year-old trucks and 40-year-old medium-lift helicopters.'' By this year, the overall Pentagon procurement account has fallen from the 1985 high of $132 to $43 billion, a reduction of more than 70 percent.

Finally, the administration's desire to overextend and over-use our shrinking military forces on an unending stream of peace operations—has dangerously diffused the Defense Department's focus. The Pentagon simply is not keeping its eye on the ball. The administration persists in stretching the reduced force and its reduced budget by sending it on a succession of missions of ambiguous focus, and it compounds the problem by refusing to budget properly for these so-called contingencies. Why long-running operations like the no-fly zones over Iraq and Bosnia should be unforeseen and not budgeted is more than a puzzle; it is a scandal. At this point, the administration's reluctance to budget for its own peacekeeping proclivities must be seen as a sin of commission, not one of omission.

But these missions cause more than budgetary mischief; they have strategic consequences. Sustaining large-scale peace operations for an extended period of time places a heavy burden on certain key military capabilities. The responsibility for these operations has fallen disproportionately on a small number of units: Army military police, port handlers, water purifiers, and quartermasters; and Air Force air cargo carriers—the kind of people who provide food, water, sanitation and showers in inhospitable places, not only to our own troops but to coalition allies, humanitarian relief organizations, even the local populations.

As essential as these units are for peacekeeping operations, they are equally vital in wartime. And the more they participate in peace operations, the less prepared they are to meet the major regional contingencies that are the backbone of our national security strategy.

Should Iraq threaten Kuwait and Saudi Arabia again, our response time would be lengthened while we withdrew essential units and equipment from the many peacekeeping activities they're now engaged in.

These, and other problems can only addressed within the context of stable defense budgets: there must be renewed investment, reordered investment priorities, and reformed defense processes. This budget resolution not only allows us to halt the decline in spending, it allows us to spend on the right things, and to spend smarter.

Our first priority is to restore the quality of service life. The service chiefs who helped to craft the early phases of the post-cold-war drawdown worried first and foremost about not breaking the force; in other words, not breaking the basic contract between the Nation and the men and women who wear its uniforms.

We also must take a comprehensive approach to the complex issue of force readiness: not only do we wish to ensure that current problems be solved, but that tomorrow's readiness is not compromised to meet today's shortfalls.

And we must end the procurement holiday. The President's budget request included no new bombers, no scout or attack helicopters, no tanks or fighting vehicles, just a handful of fighter aircraft and insufficient ammunition to replenish stocks. Relatively small investments will provide the necessary link between the force of today and the force of tomorrow.

Some part of this investment must go to revitalize the administration's anemic ballistic missile defense efforts. As rogue states like Iran dedicate themselves to acquiring weapons of mass destruction and the missiles to deliver them, the United States has a moral obligation to pursue a robust effort to defend against these weapons of terror. We must not forget how a crude, conventionally armed Scud missile accounted for the greatest single loss of American lives during the gulf war. A massive SDI program to develop and deploy exotic technologies is no longer envisioned, but we have an absolute obligation to develop and deploy theater and national missile defenses. It would be unconscionable to protect our troops and friends abroad while insisting that Americans here at home remain vulnerable to ballistic missile attack. Theater and national missile defense must once again become a primary goal, and we must work prudently to make that goal a reality.

We must allow small force structure increases to alleviate the burdens of constant deployments and high operating tempos. We simply cannot ask a small portion of our force to bear a disproportionate burden for noncombat operations.

Finally, we must reform the defense bureaucracy. It must be made to do its proper job, and to do a better job. For example, each year the Government spends about $200 billion on a wide range of goods and services, from sophisticated Stealth bombers to pencils. Regulations and redtape account for almost one-fifth of that amount. Some are necessary—we should not take risks with the American people's money. But too many mandates leave little room for sound business judgment, initiative and creatively.

The Pentagon, particularly, must learn to do its business more effectively. This is not merely a matter of efficiency, it is part and parcel of national security in a rapidly changing strategic and technological world. Unless the Pentagon can be as agile as America's adversaries, we will be at risk; our bureaucrats must be as nimble as our fighter aircraft. This year's National Defense Authorization Act will tackle this problem head-on, recommending a host of good-Government and streamlining initiatives that will make sure the Pentagon becomes a better steward of the taxpayers' dollars. Similarly, Representative BILL CLINGER, chairman of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, and I are today introducing a comprehensive Federal Acquisition Reform Act that will lighten the bureaucrats' burden and let managers manage; they'll be given power and responsibility.

A second goal of our reform effort must be to ensure that the Defense Department sticks to defense. For too long, the defense budget has been the largest cash cow in Washington. Sadly, items in the defense budget are questionable projects that have little to do with national security. Others may be worthwhile, but are not the Defense Department's job.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Budget Committee's budget resolution. Just as we set the rest of the Government on the proper path forward, so it must be with the Pentagon. The decisions we reach about defense spending today will create effects felt not only next year but many years from now. Lieutenants and privates recruited today will become tomorrow's generals and sergeants major. They will not fly the aircraft we order today for a decade. The research we undertake now will produce the new weapons that they will rely on in 20 years. In sum, we must ensure that our future military forces will be assured of being the smartest, best-trained, and best-equipped, and that there will be no doubt in America or around the world that, in Colin Powell's words, a ''superpower lives here.''

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, ''What a difference a year makes.'' Who could predict a year ago that we would be standing here today debating not one, but four separate, specific proposals to bring our budget into balance. While I do not support each different vision, it is truly gratifying to see the debate shift toward fiscal responsibility and real accountability to the American taxpayer.

I would first like to congratulate Chairman KASICH and his colleagues on the Budget Committee for their tremendous work in crafting the committee's first balanced budget resolution in nearly three decades. We can measure their success by the type of demagogic opposition from those on the other side of the aisle and down the street. Remember, they have no serious proposal. It seems opponents of fiscal responsibility have been reduced to inflammatory rhetoric and misleading assertions of draconian budget cuts. ''The sky is falling,'' they shriek. Nonsense. As you can see from this chart, total outlays under the committee budget will in fact continue to grow at a healthy but responsible rate.

And in fact, we show in the Solomon-Neumann proposal that it's possible to go further and balance the budget in an even more expeditious manner—5 years, rather than 7. This proposal underscores what I have claimed for several years, that there are literally hundreds of billions of dollars of low priority, excessive and wasteful discretionary spending programs

in our current budget. We can cut those programs without touching Social Security and while preserving Medicare benefits. In addition, by balancing the budget in 5 years rather than 7 the national debt will be $600 billion less, and so we could save an extra $42 billion in interest payments. The result: interest rates could drop an additional 1 percent. That's good news for families. The Solomon-Neumann budget is, as advertised, truly a contract with our children.

Mr. Chairman, this is an historic occasion for this body. This Congress is on the verge of reasserting our fundamental duty to live within our means. This Congress will rein in runaway spending and bring our budget into balance. But most importantly, Mr. Chairman, as we enter the 21st century, it is this Congress that will preserve a bright future for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman: I rise in support of the Republican budget not because I agree with every detail, but because this nation must balance it's budget. If we don't we may go the way of Mexico, and if we go bankrupt, there won't be anyone to bail us out.

The American people should know that the Appropriations Committee will make the final decisions on what programs will be eliminated, what programs will be cut and what programs may be increased. Today, we spend about $1.12 for every dollar we take in—it's a 12 percent problem and we can fix it.

This budget begins the process of making priorities, we've simply got to determine how much money we have, prioritize our needs and when the money runs out, so do the programs. Every spending program has a rationale, a constituency and a lobby.

There's been a lot of loose talk in this Chamber about so-called cuts in some programs like Medicare. Only in Washington is an increase in spending a cut. The fact is that Medicare will be broke in 7 years. That means in 2002 there will be no money for Medicare. Those who oppose this budget are willing to scare our seniors and are willing to lie to them, in the pursuit of politics. To vote against this budget is to tell our seniors that we don't care about their healthcare—that we are willing to cast them out—just for politics.

The fact is, under this budget, Medicare spending will increase from $4,700 to $6,300 in the next 7 years—that's a 40 percent increase per recipient. That's hardly a cut anywhere in America, except on the other side of the aisle.

This budget lays out a road map to follow to a balanced budget and a healthy Medicare System in 7 years. We may not agree with every dot and tittle in this budget—they'll be worked out in the Appropriations Committee—but we must agree with a balanced budget, with a healthy Medicare System, and Social Security off the table.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, America in ruins. That's right. Even if you put aside for a moment the harm that the Kasich budget does to Medicare, student loans, and everyday Americans, you are left, in terms of our Nation's infrastructure, with a blueprint for disaster.

Forget what we have learned over the past 20 years: That our infrastructure investment has a direct bearing on our ability to compete in the global economy; that an enhanced infrastructure can greatly further productivity, lower the cost of production and increase employment; and that our infrastructure is critical to upgrading the standard of living and quality of life for all Americans.

Forget what we know about the current needs of our transportation systems, wastewater treatment, and water supply facilities: That more than one-half—56 percent—of the Nation's major roadways are in poor to fair condition and are in need of immediate repair, with the cost to eliminate backlogged highway deficiencies estimated at $212 billion; that more than 70 percent of peak-hour travel on urban interstates occurs under congested or severely congested conditions, generating costs from wasted fuel and lost productivity to the economy of $39 billion per year; that one out of three bridges in America is rated structurally deficient or functionally obsolete; that almost one-fourth of the Nation's rail transit facilities are in poor condition, and one-fifth of our transit buses must be replaced as soon as possible; that we now have 23 airports experiencing more than 20,000 hours of aircraft delay annually, costing our economy as much as $6 billion every year; and that more than 10,000 of our 75,000 dams are classified as high hazard, meaning they would cause loss of life and extreme property damage should they fail; 13,549 are classified as being of significant hazard, meaning significant property damage would be sustained if they fail; and about 2,000 are considered unsafe or in need of repair.

Forget—we should not—but that is what the Kasich budget plan does. As a result, spending for infrastructure would decline dramatically.

For transportation, in 1996, the Kasich budget calls for a 1.3-percent cut below 1995 spending. By the year 2002 this would increase to a 14.6-percent cut below last year's spending, representing, because the Kasich budget fails to take account of inflation, a 30.3-percent decline in real transportation purchasing power.

Specific transportation cuts would include the following:

Freeze user-fee supported highway program. The Republican budget freezes the highway program at last year's level notwithstanding the fact that it is supported exclusively by user fees and does not contribute one penny toward the deficit.

Phase out Mass Transit Operating Assistance. The budget phases out operating assistance for local transit agencies between 1996 and 1999, cutting an additional 25 percent each year. This proposal cuts $193 million in 1996, $385 million in 1997, $578 million in 1998, and $770 million in 1999 through 2002.

No new starts for fixed guideway capital grants. The budget terminates funding for new section 3 mass transit systems, cutting $12 million in outlays in 1996, increasing to $645 million in 2002.

Terminate rail programs. The budget eliminates high-speed rail development and the local rail freight assistance program, terminates the Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment Project, and ends funding for the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program in 1999.

Eliminate air transportation programs. The budget eliminates the essential air services program, grants to reliever airports, the Civil Aeromedical Institute, the FAA Management Training Institute, and Air Traffic Control Revitalization Act premium pay.

Cut Coast Guard operating expenses. The Republican budget cuts funding for Coast Guard operations by $65 million, or 3 percent, in 1996 and freezes funding at this reduced level for the following 6 years. By 2002, this would mean a 24-percent loss in real purchasing power.

For environmental programs, in 1996, the Republican plan calls for a 14.2-percent cut below 1995. In 2002, the plan proposes a 15.2-percent cut below 1995, representing a 32.8-percent decline in real purchasing power.

Major changes proposed by the Republicans would include the following:

Cut funds for sewage treatment and safe drinking water facilities. The Republican budget proposes to cut funding for construction and upgrading of sewage treatment and drinking water facilities by $650 million, or 22 percent, in 1996 and then to freeze funding at this reduced level for the following 6 years. By 2002, this would mean a 38 percent loss in real purchasing power.

Cut Corps of Engineers construction. The Republican budget calls for cutting funds for Corps of Engineers water resources construction projects by $172 million, or 19 percent, in 1996. Although the cut is reduced beginning in 1998, in 2002 funding would still be 7 percent below 1995—representing a 26 percent real cut in purchasing power.

Reduce Superfund spending. The budget calls for reducing appropriations from the Superfund for hazardous waste cleanup by 10 percent in 1996 and then freezing appropriations at that reduced level for the following 6 years. By 2002, purchasing power would be down 30 percent.

For regional development programs, in 1996, the Republican plan calls for a 25.3 percent cut below 1995. In 2002, the plan proposes a 25.5 percent cut below 1995, representing a 40.6 percent decline in real purchasing power.

Major changes proposed by the Republicans would include the following—

Eliminate the Economic Development Administration.

Eliminate the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Eliminate the nonpower programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. Chairman, these are but a few examples of the many real infrastructure hardships this budget advocates.

American in ruins. Sound familiar? That is the title of a 1983 best-seller which, for the first time, brought to the forefront of American politics the important role that infrastructure plays in the world economy.

Let me read from the conclusion of that work:

> Economic renewal must be the premier focus of domestic policy in this decade. Our public infrastructure is strategically bound-up in that renewal. Without attention to deterioration of that infrastructure, economic renewal will be thwarted if not impossible.
>
> We have no recourse but to face the complex task at hand of rebuilding our public facilities as an essential prerequisite to economic renewal and maintenance of our quality-of-life.

How quickly we forget—how much the Kasich Republican plan forgets.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on the Republican budget.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to note that a number of our colleagues on the

other side of the aisle have shown pictures of their children during the course of the debate on budget priorities. These children are beautiful; they have bright futures; and, I am sure they are the pride and joy of their lucky parents. I know; I am the lucky mother of five wonderful children.

With all due respect to my colleagues however, I would note that we are here in Congress to represent all of the children of our districts and, in fact, our Nation, not just our own children. Our children are the lucky ones—they are covered by their parents' congressional health benefits; and, with the benefit of their parents' congressional salaries, they have decent housing and will be able to afford higher education.

It is not enough to gauge the brilliance of the future of this great Nation by its impact on our own children. We, as Federal legislators, have an obligation to all of this Nation's children. Our children are not only the ones in our families. They are also the children down the street, in low income housing, and tragically, sometimes not in housing at all but out on the street. Unless we meet their needs too, the future of our children is not as bright.

The Republican budget before us today is not for America's children, it is only for the children of the privileged few.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 67 which sets out the annual budget limits that will enable our Federal Government to achieve a balanced budget over the next 7 years. Our country faces a deficit crisis that can only be resolved through an honest commitment to the basic idea that our Federal Government can no longer afford to live beyond its means. With this resolution, Congress has an historic opportunity to put an end to the business-as-usual partisan bickering that has resulted in a $4.8 trillion debt that threatens to overwhelm our Nation's economy. It is time to stand together and do the heavy lifting that is needed to put our country's balance sheet in order.

This year's interest obligation on the debt is $235 billion, and over the next 15 years—if current patterns are allowed to continue—accumulated interest payments will total several trillion dollars. You don't need to be a finance expert to understand that this year's $235 billion interest payment on the Government's debt means that we have that much less money to fund critical government functions like crime control, education, and transportation initiatives. On a personal level, these growing interest payments will mean that my 13-year-old son Carlton will be saddled with approximately $125,000 in additional taxes during his expected lifetime to pay for his share of the interest obligation.

Even now, Americans are paying for this debt in the form of interest rates that are about 2 percentage points higher than they would be if the budget were balanced. This adds as much as $37,000 over 30 years to the mortgage on a $75,000 home. A 2-percent reduction in interest rates will result in the following economic benefits:

It will lead to the creation of 4.25 million more jobs over the next 10 years.

It will increase per capita incomes 16.1 percent.

It will generate $235 billion more revenue for the Federal Government without a tax increase.

It will generate $232 billion more revenue for State and local governments without a tax increase.

As the former chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, I can report from firsthand experience that a spendthrift Federal Government with unrestrained deficits will inevitably attempt to pass the buck on to State and local governments in the form of unfunded mandates. While we addressed part of this problem with the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, we will never fully cure the Federal Government's habit of passing the buck until we adopt a firm balanced budget policy that forces the Government to live within its means. When I was elected county board chairman in Fairfax County, VA—a county of 900,000 residents with the second largest county budget in the Nation—we were faced with more than a $200 million deficit that threatened the financial security and well-being of the county. Well, we rolled up our sleeves and went to work. We made the county government leaner and more efficient. We set priorities and stayed on focus to achieve a balanced budget, without tax hikes, that featured added funding for education. Two years later, Fairfax County was voted best financially managed county in the country by City and State magazine and I learned that fiscal responsibility creates economic opportunity and has the power to restore the average taxpayer's faith in government.

It is now time to restore faith in the Federal Government. This resolution sets tough budget limits that will require difficult choices and painful spending cuts. I oppose several of the individual, non-binding proposals that are contained in the committee report that accompanies this resolution. I will continue to fight to see that the more than two million hard working Federal employees are not unfairly targeted for pay and benefit cuts. While we all must share in the sacrifices that are necessary to achieve a balanced budget, I believe that Federal workers were unfairly singled out for a 2.5 percent pay cut and a sizeable reduction in promised retirement pay contained in H.R. 1215—the tax bill.

I voted against the rule that limited amendments and against final passage of H.R. 1215. The other body has not embraced these pay cuts, and I am confident that the end result of this budget process will be much more acceptable to the Federal worker than the provisions contained in the misguided tax bill. I am pleased that this resolution recommends the formation of a high-level commission to study the security of our military and civil service retirement funds. The Congressional Research Service and General Accounting Office are on record as certifying that these retirement systems have no unfunded liability problem and face no threat of insolvency. I applaud this resolution for embracing a long-range, analytical approach to the questions raised during the tax bill debate about the solvency of these retirement funds. This resolution appears to recognize that any increase in employee contribution rates based on the argument that these funds are unstable should be postponed until the commission makes findings and recommendations.

There is some good news for northern Virginians in this balanced budget plan: our METRO system is fully funded until its planned completion; retired civil servants and military personnel do not face reduced or delayed cost-of-living allowances; and, the U.S. Geological Survey remains intact and viable in its Reston headquarters.

Let's put partisanship aside for the sake of our children's economic security. To those critics who focus solely on the sacrifices required to balance our budget, I say: Where is your plan? This resolution represents a solid plan to balance the budget over 7 years. A balanced budget will directly result in lower interest rates, a stable dollar in the international market, and long-term economic security. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of House Concurrent Resolution 67.

The CHAIRMAN. No further debate is in order. Accordingly, pursuant to House Resolution 149, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, as amended, he reported the concurrent resolution, as amended, back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the amendment printed in H. Rept. 104–125 is adopted.

Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, does House rule XXI(c) requiring a three-fifths vote to increase Federal taxes apply to the $17.4 billion tax increase contained in the Republican budget resolution due to the consumer price index cut?

The SPEAKER. The Chair appreciates the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry, and the Chair interprets clause 5(c) of rule XXI to apply only to the passage or adoption of a bill, a joint resolution, an amendment thereto, or a conference report thereon. The rule does not apply to the adoption of a concurrent resolution.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I am a freshman. On my first day here I voted that a three-fifth vote of this body be required to pass a tax increase.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not in order.

Mr. WARD. Is this not a bill, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. This is not a bill. The gentleman is a freshman. He should study this. It is not a bill.

Mr. WARD. It is not a question of studying, Mr. Speaker. What is the voter to think if we do not call a bill a bill?

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution, as amended.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 193, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No 345]

YEAS—238

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
Condit
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)
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
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
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
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
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
Roukema
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 (MS)
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—193

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (MI)
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
Flanagan
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
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
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
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—4

Berman
Collins (IL)
Kleczka
McNulty

☐ 1609

So the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 345 on House Concurrent Resolution 67 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted ''no.''

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, MAY 19, 1995, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 1561, AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations have until midnight, Friday, May 19, 1995, to file a report on the bill (H.R. 1561) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I was present and voted no on rollcall vote No. 337, final passage of H.R. 961, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments. Unfortunately, due to a technical difficulty, my vote was not recorded.

I ask that the RECORD be clear that I voted on opposition to final passage of H.R. 961.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 151 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 151

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Boston, MA [Mr. MOAKLEY], the former chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded is for debate purposes only.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill, H.R. 1158, a measure providing emergency supplemental appropriations for disaster assistance and rescissions for fiscal year 1995. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration.

In particular, I would note that the conference report violates clause 3, rule XXVIII, relating to scope, because appropriations related to the terrorist

bombing in Oklahoma City were added to the bill in conference, and I know everyone is very supportive of that effort.

□ 1615

The debates on this floor are getting somewhat predictable. Fortunately, the American people are getting one message that is coming through loudly and clearly.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic leadership, including President Clinton right at the top, are unquestionably, unwaveringly, and unalterably addicted to big government. We just heard the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] talk about the fact that we are for the first time in years turning the corner on that.

There are a number of important emergency supplemental appropriations in this bill. However, I would especially call attention to the $6.7 billion in supplemental funding for disaster relief in 40 States; not just California, 40 States are involved.

I can assure the Members, Mr. Speaker, that in Los Angeles, in Los Angeles, where the impact of the Northridge earthquake is still felt, these funds are more critical than the rescissions included in the funding package.

The budget debate in this House boils down to whether politicians can muster the courage and conviction to stop passing trillions of dollars of economy-choking debt to our Nation's children. This is one of the most important political debates in our history. It will impact the future of every working family in this country. This emergency supplemental is a miniature version of the budget debate that we just went through.

The new majority in Congress has changed the way Washington does business. Rather than simply tossing new spending onto the mountainous Federal debt, as has been done in the past, we propose to pay for it. Is that so incredibly radical, Mr. Speaker?

The Committee on Appropriations went back and reevaluated nearly every item in the fiscal year 1995 spending program. They tried to find what I call smart cuts. They used the following criteria: No. 1, spending that was not authorized; No. 2, duplicative Federal programs; No. 3, programs that receive large funding increases in fiscal year 1995; No. 4, programs with unspent funds piling up from year to year; No. 5, programs that exceeded the level in the Clinton budget; finally, programs that are wasteful and do not work.

Those are the criteria that they used in looking at these items. Only among big-government liberals in Washington are these considered radical criteria. The Committee on Appropriations took another radical step. They proposed to cut as much unnecessary spending as possible, not just enough to balance out the new spending. Only inside the Beltway here in Washington would people advocate only looking for enough wasteful spending to balance the amount of new spending, but the Committee on Appropriations very responsibly went further. We proposed to get this Government on the path to a balanced budget, the one that was just called for in the resolution passed.

That, of course, gets us back to the balanced budget question. We are starting to see a clear trail here, Mr. Speaker, on the balanced budget amendment, despite strong bipartisan support, the President opposed it, and it came up short. However, he sure had the rhetoric down extraordinarily well, as many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have in this House. He and his friends supported a balanced budget, not just that they supported the amendment. They said they wanted specifics.

Then the Republicans came up with specific budget plans to balance the budget. Again, the big-government liberals, led by the President, ran for cover. Again there were excuses. We heard a lot of that here today when the House made history and passed this budget resolution that will put us on this glide path towards a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the President's staff indicates, and the President himself has indicated, that this emergency supplemental appropriations and rescission bill will be vetoed. We are the ones who responded to his request, and he was not at the table, and yet the call is that he is going to be vetoing it. Should we be surprised?

On the one hand it is hard to believe that the President is going to veto the bill that provides relief to American families that have already suffered at the hands of earthquakes, fires, flood, and terrorism. However, look at it from the perspective of big-government's great protector. Every special interest that lives off the bloated Federal Government is frightened. They all think that they are next. The President and his very liberal allies in Congress are their great protectors. The great protectors' advisers have probably told him that if he does not oppose these cuts, special interests all over the country are likely to think that maybe the President will agree with Congress tomorrow or next week or later this year, that their special program is not absolutely critical to this Nation's future. Better to make it clear to those who live off the Federal Government that he is here for them.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good conference report. It makes history. Two months ago when a bill came to the floor providing funding for these priorities, and reducing spending to pay for it, people said the spending cuts would die in the other body. Apparently they misread things. They passed by a 99 to 0 vote. Now we have these veto threats. They could be wrong, too. If not, let the President make the case that in a $1.5 trillion budget, a 1-percent spending cut is too much.

By the way, explain why those cuts are more important than this extraordinarily important disaster relief. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very fair rule, this extraordinarily balanced conference report, which the American people are behind.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill really cuts things we should keep, and keeps things that we should cut. Even though, and I want the Members to listen closely, even though it is not as bad as the House bill, and in that we are all thankful, we are still left holding a big pile of favors for the well off at the expense of everyone else. The worst part is that $50 billion of these cuts are not even going to deficit reduction. They are going to provide a tax break for some 1 million people, 1 million of the richest Americans in the land. Those are figures from the Department of the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I feel like yesterday I was standing here complaining about tax cuts for the rich at the expense of Medicare recipients. Now I am standing here complaining about tax cuts for the rich at the expense of education and housing. My Republican friends say they have to cut these programs to balance the budget, but President Clinton has shown us that it is possible to cut spending, and not cut the legs from under working families. President Clinton's bill cuts $110 million more than the Republican bill, but it does it without socking it to the middle class.

The President's rescissions bill proves if you give up the idea of tax breaks for the very rich, then we can afford a lot of very good programs that benefit the rest of the people, programs for education and training, programs for crime prevention, programs for housing, programs for veterans, and the list just goes on and on.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican rescissions package is a big, fat boon for expatriated billionaires, and a serious cut for working American families. Republicans have broken their promise not to cut Medicare, and they are breaking their promise to help working families. While we are on the subject of broken promises, Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends had promised not to waive the 3-day layover, and they have gone ahead and done that, too.

Therefor, Mr. Speaker, we are getting used to this. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule. This bill, like the Republican budget, hurts the people who need help and helps the people who really do not need help. We do not have to gut education and crime programs to pay for tax breaks for the very, very rich.

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

Mr. DREIER, Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in response to the last

gentleman's statements, there are no tax breaks in here, no money is going to people for tax breaks, because the conference agreement includes the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia in the Senate. The President never got his list of rescissions to us until after the conference was closed, so there was no possible way for us to act on any of his ideas, even though we have been pleading with him for 4 months to give us his ideas on rescissions.

I do not know where the gentleman got this business about a billionaires' tax cut. This is an appropriation bill, not a Committee on Ways and Means bill. It has nothing to do with tax breaks.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, still basking in the glow of passing the first balanced budget in 26 years, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Claremont, CA, for yielding time to me. It is nice to have him down out of the gallery and here on the floor. He is doing such a great job.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the conference report it makes in order. This is the conference report that contains funds to try to repair just some of the damage that was done by the Oklahoma City blast, and yet the President has said he will veto it? This is the conference report that contains disaster assistance for the victims of the California earthquake, and yet the President of the United States has said he will veto it? This is the conference report which contains debt relief for Jordan, which the President says he wants, and yet the President has said he will veto it?

This is the conference report, Mr. Speaker, which takes the first concrete steps toward reducing the deficit by actually cutting excessive spending out of this year's funds, and yet the President has said that he will veto it? What is going on here, Mr. Speaker? Is this the only way the President can try to prove that he is relevant to the setting of budget priorities, since he has failed to propose a budget plan which would lead to a balanced budget by the year 2002?

As chairman of the Committee on Rules, I personally invited him to put that budget before us, and we would make it in order and have a legitimate, relevant debate. There was no proposal. It is unlikely, Mr. Speaker, that all 435 of us will ever agree on every detail of any set of budget priorities, because we represent different constituencies. I come from New York. We did not have the earthquake disasters in California, but yet, we have to support legitimate legislation, and this is just that.

However, this conference report does agree to reflect the will of the House reached after, I think, 10 hours of the amendment process back when the bill was first considered in this House. There is a little sore spot involved, because at that time the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], and myself, along with the help of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], successfully passed on this floor by a vote of 382 to 23 an amendment and that is overwhelming, 382 to 23 restoring funding for veterans medical care and veterans health care facilities, with the cost offset by reductions in AmeriCorps, and leaving the veterans' programs with zero cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to report that in a compromise the conferees have restored AmeriCorps, the President's pet project, to where it was before this House acted, and put back in the cuts in veterans' programs totaling $81 million. I know conferees fought very hard against that, and I appreciate that, but as far as I am concerned, this conference agreement has already gone too far to protect the President's pet project, that thing called AmeriCorps.

I am going to vote for this conference report, but if the President does veto the compromise agreement, I strongly hope and urge that our conferees or that this House will stick to the overwhelming position that this House took when the bill first left the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] have very difficult jobs, and they have done them so well. I just hope that this body, after the vote on the balanced budget resolution today, is now going to have the guts that the gentleman from Louisiana has and that the other members of the Committee on Appropriations are going to have in putting specific cuts out here on the floor for debate. I am going to support every one of them. That is a promise. They deserve our support, and they deserve our commendations.

If the President is smart, he will sign this legislation, Mr. Speaker. There is one other point I would like to make. That has to do with the rhetoric that has been used with regard to the conference agreement on the budget debate. Repeatedly we Republicans have been accused of making cuts that are mean-spirited as we attempt to balance the budget, the most important issue facing this entire Nation over the next 5 years. What is really mean-spirited and what is greedy is to keep borrowing money and doubling the bills on future generations so liberal Democrats can make themselves feel self-righteous today.

□ 1630

Mr. Speaker, if they want to feel self-righteous, they should have the courage to step up here and offer balanced budget solutions of their own rather than just criticize those that we have offered.

I urge support for this very vital piece of legislation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and this conference report. I do so not because I oppose cutting spending, but because the conference report does not include the Brewster-Minge lockbox amendment which applied all of the savings from the bill to deficit reduction.

The Brewster-Minge amendment would have reduced the discretionary spending caps to reflect the savings in each of the next 5 years from the spending cuts in the package, thereby applying the savings to deficit reduction. The Brewster-Minge amendment would have reduced the spending limits by $66.2 billion over 5 years. Incidentally, I would point out that the Brewster-Minge amendment uses the same approach to reducing the discretionary caps that was in the Penny—Kasich amendment offered by our former colleague Tim Penny and the current chairman of the Budget Committee JOHN KASICH in the 103d Congress.

The House overwhelmingly passed the Brewster-Minge amendment when the rescission bill was considered by the House, but the House leadership almost immediately began to back away from its support of the amendment. The other body passed a significantly weaker version of the lockbox that only applied the savings from the first year to deficit reduction instead of reducing the caps to lock in the savings for all 5 years to deficit reduction. Unfortunately, the conference chose to accept the weaker version of lockbox that only applies $15.5 billion in savings to deficit reduction.

The House conferees would have us believe that they had to drop the Brewster amendment because the other body would not accept it. However, I would point out that PETE DOMENICI, the chairman of the Budget Committee and a very influential member of the other body on budget issues in the other body endorsed the approach in the Brewster-Minge amendment during the debate on this bill on March 29. He said, and I quote, ''We could take this little $6 billion savings and make it recur each year, and we would be over $30 billion * * * We will have to do more than that.''

I have heard some members argue that the savings from the lockbox amendment are irrelevant because we will reduce the spending limits much more in the reconciliation bill later in the year. If that is true, then I do not understand the objection to making those reductions now by accepting the Brewster-Minge amendment. Should we not lock in the savings now just in case we do not enact lower spending limits later in the year for whatever reason?

Mr. Speaker, we should defeat this bill and send it back to conference so

that we can keep the strongest possible lockbox in the bill. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Everett, PA [Mr. SHUSTER], the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. To set the record straight, yesterday the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Leon Panetta, stated that the President was disappointed that the conferees failed to rescind and included $130 million for nine separate highway projects in one congressional district, in my congressional district.

The facts are that they had their facts all wrong. The truth is, and I know it is difficult sometimes for them in this administration to stick to the truth, but the truth is that the Senate attempted to rescind $141 million in 72 projects. This gentleman had only 2 projects in the 72 with a total value of less than $6 million.

I regret deeply that this administration has decided to attempt to politicize what historically has been a bipartisan issue, transportation, and just this afternoon compounded their distortion with the double talk of saying what they really were talking about were 10 projects in Pennsylvania that go all the way back to the 1980's.

These projects that they talked about this afternoon have absolutely nothing to do with the rescission bill. This is classic double talk. I deeply regret that the administration is deciding apparently to politicize transportation.

In fact, it is ironic the projects which they seem to attack this afternoon are projects which were passed into law by a Democratically controlled House, and projects which Leon Panetta voted in favor of when he was in this House. But their crocodile tears are simply that.

The fact of the matter is the proof of their political activity is that the original House rescission bill had $131 million in old transit funds in it. Despite the fact that the Federal Transit Administration promised us they would not act on any of these rescissions to put the money out, they violated that trust. Between the time of the original rescission bill and when it came to the floor, the Federal Transit Administration pumped out $100 million in transit projects that were to be rescinded. Of course, these transit projects go to the big cities, largely to Democratic districts.

Mr. Speaker, they have chosen to politicize transportation. I regret that deeply, but if that is the game they want to play, we know how to play that game.

I would simply say to the Clinton administration downtown, if this is the way you want to treat transportation, we understand what you are doing. We regret it. We hope that you will rethink this partisan approach to transportation. But if you do not, then I can assure you as we move transportation legislation this year through the House, the national highway system, for example, and other transportation bills, we will have to respond in kind to the very sad approach which you seem to be taking to what historically has been a bipartisan issue, and, that is, transportation for the good of our country.

Wonderful Jim Howard, Democratic chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure when he was here, used to say there are no Republican or Democratic bridges or highways; there are American bridges and highways. That is the way we Republicans still feel.

I know many of my Democratic friends in the House here feel that way as well, but obviously the Clinton administration does not. They have chosen to politicize this issue. They have chosen to break trust with the House by pushing through $100 million in transit projects that were to be rescinded. I guess we are going to have to recognize it is a new and sad day.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking minority member.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to correct the impression left by the last speaker. The fact is, the last speaker arrives at his number by carefully excluding certain activities that were undertaken by the administration. The fact is, the administration's proposal would have allowed cancellation of projects in ISTEA, which is the authorizing highway legislation, as well as allowing the cancellation of appropriated items.

If we look at all of the projects that the administration was talking about being allowed to cancel, including those in the authorizing legislation, there are 9 projects in the gentleman's district and there are 30 in the gentleman's State. The gentleman is correct that if we look only at what the Senate rescinded, or tried to rescind, that he only has 2 projects, but if we look at the totality of the projects the administration wanted to cancel in both the authorization and appropriation bill, then the administration's numbers are correct.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Sanibel, Florida [Mr. GOSS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from greater downtown San Dimas, CA [Mr. DREIER], the chairman of another important subcommittee of the Committee on Rules, for allowing me such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have just had a very strong historic vote in this Chamber. It really was remarkable to be here and feel the sense of what is happening here. We sent a signal.

Sadly enough, it is a little too late in fiscal year 1995 to balance our budget this year. But it is certainly not too late to cut our unnecessary spending in fiscal year 1995, and we have a chance to do that right now.

Any day is a good day to save taxpayers' dollars. If you doubt it, just ask the taxpayer. Every day that we spend taxpayers' dollars is a good day to spend them wisely. If you doubt it, ask a taxpayer.

This legislation starts us toward balancing the budget, which we just had a strong, convincing vote on. It does it in a big way. We are talking about billions of dollars.

Why would we delay that? The answer is we would not. Why is the President talking of delaying that by vetoing our effort to stop bad spending now?

Let's agree that there may be some disagreement with the President about what actually constitutes bad spending, but then let's look at the next thing. There could be no disagreement about providing prompt and needed relief to Americans, American citizens, victims of tragedies, and this conference report provides relief to such Americans.

This conference report also saves money. This conference report is a responsible first step toward getting our spending under control. Why do we not pass it now? Why would we think that the President would even veto such a good piece of legislation?

Why, in fact, did we hear from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules, that there is concern about the 3-day layover waiver so that we could get to this legislation now and pass it and provide this relief?

The waivers that we have provided for in the rule, and this is a very good rule for this type of legislation, show that the only things that are in this resolution are basically a provision to take care of the victims of Oklahoma, which I think everybody would agree is important, and recognition for Korean War veterans, which I think also everybody would agree is important. There is nothing else new from the original report. Consequently, there is no reason.

Members are aware of what is going on here. I do not think there is any justification at all for not getting on immediately with this and passing this legislation and getting it down to the White House. I sincerely hope the President of the United States will agree there is no reason for delay.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think you will notice that I have a pretty worn and torn and tattered example of what will happen to not just the State of Texas but to many States

around the Nation. I carry this because these are not the numbers of the 18th Congressional District in Texas. These are the numbers of $1.1 billion that will impact the citizens of the State of Texas.

Even as we begin to deliberate on the rescissions bill, I thought there was hope, as the process proceeded and we went forward to the Senate and then the conference committee, in order to be able to emphasize what all of us are concerned about, and that is helping to reduce the deficit.

Unfortunately, when the bill returns we find that if you take it, you will lose it. What we will lost in Texas is $1.1 billion, only an example of what the rest of the country will lose as well.

□ 1645

Let me respond to the concern for those citizens who tragically have experienced a very serious loss. I have spoken to the administration and there is a response to those in Oklahoma City and California, the dollars are there for that kind of need. But what we do not have the dollars for, and what we are spending the dollars for, is a tax cut for those making over $200,000, and taking away money in this rescissions package from assisted housing that is needed all over the Nation for those who would need to have section 8 rental assistance. Those are working families that need those dollars, and I thought we were beginning to be able to strike a very good compromise on summer youth employment. That is what the young people have asked for in my district. They need to work. Oh, yes, they can work this summer, but folks, they will not be able to work next summer. And some of these people work to survive, to be able to go to school and in order to pay for clothes in order to get an education.

Education, the school-to-work program that the Houston Community College came to me and said was one of the best programs in this Nation, is now being cut drastically, $12.5 million. Education in the Goals 200 Program, and those communities, rural, towns, and cities that are just beginning to rebuild their infrastructure and transportation system, well, folks, they are gone.

Those who are just getting up the stairsteps, trying to make a system that is more mobile, trying to comply with the Clean Air Act, transportation dollars for those communities have now been cut $2.2 billion.

And the veterans, somebody said stop giving to the deadbeats, are veterans deadbeats? Are they the ones who have, in fact, given both their lives, some, but as well their support to this Nation? Well, Mr. Speaker, the veterans are being cut as well, $50 million.

I thought I could support this rescission package in the spirit of cooperation, but not at the tune of $1.1 billion for the State of Texas.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 10½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished former mayor of Santa Clarita, CA, an area heavily impacted by the Northridge earthquake, the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON].

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I always love to be introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER]. He always makes you feel so good and has some flowery use of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for this rule, and to decry the veto threats of the President's political advisors. There is no excuse for playing politics with working families in California who have suffered immense hardship from natural disasters.

There are times when elected officials must rise above politics and respond to a crisis. When the Northridge earthquake devastated the San Fernando Valley, Santa Clarita, and surrounding areas last year, I believed one of those times was at hand.

I applauded the President for going to Los Angeles and seeing the destruction first hand. He met hard-working people who bravely faced the brunt of the disaster. It was not a question of Democrat or Republican, liberal or conservative, it was the President responding to an emergency that rose above politics.

When the President asked Congress for $6.7 billion in supplemental appropriations to begin to rebuild in the face of massive destruction, my Republican colleagues in the House were determined to cut other spending to pay for the cost. Now, I accept second place to nobody in the desire to reduce Federal spending and balance the budget. However, I opposed my colleagues and supported the President's request without offsets.

I argued last year that there are a few instances when providing relief rises above political fights. When a leader must make the difficult decisions, even stand against those who are usually his allies, in order to meet the needs of those who have been struck by a disaster.

Mr. Speaker, by threatening to veto the conference report that continues to provide relief to communities decimated by last year's earthquake, the President is failing that test. He is letting down the families and communities who need this assistance. Has he forgotten his visit of last year? Maybe the political advisers urging a veto weren't with the President when he walked through the communities he now threatens to ignore?

I recognize that it is difficult for this big-government President to support spending cuts. It was very difficult for me last year to vote to add emergency relief funds to deficit. But, I made a tough choice in order to help those disaster victims who needed it most. Ultimately, the political fights over balanced budgets were played out in more appropriate places.

Mr. Speaker, the President's advisers have lost touch with disaster victims in California. Go ahead, oppose the balance budget amendment. Oppose the budget resolution. Oppose the appropriations bills later this year that will cut spending. But have the courage to accept a few cuts to enact disaster relief.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I must vote against the rule and this bill. It is an accumulation of unwise reductions in important programs. Just about every program in the Government was cut, housing, health research, transportation, clean fuel, nutrition for women and children, the elderly, every program benefiting the average person has been reduced by the Republican majority. But the amazing fact, Mr. Speaker, is that this bill does not cut the Department of Defense by one penny; a budget of $272 billion for the Department of Defense last year, and there are no reductions at all.

I noticed in the paper this morning, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Defense is getting ready to obtain procurement for a program of $60 billion in new submarines. When I asked the staff who our enemy was that justifies the expenditure of $60 billion, I was told that the Navy came in and testified well, it could be Iran, it could be North Korea, it could be India.

What kind of program is this? What kind of fairness is this when the programs that are so vital to the average person are being reduced substantially and the Department of Defense, which a great majority of the people of this country look to for having reductions, has not been cut at all? I shall vote against this program, Mr. Speaker. I think that the House should kill this bill. The President is exactly right in threatening to veto it.

Particularly destructive is the so-called Taylor amendment.

One point seven million miles of timber. Nine billion board feet. That is what the timber salvage sales amendment mandates. And this long line of timber is to be taken out of our national forests without the normal environmental protections, with no administrative review, and only limited judicial review.

If you voted for my amendment to strike the timber salvage sales provision when the rescissions bill was before the House in March, there is no reason to change your mind now about this subsidy for the timber industry. In fact, there is every reason for more of you to

join me in rejecting this ill-conceived evasion of current law and invasion of our national forests.

First, you will recall that the House version was limited to 2 years of salvage sales. The Senate version was to last only through fiscal year 1996, less than 2 years. But guess what, the timber lobbyists got their wish and the conference agreement extends all the way through fiscal year 1997. This giveaway now lasts 3 years. So, now you have an amendment that suspends all laws, yes, all laws, not just environmental laws, for a period longer than either the House or Senate version.

Proponents of the amendment will say they have removed the mandates to sell 6 billion board feet in 2 years as contained in the House version. Yes, that is accurate. But read the statement of the managers. That is where the targets are and they are more than the Forest Service says it can reasonably and responsibly do. Now, nearly 9 billion board feet is demanded, 3 billion more than the original plan. And if the Forest Service is not able to match the targets of the managers, then there are veiled threats about what will happen to the Forest Service. The report says: ''The managers will carefully review the Administration's implementation of the salvage program, and, if found to be inadequate, will employ such actions as deemed necessary. Such action might include, but are not limited to, reallocation or other prioritizations to be determined by the Congress.'' A threat if I have ever heard one. Do not be fooled, there is still a mandate to get a specified amount of timber cut.

All administrative appeals processes are eliminated. Judicial review is severely curtailed. All balance is thrown out the window. Just get the timber out the door. Do not worry about silting streams, do not worry about environmental protection; do not worry about Forest plans; do not worry about below cost sales; do not worry about contracting procedures. Just do it, or else.

And the conference agreement goes beyond the House version by exempting the President's plan for the Pacific Northwest from all administrative review and as with salvage sales, also limits judicial review. There is no reason to do this. The President's plan has just recently received the approval of the courts. It takes time to refill the pipeline to reach the timber sales approved by the courts.

Those who were allowed to participate in the discussions leading to this final version, and I was not invited, have exceeded their scope. They have gone beyond what either House agreed to in terms of length of the program and have added more exemptions to the Senate provision on the President's Northwest Forest Plan, exemptions that were in neither bill. This timber salvage sale provision now has more exemptions than a CPA's tax return.

Yes, I care about forest health and acknowledge there must be timber salvage sales. That is not the question. The question is: Do we allow the Forest Service to harvest the salvageable timber in a responsible way or do we arbitrarily impose these capricious limits on agencies that think it is a mistake. The Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the administration have moved to expedite salvage sales without abandoning appropriate checks and balances. We must let the professional foresters do their job.

In the name of fiscal prudence, forest health and common sense, we should reject this fatally flawed conference agreement.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my dear friend from South Boston how many speakers he has remaining?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the present time we have four speakers waiting with bated breath.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, we have had a great deal of rhetoric this afternoon about the task of balancing the budget. There is probably not a Member of this Chamber that does not in one way or the other have a commitment to balancing the budget. It is a question of how do we do it and do it fairly.

The term shared sacrifice has been used a great deal. To me shared sacrifice means that we do not balance the budget on the backs of low-income Americans, children, veterans, and the elderly. It means that we look to the broader community and ask who can contribute a fair share to this effort.

I am struck because this year I had a visit from a person who has been very active in the Republican Party in my community. He came as a businessman. And he talked to me about the summer job program for youth, not because he in any way is connected with the program; his business does not benefit one way or the other. He is a former educator. He came to me because he believes in the program and he thinks it ought to be continued. And he paid his own way, he bought his own ticket to come to Washington, DC, to talk to me about this.

To me, this speaks volumes about what this type of program does for our young people. The question is then, if we truly have shared sacrifice, how does this fit into the equation? What does it mean when we are trying to balance the budget and at the same time we strip out of the rescissions bill the provisions that would otherwise commit the savings to deficit reduction and allow them to go to tax cuts?

This speaks volumes to me about the motives of those that have brought this bill to us for final action.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that what is happening here bears no resemblance to shared sacrifice. Instead we are asking youth, elderly, low-income, and veterans, with the budget that we have debated today in this rescissions bill, to tighten their belts by two notches while many other Americans are bellying up to the table for an extra dessert.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me the time. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I recall very vividly that when we started the markup in our appropriations subcommittees on this rescission bill the first question that was asked of the chairman of the committee was why are we making these cuts, why do we have to make billions of dollars of cuts in nutrition, education, housing, mass transit, clean air enforcement, and the list goes on and on.

The response we received was that we needed the funds to provide a tax cut. There was some embarrassment with that answer after a while and it shifted to well, we need the funds for deficit reduction.

Why then, if these funds are supposed to go to deficit reduction, did not the Republican majority accept the Brewster Minge language for the lockbox to save the money that is in this bill for deficit reduction? It is very clear, and that is that the funds that are cut from education, nutrition, transportation, housing, et cetera, are once again to fund a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans.

Earlier today we saw Members on the other side of the aisle show us beautiful pictures of their children, and they are lovely. Indeed, we are all so very proud of our children, and it is hard to understand how we can treasure our own children while at the same time we come to this floor to cut education for the children of America and they are our children, too. How can we value our children and make all of the cuts that this legislation does in funding for safe and drug-free schools, for Goals 2000, and then down the line to vocational and adult education and student financial aid. This on the same day as the budget bill cut so much funding from the student aid programs for college education. In addition to that, in addition to that, there are millions of dollars cut in funding for displaced workers' programs to assist those who have lost their jobs due to imports, plant closings, and other economic reasons.

There are many, many reasons to oppose this legislation, Mr. Speaker, but the education part of the bill and adult education and job training part of the bill and the summer youth programs part of the bill are enough reason for the President to veto the bill, and I am so pleased that he is.

As a California member of the Committee on Appropriations I want to make another point, and it is that no person in any disaster in any part of this country will be deprived of their assistance if the President vetoes this bill.

Indeed, I voted against this bill in committee and on this floor because I object to a bill that would say to the children of California you had a disaster, now in order to get assistance you are going to have to pay for it with your education and your nutrition and your housing.

□ 1700

So I think that the Clinton administration response to this legislation is appropriate.

I also want to say one more thing about the Clinton administration. They deserve a great deal of credit for the excellent response they have given to disasters that have occurred in this country. Jamie Lee Whitten deserves our gratitude and the President our commendation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman because in the last day and a half we have learned a great deal about rescissions. We have seen one giant rescission on the floor of this House as our Republican colleagues rescinded their commitment to the millions of American seniors that are counting on Medicare.

And now we get three more lessons:

No. 1, when it comes to making a choice, a choice between locking in savings from these cuts to deficit reduction and using it for a tax cut for the privileged few, the choice was easy; this House voted overwhelmingly to lock in those savings. But it was not 24 hours later than across the street the chairman of the Committee on the Budget said, ''Oh, it is all just a big game.'' And it was just a big game because all along they needed every dollar of those cuts to give out tax breaks for their friends.

Lesson No. 2: When it comes time to chop, who gets chopped first? Well, it is the middle-class families that are struggling to get up that economic ladder, to get their children educated, because the place that this rescission begins rescinding is in education and the Federal commitment to back up our local schools with education.

Lesson No. 3: Loopholes last. The Senate approved language that would be part of this rescissions bill to condemn the atrocious practice where some Americans can actually go out and burn their citizenship card and at the same time burn the taxpayer. Is that loophole provision in here? No, sir, it is nowhere to be found in this conference report.

We have heard a lot about disasters today. Well, let me tell you, as long as the priorities are to cut education first and to cut tax loopholes for the privileged last, that is a disaster.

I am glad to have an opportunity to vote against that kind of a disaster by voting against this conference report.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 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, I rise in opposition to this conference report.

Like many of my colleagues in the coalition and some beyond in my party, I believe in many of the rescissions included in this conference report.

I am absolutely dead set, however, against taking these spending cuts and using them for a tax cut or for other spending.

We had a way to guarantee that the cuts would go to deficit reduction. The Brewster-Minge lock box sealed up $66.2 billion over the next 5 years.

I am not only willing to make that sort of cut, I am eager to do so. But I am not going to give up Rural Health grants, AHEC money, Safe & Drug Free School money, funds for Vocational Education—and much more, just so that money can be used for tax cuts.

There has been a weakening of trust over the way the lock box in this bill was handled. An early understanding of $66 billion in savings disintegrated into something much smaller, $15.5 billion in this conference report.

I would love to vote for a rescission bill—but not for the sake of tax cuts. If the President vetoes this bill, I intend to support him in that veto for purposes of restoring the lock box.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

I just wanted to respond to the previous speaker.

All this discussion about a lock box and an agreement, the agreement was oral. There was no mention in the discussions with respect to future savings.

The past savings and current savings are in there in the Byrd amendment, which was passed in the Senate and agreed to in the conference. So that entire issue is by the boards. There is no savings going to tax cuts.

The Byrd amendment in the conference agreement makes sure that that is the case.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. I wanted to make sure I heard the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations correctly. He said that was not an agreement; it was an oral agreement. Are we to conclude from that that an agreement, an oral agreement with the Republicans is not worth the paper it is written on?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. There was no paper. When I engaged in negotiations with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER], there was no mention of paper. We talked about saving of past efforts and current efforts. There was never any mention of future projected savings or future offsets.

Ms. PELOSI. The gentleman is saying the savings in the bill will not go for deficit reduction?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am saying the Byrd amendment covers exactly word for word the agreement that was made. The gentlewoman fully knows that.

Ms. PELOSI. No, I do not.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that CBO has no trouble figuring out what the Brewster language meant. Because the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the Brewster lockbox would result in $66.5 billion in deficit reduction over 5 years.

The deficit reduction in this conference report is $15.48 billion. So it seems to me that the CBO, which is the neutral umpire which is supposed to keep all of us honest around here, understood what the Brewster amendment did. The Brewster amendment tried to dedicate all savings in the immediate year and out years for deficit reduction.

The conference report comes back and only dedicates $15 billion.

Now the chairman of the committee says, ''Oh, but that was the Byrd language.'' Let me make clear, Senator BYRD and I are in full agreement. Neither one of us wants to see these savings used to provide tax cuts for rich people. The difference is that Senator BYRD is in the other body, and the other body has a budget resolution that does not even contemplate using any of these savings for tax reduction. They contemplate using them all for deficit reduction, and so they never even dreamed that these funds would be used for a tax cut rather than for deficit reduction.

So do not try to say that the language in the conference report meets the test of the Brewster amendment. It does not.

CBO indicates the Brewster amendment would save $66 billion. This conference report only provides $15.48 billion for deficit reduction and makes available the rest for tax cuts.

Four hundred and four people in this institution voted not to do that.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. We would not need this rule if we followed the rules of the House.

The fact of the matter is, besides being a bad bill in cutting youth employment and education programs and housing, this bill also puts our national forests up for sale. This bill, which left the House as a bad bill with the forest provision, mandates these cuts. It puts

a fire sale, of course, on our national forests. It goes into wilderness study areas. In fact, 40 Members of the House signed letters to the President asking for a veto because this bill destroys not only our national legacy but our children's national legacy.

This particular provision adds to the deficit, not cuts it.

There is a place, obviously, for deficit timber sales, but it is not in a bill that is a rescission bill, not a bill that destroys our national forests, that disregards forest health. In fact, our forests are more healthy than they have ever been. That is because we have been investing in watersheds and a variety of other projects. This flies in the face of science, flies in the face of good sound practices, overrides it all, simply to award special interests to the timber interests.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to our leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk about sacrifice the past few days.

But I do not think the American people need any lectures about sacrifice.

The senior citizens who stood by this country during World War II, the working families who are struggling to make ends meet, the middle class parents who are working hard to put their kids through school, they know about sacrifice.

They do not need any lectures from Washington.

Every day in every way, the American people prove that they are willing to take responsibility and do their part.

The Republicans have come to this floor and talk about sacrifice. About how everybody must do their fair share.

But is it fair to cut Medicare and Social Security in order to give tax breaks to the privileged few?

Is it fair to cut student loans and school lunches, in order to give tax breaks to the wealthiest corporations in our society?

Is it fair to target the middle class—when we are not even willing to close a loophole that lets billionaires renounce their citizenship to avoid paying taxes?

This debate today is not just about numbers and charts. It is not just about line items and budget marks.

It is about the real lives of flesh and blood people.

And that is really the difference between Democrats and Republicans.

Republicans look at this bill and see a $319 million cut to LIHEAP. Democrats see senior citizens who will be freezing in the winter.

You look at this bill and see a $20 million cut to WIC. We see children who will be born at low birthweight if they don't get the proper nutrition.

You see a $25 million cut in the school-to-work program. We see kids who will not get jobs because they do not have the skills to compete.

You see an $81 million cut to veterans benefits.

We see people who defended this country who won't get the medical care they need and deserve.

This debate is about the real lives of real people.

You want to talk about spending cuts?

What about the $200 billion we give away every year in corporate tax breaks?

What about the $1.2 billion we give to rich corporate miners?

What about the $4.3 billion we give to rich corporate agribusiness?

What about the $50 billion you want to spent on Star Wars? What about the bloated CIA budget?

Can we not cut those programs first?

Do we have to target women and children? Do we have to target seniors and working families?

And what about that billionaires loophole?

In this bill, you propose cutting $875 million from education programs.

Closing the loophole for billionaires will save us $3.6 billion, that's billion with a ''b,'' over the next 10 years.

Yet when Democrats offered a bill to close it, every Republican but five voted against it.

So do not come here today and lecture us about sacrifice, about everybody doing their fair share, about everybody doing their part.

Do not tell us that you are doing this for our kids.

Only Republicans in Washington would believe that we could cut programs that help teach our kids, train our kids, and provide jobs for our kids, and then say they are doing it for our kids.

And do not pretend that these cuts are being made to cut the deficit, or balance the budget.

The Brewster lockbox—which had overwhelming support in this House—which would have guaranteed that the cuts went to deficit reduction—was rejected by the Republicans in conference.

These cuts are being made for one reason and one reason only: to pay for tax breaks for the privileged few.

This is a defining issue for our Nation.

The president is determined to veto this bill.

And I am confident that we will have enough votes to sustain that veto.

In the end, this vote comes down to one simple question: do you really think it is fair to target senior citizens, to cut education, to cut school-to-work, to cut veterans benefits, to cut nutrition programs, and to cut senior housing and heating assistance, in order to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy?

That is the question.

Is that what we mean by fair?

Is that what we mean by everyone doing their part?

I say no.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on final passage of this conference report, and when the President vetoes it and sends it back, to overwhelmingly endorse and sustain his veto.

□ 1715

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). All time has expired on the minority side.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I was contemplating yielding back the balance of my time so we can move ahead, but the speech that was just delivered compels me to yield myself the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for 6½ minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, to me it is very sad that we have had to continue this same kind of rhetoric that has been going on for the past several days and weeks around here. I listened to my very dear friend say that Republicans see $319 million of savings by cutting the low-income heating energy assistance program and the Democrats seeing senior citizens freeze to death in the winter.

Now, the fact of the matter is:

Let's us look at the low-income heating energy assistance program; LIHEAP, it's called. It was put into place in 1979, when this country was in the midst of an energy crisis. It was a foreign policy issue, and the Federal Government stepped forward because of the escalating energy costs that existed and decided that people who were in those areas that would get very cold in the winter should get some kind of assistance.

Now, where do we stand in 1995 when it comes to those dramatically increasing energy costs juxtaposed to where we were in 1979?

The cost of heating oil today is lower than it was when we put this program into place, and so to determine that there are going to be people who will freeze because of our desire to try and bring about some kind of sanity in the area of Federal spending is tragic, and it is really demagoguery.

This program, this package that has come from the Committee on Appropriations, in no way deals with taxes. There are no tax implications to this whatsoever.

This package that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has brought forward from his committee, having labored for days and days along with members of his staff and other members of the committee, does two very simple and basic things. It is designed to meet the very important disaster needs that exist, not only in my State of California, but in 40 States across this country. It is designed to

rebuild, to rebuild that Federal building that the entire world saw devastated in Oklahoma City, and this bill is designed to cut Federal spending.

The very moving speeches that were just given over the past several hours here in looking at this balanced budget issue have underscored the need to address this. So, disaster assistance and cutting spending; that is what this bill does. It is very important for us to move ahead with this.

Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the rhetoric about all of these tax cuts for the rich, 75 percent of the benefits go to families earning less than $60,000, and I should not say benefits. All we are saying is that they should be able to keep some of their hard-earned dollars. Where do the rest go? They go to the very important job-creating mechanisms that this country desperately needs.

We have serious economic problems. My State of California has yet to recover from the defense and aerospace cuts. We need to have the kinds of tax incentives that are built into the budget that we just passed.

This is a very fair and balanced rule that will lead us toward passage of an important historic appropriations bill. As the chairman of the committee said to our Committee on Rules last night, this is the first time ever that we have been able to have this kind of rescission package built in to meet a very important need.

Vote ''yes'' for this rule, and ''yes'' for this important appropriation and rescission bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 151, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Tuesday, May 16, 1995 at page H5013.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1158, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, just a little while ago we voted to balance the budget over the next 7 years. Mr. Speaker, what we are about to do in this bill is to take the first step, the first step toward that 7-year goal when we ultimately balance the budget.

I am very, very pleased and proud to bring to the House the conference agreement on H.R. 1158, the emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions bill. The scope and size of this agreement is unprecedented. It will rescind over $16.4 billion. Let me stress that. It will rescind over $16.4 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this is the largest single rescissions bill in history, and I say to my colleagues, that if you add in the $3.9 billion that was already rescinded in the emergency defense supplemental that is now law, the rescissions brought forward by the Committee on Appropriations total, in this year of 1995, are over $20.3 billion for the 104th Congress. I do not believe you will find any comparable performance in any previous Congress.

Mr. Speaker, for those who are thinking about voting ''no'' on this bill, let me simply say you would effectively be voting not to save the American taxpayers some $9.1 billion in net savings.

Mr. Speaker, we started developing this bill in our subcommittees the first week in February. Today, over 3 months later, we have got a conference agreement.

It has been tough. Many people said we would not get this far, but we are here. The conference was intense, the issues were hard fought on all sides, and I want to thank all the conferees and all the staff on both sides of the aisle for their very long and hard work.

I want to thank our Senate counterparts, especially the chairman on that side, the Senator from Oregon, Mr. HATFIELD, for his collegial participation in this very difficult conference.

This conference agreement is critically needed so that we can begin to get our government's fiscal house in order. In order to be in a position to achieve the savings anticipated in the budget resolution that we have just passed, Mr. Speaker, we have to start the downsizing of government this year. This agreement does that.

The conference agreement also includes important supplemental appropriations for disaster assistance in the sum of $6.7 billion; for Oklahoma City recovery, $105.4 million; for anti-terrorism initiatives and enhanced security, $145.1 million; and for debt relief requested by the President for the country of Jordan the full sum of $275 million.

These supplemental appropriations are more than offset by the amount of the rescissions or cuts in this bill.

We have achieved the goals that, frankly, I as chairman, set out for the bill. We defunded unauthorized programs. We consolidated programs where duplication was so obvious that a meaningful service could not be developed or provided. We cut back on programs that received large increases in fiscal year 1995 appropriation bills; where we found programs that just do not work or are wasteful or inefficient, we stood up and said so; in other programs we flushed the pipeline, especially in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, where we eliminated those funds that are justifying around being unused.

This bill yields over $9 billion in savings, and none of these savings go for any tax cuts, contrary to what many of the arguers contended during debate on the rule just a little while ago. All of the savings in this bill, under the Byrd amendment, are required to go for deficit reduction.

Yesterday I regret to say, after 4 months of silence, after many, many pleas to come forward and share his thoughts with us, the President of the United States stated his intention to veto this bill when it reaches his desk. I believe that that would be a tragic mistake, Mr. Speaker. His expressed concerns are totally without merit. Over the last 5 months we have been begging the President for his input. His response was the sound of silence, which, unfortunately or fortunately, was broken yesterday with a suggestion of a patchwork of more social spending, and only then, after the conference on this bill was concluded did the President state his concerns and provide a general list of alternative offsets, all of which consist of token increases in programs in which he showed little or no interest as we went through the conference.

In fact, the only indication of a veto threat throughout this entire process was on the subject of striker-replacements, which has not been included in this bill. Apparently, the President needs to reach a little better understanding on conference procedures. If he wants his views considered, he should interject them at that time when they can be considered by the conferees, and I want to assure him that they would be considered as we did with his Oklahoma City request. Coming up with alternatives after the legislative process has already concluded frankly does not reflect a very good grasp of the job. Either that or his staff does not have a good grasp of theirs.

I might add the President still has not given us the courtesy of submitting a formal document to implement his own recommendations. He says he wants more money for Goals 2000. But even with our rescissions, Mr. Speaker, we will spend 300 percent more in fiscal year 1995 than we spent the previous

year, three times the amount, even after including the rescissions in the bill. He wants more money for safe drinking water, but he has not gotten that program authorized. The money can't be spent because the program has not been authorized, Mr. Speaker.

In the last 24 hours, he objects to the emergency salvage timber sales, but his Agriculture Department had actually signed off on the language and cooperated in the perfecting of that language.

He wants more money for Women, Infants, and Children, but his own bureaucrats admit they cannot spend what they have got in the pipeline now. And, finally, he complains about the pork. This is the same President who traveled halfway across America last month to support construction of an unbudgeted swine research facility, which the House was rescinded in the House passed bill.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, every ounce of pork in the Federal checkbook that was not rescinded in this bill has President Clinton's personal stamp on it because it was passed by his Congress, his majority in this House and in the other body, and he signed every bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, the President should indeed get off the sidelines. He should get in the game. We need to get on with our fiscal year 1996 bills. We have already taken too long with this bill.

This is the last shot, the last train leaving the station for fiscal year 1995. Every day that goes by, additional funds that are proposed for rescissions, for cuts, become obligated by the administration. So I hope that we will pass this conference report and begin the process of balancing the budget the old-fashioned way, by making real, specific cuts that appear in this bill, and let us send it to the President, and let us ask him not to veto it.

Now is the time to start balancing the budget. It will not get any better. The decisions will only get harder if we postpone them until fiscal year 1996. All of those causes will only be harder hit if we are going to truly work our way toward a balanced budget.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to vote for this conference report if they want to work toward a balanced budget.

□ 1730

But if you vote ''no,'' in the final analysis, you will be voting not to take the first step towards a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD I will insert a table reflecting the conference agreement.

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158)

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	TITLE I - SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS						
	CHAPTER I						
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
.....	Agricultural Research Service (by transfer)	.....	.....	(2,218,000)	(2,218,000)	(+2,218,000)	.....
	Food Safety and Inspection Service						
104-4	Salaries and expenses	9,082,000	9,048,000	9,082,000	9,082,000	+34,000	.....
	Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	10,000,000	.....	5,000,000	-5,000,000	+5,000,000
	Commodity Credit Corporation						
104-4	Commodity Credit Corporation Fund: Food for progress	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	.....	.....
	General Provisions						
104-4	Section 715 (increase in limitation)	(24,500,000)	.....	(24,500,000)	(24,500,000)	(+24,500,000)	.....
	Total, Department of Agriculture	9,082,000	19,048,000	9,082,000	14,082,000	-4,966,000	+5,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
.....	Office of the Secretary	.....	-31,000	-31,000	-31,000	.....	.....
.....	Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization	.....	-3,000,000	.....	-1,500,000	+1,500,000	-1,500,000
	Agricultural Research Service:						
.....	Buildings and facilities	.....	-12,678,000	-1,500,000	-1,400,000	+11,278,000	+100,000
.....	Cooperative State Research Service	.....	-1,051,000	-958,000	-1,051,000	.....	-93,000
.....	Buildings and facilities	.....	-20,994,000	.....	-2,184,000	+18,810,000	-2,184,000
	Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:						
.....	Buildings and facilities	.....	.....	-6,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	+4,000,000
	Farmers Home Administration						
	Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:						
.....	Rental housing (sec. 515) (loan subsidy)	.....	-115,500,000	.....	-15,500,000	+100,000,000	-15,500,000
.....	Local technical assistance and planning grants	.....	-1,750,000	-1,750,000	-1,750,000	.....	.....
.....	Alcohol Fuels Credit Guarantee Program Account (FY93)	.....	-9,000,000	-9,000,000	-9,000,000	.....	.....
	Total, Farmers Home Administration	.....	-126,250,000	-10,750,000	-26,250,000	+100,000,000	-15,500,000
	Rural Electrification Administration						
	Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account:						
.....	Loan subsidies: Telephone 5%	.....	-3,000,000	-1,500,000	-1,500,000	+1,500,000	.....
	Food and Nutrition Service:						
.....	Special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	.....	-25,000,000	.....	-20,000,000	+5,000,000	-20,000,000
	Food stamp program:						
	Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico:						
104-28	Cattle tick eradication	-2,900,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Public Law 480 Program Account:						
	Title I - Credit sales:						
104-28	Program level	(-60,200,000)	.....	(-60,200,000)	.....	.....	(+60,200,000)
104-28	Ocean freight differential	-6,135,000	.....	-6,135,000	.....	.....	+6,135,000
	Title III - Commodity grants:						
104-28	Program level	(-92,500,000)	(-20,000,000)	(-92,500,000)	(-40,000,000)	(-20,000,000)	(+52,500,000)
104-28	Appropriation	-92,500,000	-20,000,000	-92,500,000	-40,000,000	-20,000,000	+52,500,000
104-28	Loan subsidies	-43,865,000	.....	-43,865,000	.....	.....	+43,865,000
	Total, Public Law 480 program account	-142,500,000	-20,000,000	-142,500,000	-40,000,000	-20,000,000	+102,500,000
	Total, Chapter I:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	-136,318,000	-192,956,000	-154,157,000	-81,834,000	+111,122,000	+72,323,000
	Appropriations	(9,082,000)	(19,048,000)	(9,082,000)	(14,082,000)	(-4,966,000)	(+5,000,000)
	Rescissions	(-145,400,000)	(-212,004,000)	(-163,239,000)	(-95,916,000)	(+116,088,000)	(+67,323,000)
	(By transfer)	.....	.....	(2,218,000)	(2,218,000)	(+2,218,000)	.....
	CHAPTER II						
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
	RELATED AGENCY						
104-4	National Bankruptcy Review Commission (by transfer)	(1,500,000)	.....	(1,500,000)	(1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	(-500,000)
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
	International Organizations and Conferences						
104-4	Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (emergency)	672,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	RELATED AGENCY						
	United States Information Agency						
104-4	International broadcasting operations	7,290,000	7,290,000		7,290,000		+7,290,000
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
	Office of Justice Programs						
	Drug courts (crime trust fund)		-27,750,000	-17,100,000	-22,100,000	+5,650,000	-5,000,000
	Ounce of Prevention Council (crime trust fund)			-1,000,000			+1,000,000
	General Administration						
	Working capital fund 1/		-1,500,000	-5,000,000	-5,500,000	-4,000,000	-500,000
	Legal Activities						
	Assets forfeiture fund			-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	
	Immigration and Naturalization Service						
	Salaries and expenses: General fund appropriation		-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000		
	Federal Prison System						
104-59	Salaries and expenses	-28,037,000			-28,037,000	-28,037,000	-28,037,000
	Total, Department of Justice	-28,037,000	-30,250,000	-29,100,000	-61,637,000	-31,387,000	-32,537,000
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
	National Institute of Standards and Technology						
	Scientific and technical research and services		-16,500,000	-19,500,000	-17,000,000	-500,000	+2,500,000
	Industrial technology services		-27,100,000	-3,100,000	-16,300,000	+10,800,000	-13,200,000
	Construction of research facilities			-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	
	Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology		-43,600,000	-52,600,000	-63,300,000	-19,700,000	-10,700,000
	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
	Operations, research, and facilities		-37,000,000	-23,100,000	-24,200,000	+12,800,000	-1,100,000
	Construction			-15,000,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	
	GOES satellite contingency fund			-2,500,000	-2,500,000	-2,500,000	
	Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration		-37,000,000	-40,600,000	-41,700,000	-4,700,000	-1,100,000
	Technology Administration						
	Salaries and expenses		-3,300,000		-1,750,000	+1,550,000	-1,750,000
	National Technical Information Service						
	NTIS revolving fund		-4,000,000	-7,600,000	-1,000,000	+3,000,000	+6,600,000
	National Telecommunications and Information Administration						
	Information infrastructure grants		-30,000,000		-4,000,000	+26,000,000	-4,000,000
	Economic Development Administration						
	Economic development assistance programs		-7,500,000	-40,000,000	-25,000,000	-17,500,000	+15,000,000
	Emergency appropriations		-37,584,000	-7,384,000	-5,250,000	+32,334,000	+2,134,000
	Total, Department of Commerce		-162,984,000	-148,184,000	-142,000,000	+20,984,000	+6,184,000
	THE JUDICIARY						
	United States Court of International Trade						
	Salaries and expenses			-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	
	Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services						
104-62	Defender services	-5,400,000	-1,100,000	-4,100,000	-9,500,000	-8,400,000	-5,400,000
104-62	Fees of jurors and commissioners	-5,000,000			-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000
	Total, The Judiciary	-10,400,000	-1,100,000	-5,100,000	-15,500,000	-14,400,000	-10,400,000
	RELATED AGENCIES						
	Small Business Administration						
104-28	Salaries and expenses	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000		+15,000,000	+15,000,000
	Business loans program account			-15,000,000	-6,000,000	-6,000,000	+9,000,000
	Total, Small Business Administration	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	-30,000,000	-6,000,000	+9,000,000	+24,000,000

1/ $1,500,000 requested to be transferred to National Bankruptcy Review Commission. House Subcommittee denied request and rescinded the amount.

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	Legal Services Corporation						
	Payment to the Legal Services Corporation		-5,849,000			+5,849,000	
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
	Administration of Foreign Affairs						
	Diplomatic and consular programs		-2,000,000	-2,500,000	-2,250,000	-250,000	+250,000
	Acquisition and maintenance of buildings abroad		-23,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-7,000,000	
	Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs		-25,000,000	-32,500,000	-32,250,000	-7,250,000	+250,000
	International Organizations and Conferences						
	Contributions for international peacekeeping activities		-14,617,000	-14,617,000	-14,617,000		
	Total, Department of State		-39,617,000	-47,117,000	-46,867,000	-7,250,000	+250,000
	RELATED AGENCIES						
	Arms Control and Disarmament Agency						
	Arms control and disarmament activities		-3,000,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	-1,000,000	
	Board for International Broadcasting						
	Israel relay station		-2,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000		
	United States Information Agency						
	Educational and cultural exchange programs		-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000		
	International broadcasting operations			-27,710,000			+27,710,000
	Radio construction		-6,000,000	-6,000,000	-16,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
	Radio Free Asia			-6,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	+1,000,000
	Total, United States Information Agency		-11,000,000	-44,710,000	-26,000,000	-15,000,000	+18,710,000
	Total, Chapter II:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	625,653,000	-263,510,000	-310,211,000	-296,714,000	-33,204,000	+13,497,000
	Emergency appropriations	(672,000,000)					
	Emergency rescissions		(-37,584,000)	(-7,384,000)	(-5,250,000)	(+32,334,000)	(+2,134,000)
	Appropriations	(7,290,000)	(7,290,000)		(7,290,000)		(+7,290,000)
	Rescissions	(-53,437,000)	(-233,216,000)	(-302,827,000)	(-298,754,000)	(-65,538,000)	(+4,073,000)
	(By transfer)	(1,500,000)		(1,500,000)	(1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	(-500,000)
	CHAPTER III						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
	Corps of Engineers - Civil						
	General investigations		-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000		
	Construction, general		-40,000,000	-60,000,000	-60,000,000	-20,000,000	
	Total, Department of Defense - Civil		-50,000,000	-70,000,000	-70,000,000	-20,000,000	
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
	Bureau of Reclamation						
	Operation and maintenance		-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000		
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
	Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities.		-116,500,000	-71,500,000	-74,000,000	+42,500,000	-2,500,000
	Atomic Energy Defense Activities:						
	Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management		-26,000,000	-13,000,000		+26,000,000	+13,000,000
	Materials Support and other Defense programs			-15,000,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	
	Departmental Administration		-20,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000		
	Power Marketing Administrations						
	Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration			-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	
	Total, Department of Energy		-164,500,000	-149,500,000	-139,000,000	+25,500,000	+10,500,000
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	Appalachian Regional Commission		-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000		
	Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund		-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000		
	Total, Chapter III:						
	Rescissions		-239,500,000	-244,500,000	-234,000,000	+5,500,000	+10,500,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	CHAPTER IV						
	FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS						
	BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
104-4	Development assistance fund	18,000,000					
104-4	Economic support fund	82,300,000					
104-4	Debt restructuring: Debt relief for Jordan	275,000,000	50,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	+225,000,000	
	Total, Bilateral Economic Assistance	375,300,000	50,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	+225,000,000	
	MILITARY ASSISTANCE						
104-4	Peacekeeping operations	27,200,000					
	Total, Foreign Operations	402,500,000	50,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	+225,000,000	
	FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS						
	Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs			-125,000,000			+125,000,000
	MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
	International organizations and programs		-25,000,000		-15,000,000	+10,000,000	-15,000,000
	BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
	Agency for International Development						
	Development assistance fund		-45,500,000		-41,300,000	+4,200,000	-41,300,000
	Population, development assistance		-9,000,000		-19,000,000	-10,000,000	-19,000,000
	Development fund for Africa				-21,000,000	-21,000,000	-21,000,000
	Debt restructuring under the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative		-2,400,000		-2,400,000		-2,400,000
	Economic Support Fund		-42,975,000		-25,000,000	+17,975,000	-25,000,000
	Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development		-5,000,000		-2,000,000	+3,000,000	-2,000,000
	Assistance for the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union		-47,700,000		-25,000,000	+22,700,000	-25,000,000
	Total, Bilateral Economic Assistance		-152,575,000		-135,700,000	+16,875,000	-135,700,000
	MILITARY ASSISTANCE						
	Peacekeeping operations		-4,500,000		-3,000,000	+1,500,000	-3,000,000
	EXPORT ASSISTANCE						
	Export-Import Bank of the United States						
	Subsidy appropriation		-5,000,000			+5,000,000	
	Trade and Development Agency						
	Trade and development		-4,500,000		-4,000,000	+500,000	-4,000,000
	Total, Export Assistance		-9,500,000		-4,000,000	+5,500,000	-4,000,000
	Total, Chapter IV:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	402,500,000	-141,575,000	150,000,000	117,300,000	+258,875,000	-32,700,000
	Appropriations	(402,500,000)	(50,000,000)	(275,000,000)	(275,000,000)	(+225,000,000)	
	Rescissions		(-191,575,000)	(-125,000,000)	(-157,700,000)	(+33,875,000)	(-32,700,000)
	CHAPTER V						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
	National Park Service						
104-4	Construction	5,500,000					
104-4	Land acquisition and State assistance	1,300,000					
	Total, National Park Service	6,800,000					
	Bureau of Land Management						
	Management of lands and resources		-70,000	-70,000	-70,000		
	Construction and access		-4,500,000	-2,100,000	-900,000	+3,600,000	+1,200,000
	Payments in lieu of taxes		-5,000,000		-2,500,000	+2,500,000	-2,500,000
	Land acquisition		-1,997,000	-1,497,000	-1,497,000	+500,000	
	Total, Bureau of Land Management		-11,567,000	-3,667,000	-4,967,000	+6,600,000	-1,300,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
.....	Resource management	.....	-2,000,000	.....	.....	+2,000,000	.....
.....	Construction	.....	-14,390,000	-13,215,000	-12,415,000	+1,975,000	+800,000
.....	Land acquisition	.....	-7,345,000	-3,893,000	-1,076,000	+6,269,000	+2,817,000
	Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	.....	-23,735,000	-17,108,000	-13,491,000	+10,244,000	+3,617,000
	National Biological Survey						
.....	Research, inventories, and surveys	.....	-16,680,000	-12,544,000	-14,549,000	+2,131,000	-2,005,000
	National Park Service						
.....	Construction	.....	-22,831,000	-25,970,000	-20,890,000	+1,941,000	+5,080,000
.....	Urban park and recreation fund	.....	-7,480,000	-7,480,000	-7,480,000	.....	.....
.....	Land acquisition and State assistance	.....	-16,509,000	-9,983,000	-13,634,000	+2,875,000	-3,651,000
	Total, National Park Service	.....	-46,820,000	-43,433,000	-42,004,000	+4,816,000	+1,429,000
	Minerals Management Service						
.....	Royalty and offshore minerals management	.....	.....	-814,000	-514,000	-514,000	+300,000
	Bureau of Indian Affairs						
.....	Operation of Indian programs	.....	-4,046,000	-11,350,000	-4,850,000	-804,000	+6,500,000
.....	Construction	.....	-10,309,000	-9,571,000	-9,571,000	+738,000	.....
.....	Indian direct loan program account	.....	.....	-1,900,000	-1,700,000	-1,700,000	+200,000
	Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	.....	-14,355,000	-22,821,000	-16,121,000	-1,766,000	+6,700,000
	Territorial and International Affairs						
.....	Administration of territories	.....	-2,438,000	-1,900,000	-1,938,000	+500,000	-38,000
.....	Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	.....	-32,139,000	-32,139,000	-32,139,000	.....	.....
.....	Compact of Free Association	.....	.....	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	.....
	Total, Territorial and International Affairs	.....	-34,577,000	-35,039,000	-35,077,000	-500,000	-38,000
	Departmental Offices						
.....	Office of the Secretary	.....	.....	-150,000	.....	.....	+150,000
	Total, Department of the Interior	6,800,000	-147,734,000	-135,576,000	-126,723,000	+21,011,000	+8,853,000
	RELATED AGENCIES						
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
	Forest Service						
.....	Forest research	.....	-6,000,000	-6,000,000	-6,000,000	.....	.....
.....	State and private forestry	.....	-12,500,000	-6,250,000	-7,800,000	+4,700,000	-1,550,000
.....	International forestry	.....	-1,000,000	-3,000,000	-2,000,000	-1,000,000	+1,000,000
.....	National forest system	.....	-3,327,000	.....	-1,850,000	+1,477,000	-1,850,000
.....	Construction	.....	-4,919,000	-7,824,000	-6,072,000	-1,153,000	+1,752,000
.....	Land acquisition	.....	-3,974,000	-3,720,000	-1,429,000	+2,545,000	+2,291,000
	Total, Forest Service	.....	-31,720,000	-26,794,000	-24,951,000	+6,769,000	+1,843,000
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
.....	Fossil energy research and development	.....	-18,850,000	-20,750,000	-18,100,000	+550,000	+2,650,000
.....	Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves	.....	-21,000,000	-11,000,000	.....	+21,000,000	+11,000,000
.....	Energy conservation	.....	-59,928,000	-48,628,000	-49,628,000	+10,300,000	-1,000,000
	Total, Department of Energy	.....	-99,578,000	-80,378,000	-67,728,000	+31,850,000	+12,650,000
	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
.....	Indian education	.....	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	.....	.....
	OTHER RELATED AGENCIES						
	Smithsonian Institution						
.....	Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	.....	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	.....	.....
.....	Construction	.....	-31,012,000	-11,237,000	-11,512,000	+19,500,000	-275,000
	Total, Smithsonian Institution	.....	-32,012,000	-12,237,000	-12,512,000	+19,500,000	-275,000
	National Gallery of Art						
.....	Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings	.....	-407,000	-407,000	-407,000	.....	.....
	John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts						
.....	Construction	.....	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	.....	.....

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-2,300,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	+1,300,000	.....
	National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities						
	National Endowment for the Arts						
.....	Grants and administration	.....	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	.....	.....
	National Endowment for the Humanities						
.....	Grants and administration	.....	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	.....	.....
	Total, Chapter V:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	6,800,000	-328,751,000	-271,392,000	-248,321,000	+80,430,000	+23,071,000
	Appropriations	(6,800,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Rescissions	.....	(-328,751,000)	(-271,392,000)	(-248,321,000)	(+80,430,000)	(+23,071,000)
	CHAPTER VI						
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR						
	Employment and Training Administration						
.....	Training and employment services	.....	-2,284,132,000	-1,308,720,000	-1,399,115,000	+885,017,000	-90,395,000
.....	Community service employment for older Americans	.....	-14,440,000	-14,440,000	-14,440,000	.....	.....
.....	State unemployment insurance and employment service operations	.....	-12,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	-8,000,000	.....
104-4 104-39	Limitation on trust fund transfer	-40,700,000	-47,700,000	-67,700,000	-67,700,000	-20,000,000	.....
	Total, Employment and Training Administration	-40,700,000	-2,358,272,000	-1,410,860,000	-1,501,255,000	+857,017,000	-90,395,000
	Employment Standards Administration						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-2,487,000	.....	.....	+2,487,000	.....
	Occupational Safety and Health Administration						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-19,572,000	.....	.....	+19,572,000	.....
	Bureau of Labor Statistics						
104-28	Salaries and expenses	-1,100,000	.....	-1,100,000	-700,000	-700,000	+400,000
	Compliance Assistance Activities						
.....	Compliance assistance activities (sec. 602)	.....	.....	-8,975,000	.....	.....	+8,975,000
	Total, Department of Labor	-41,800,000	-2,380,331,000	-1,420,935,000	-1,501,955,000	+878,376,000	-81,020,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
	Health Resources and Services Administration						
104-28	Program operations	-29,147,000	-53,925,000	-42,071,000	-41,350,000	+12,575,000	+721,000
	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention						
104-28	Disease control, research, and training	-1,300,000	-8,883,000	-1,300,000	-2,300,000	+6,583,000	-1,000,000
	National Institutes of Health						
104-28	National Center for Research Resources	-1,000,000	-20,000,000	.....	-10,000,000	+10,000,000	-10,000,000
.....	Buildings and facilities	.....	-50,000,000	-79,289,000	-60,000,000	-10,000,000	+19,289,000
	Total, National Institutes of Health	-1,000,000	-70,000,000	-79,289,000	-70,000,000	.....	+9,289,000
	Assistant Secretary for Health						
.....	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health	.....	-1,400,000	-2,320,000	-1,400,000	.....	+920,000
	Agency for Health Care Policy and Research						
.....	Health care policy and research	.....	-3,132,000	-3,132,000	-3,132,000	.....	.....
	Health Care Financing Administration						
104-4	Program management	-20,000,000	-26,200,000	-15,700,000	-19,700,000	+6,500,000	-4,000,000
	Social Security Administration						
.....	Supplemental security income program	.....	.....	(-87,000,000)	.....	.....	(+87,000,000)
.....	Limitation on administrative expenses	.....	.....	(-88,283,000)	.....	.....	(+88,283,000)
	Administration for Children and Families						
.....	Job opportunities and basic skills	.....	.....	-330,000,000	-330,000,000	-330,000,000	.....
.....	Low income home energy assistance (advance appropriation, 1996)	.....	-1,319,204,000	.....	-319,204,000	+1,000,000,000	-319,204,000
.....	State legalization impact assistance grants	.....	.....	-6,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	+4,000,000
.....	Child care and development block grant	.....	.....	.....	-8,400,000	-8,400,000	-8,400,000
.....	Community services block grant	.....	-26,988,000	-12,888,000	-15,287,000	+11,701,000	-2,399,000
.....	Children and families services programs	.....	-25,900,000	.....	-25,900,000	.....	-25,900,000
.....	Payments to States for foster care and adoption assistance (indefinite)	.....	-150,000,000	.....	.....	+150,000,000	.....
	Total, Administration for Children and Families	.....	-1,522,092,000	-348,888,000	-700,791,000	+821,301,000	-351,903,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
.....	Administration on aging	.....	-899,000	-899,000	-899,000	.....	.....
	Office of the Secretary						
.....	Policy research	.....	.....	-4,018,000	-4,018,000	-4,018,000	.....
	Total, Department of Health and Human Services	-51,447,000	-1,688,531,000	-497,617,000	-843,590,000	+844,941,000	-345,973,000
	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
.....	Education reform	.....	-186,030,000	-10,100,000	-104,030,000	+82,000,000	-93,930,000
.....	Education for the disadvantaged	.....	-146,570,000	-7,900,000	-4,606,000	+143,964,000	+3,294,000
.....	Impact aid	.....	-16,293,000	.....	.....	+16,293,000	.....
.....	School improvement programs	.....	-735,921,000	-111,317,000	-391,840,000	+344,081,000	-280,523,000
.....	Crime trust fund	.....	-11,100,000	-11,100,000	-11,100,000	.....	.....
.....	Bilingual and immigrant education	.....	-38,500,000	-34,580,000	-38,500,000	.....	-3,920,000
	Special Institutions for Persons With Disabilities:						
.....	National Technical Institute for the Deaf	.....	-799,000	.....	.....	+799,000	.....
.....	Gallaudet University	.....	-1,298,000	.....	.....	+1,298,000	.....
	Total	.....	-2,097,000	.....	.....	+2,097,000	.....
104-28	Vocational and adult education	-43,888,000	-119,544,000	-54,566,000	-90,607,000	+28,937,000	-36,041,000
.....	Student financial assistance	.....	-187,475,000	-10,000,000	-85,000,000	+102,475,000	-75,000,000
.....	Howard University	.....	-4,300,000	-3,300,000	-1,800,000	+2,500,000	+1,500,000
104-28	Higher education	-26,903,000	-102,246,000	-42,159,000	-54,672,000	+47,574,000	-12,513,000
104-28	College housing and academic facilities loans program	-166,000	-490,000	-490,000	-432,000	+58,000	+58,000
104-28	Education research, statistics, and improvement	-750,000	-55,250,000	-15,200,000	-30,925,000	+24,325,000	-15,725,000
104-28	Libraries	-12,942,000	-26,716,000	-2,916,000	.....	+26,716,000	+2,916,000
.....	Program administration	.....	.....	-4,424,000	.....	.....	+4,424,000
	Total, Department of Education	-84,651,000	-1,634,532,000	-308,052,000	-813,512,000	+821,020,000	-505,460,000
	RELATED AGENCIES						
	Corporation for Public Broadcasting:						
.....	Advance appropriation, 1996	.....	-47,000,000	-26,360,000	-37,000,000	+10,000,000	-10,640,000
.....	Advance appropriation, 1997	.....	-94,000,000	-29,360,000	-55,000,000	+39,000,000	-25,640,000
	Railroad Retirement Board:						
.....	Dual benefits payments account	.....	-5,000,000	-7,000,000	-7,000,000	-2,000,000	.....
	GENERAL PROVISIONS						
	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
.....	Federal direct student loans	.....	-47,000,000	-95,000,000	-61,000,000	-14,000,000	+34,000,000
	Total, Chapter VI: Rescissions	-177,898,000	-5,896,394,000	-2,384,324,000	-3,319,057,000	+2,577,337,000	-934,733,000
	CHAPTER VII						
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH						
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES						
	Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress						
.....	Gratuities, deceased Members	.....	133,600	133,600	133,600	.....	.....
	JOINT ITEMS						
.....	Joint Economic Committee	.....	-460,000	-460,000	-460,000	.....	.....
.....	Joint Committee on Printing	.....	-418,000	-238,137	-238,137	+179,863	.....
	Total, Joint items	.....	-878,000	-698,137	-698,137	+179,863	.....
	OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-650,000	-650,000	-650,000	.....	.....
	CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-187,000	-187,000	-187,000	.....	.....
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL						
	Capitol Buildings and Grounds						
.....	Capitol buildings	.....	-2,500,000	.....	.....	+2,500,000	.....
.....	Senate office buildings	.....	.....	-850,000	-850,000	-850,000	.....
.....	Capitol Power Plant	.....	.....	-1,650,000	-1,650,000	-1,650,000	.....
.....	Capitol complex security enhancements (transfer from Botanic Garden)	.....	(3,000,000)	.....	(3,000,000)	.....	(+3,000,000)
	Total, Capitol Buildings and Grounds	.....	-2,500,000	-2,500,000	-2,500,000	.....	.....

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE						
.....	Congressional printing and binding	.....	-3,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-2,000,000	.....
	Office of Superintendent of Documents						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-600,000	-600,000	-600,000	.....	.....
	Total, Government Printing Office	.....	-3,600,000	-5,600,000	-5,600,000	-2,000,000	.....
	BOTANIC GARDEN						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-4,000,000	-7,000,000	-4,000,000	.....	+3,000,000
	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-150,000	-150,000	-150,000	.....	.....
.....	Books for the blind and physically handicapped, salaries and expenses	.....	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	.....	.....
	Total, Library of Congress	.....	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000	.....	.....
	GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-8,867,000	-8,867,000	-2,617,000	+8,250,000	+8,250,000
	Total, Chapter VII:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	.....	-20,798,490	-25,618,537	-18,368,537	+4,429,863	+9,250,000
	Appropriations	.....	(133,600)	(133,600)	(133,600)	.....	.....
	Rescissions	.....	(-20,932,000)	(-25,752,137)	(-18,502,137)	(+4,429,863)	(+9,250,000)
	(By transfer)	.....	(3,000,000)	.....	(3,000,000)	.....	(+3,000,000)
	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
.....	Military construction, Army	.....	.....	-10,000,000	.....	.....	+10,000,000
.....	Military construction, Navy	.....	.....	-13,050,000	.....	.....	+13,050,000
104-4	Emergency appropriation	18,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	Military construction, Air Force	.....	.....	-33,250,000	.....	.....	+33,250,000
.....	Military construction, Air National Guard	.....	.....	-1,340,000	.....	.....	+1,340,000
	Total, Military Construction	.....	.....	-57,640,000	.....	.....	+57,640,000
.....	North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure	.....	.....	-69,000,000	.....	.....	+69,000,000
	Base realignment and closure accounts:						
.....	Part II	.....	.....	-10,628,000	.....	.....	+10,628,000
.....	Part III	.....	.....	-93,566,000	.....	.....	+93,566,000
	Total, Base realignment and closure accounts	.....	.....	-104,194,000	.....	.....	+104,194,000
	Total, Military Construction:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	18,000,000	.....	-230,834,000	.....	.....	+230,834,000
	Emergency appropriations	(18,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Rescissions	.....	.....	(-230,834,000)	.....	.....	(+230,834,000)
	CHAPTER VIII						
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
	Coast Guard						
104-4	Operating expenses (emergency)	28,297,000	28,197,000	.....	.....	-28,197,000	.....
	Federal Railroad Administration						
104-4	Office of the administrator (by transfer)	(611,950)	(611,950)	(611,950)	(611,950)	.....	.....
	Federal Transit Administration						
.....	Mass transit capital fund (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization)	.....	.....	.....	(350,000,000)	(+350,000,000)	(+350,000,000)
	Office of the Secretary						
.....	Transportation, planning, research, and development	.....	-1,293,000	.....	.....	+1,293,000	.....
.....	Working capital fund	.....	-8,000,000	-4,000,000	-6,000,000	+2,000,000	-2,000,000
104-28	Payments to air carriers (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	-7,680,000	.....	-5,300,000	-5,300,000	-5,300,000	.....
	Total, Office of the Secretary	-7,680,000	-9,293,000	-9,300,000	-11,300,000	-2,007,000	-2,000,000
	Coast Guard						
.....	Operating expenses	.....	-6,440,000	-3,700,000	-4,300,000	+2,140,000	-600,000
	Acquisition, construction, and improvements:						
.....	Hurricane Andrew/Iniki supplemental (emergency)	.....	-4,400,000	-4,400,000	-4,400,000	.....	.....
.....	Vessels	.....	-12,333,000	-12,133,000	-12,133,000	+200,000	.....
.....	Aircraft	.....	-3,400,000	.....	.....	+3,400,000	.....
.....	Other equipment	.....	-6,155,000	-2,000,000	-2,500,000	+3,655,000	-500,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
.....	Shore facilities and aids to navigation	.....	-18,281,000	-15,765,000	-18,281,000	.....	-516,000
	Subtotal	.....	-42,569,000	-34,298,000	-35,314,000	+7,255,000	-1,016,000
.....	Environmental compliance and restoration	.....	-3,500,000	-400,000	-2,500,000	+1,000,000	-2,100,000
	Total, Coast Guard	.....	-52,509,000	-38,398,000	-42,114,000	+10,395,000	-3,716,000
	Federal Aviation Administration						
.....	Operations	.....	.....	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	.....
.....	Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	.....	-69,825,000	-31,850,000	-24,850,000	+44,975,000	+7,000,000
.....	Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	.....	-7,500,000	-7,500,000	-7,500,000	.....	.....
104-59	Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	-94,000,000	.....	-2,000,000,000	-2,094,000,000	-2,094,000,000	-94,000,000
	Total, Federal Aviation Administration	-94,000,000	-77,325,000	-2,040,350,000	-2,127,350,000	-2,050,025,000	-87,000,000
	Federal Highway Administration						
.....	Limitation on general operating expenses	.....	(-42,500,000)	(-45,950,000)	(-54,550,000)	(-12,050,000)	(-8,600,000)
	Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):						
.....	(Limitation on obligations)	.....	(-70,140,000)	(-123,590,000)	(-132,190,000)	(-62,050,000)	(-8,600,000)
.....	Rescission	.....	.....	.....	-132,190,000	-132,190,000	-132,190,000
104-4	(Bonus obligations)	(-208,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	Emergency relief program	.....	-351,000,000	-50,000,000	-100,000,000	+251,000,000	-50,000,000
104-4	Federal-aid highways	-356,154,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
104-4	Miscellaneous highway trust funds	-8,890,000	.....	-140,638,074	.....	.....	+140,638,074
104-4	Miscellaneous appropriations	-36,956,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Total, Federal Highway Administration	-400,000,000	-351,000,000	-190,638,074	-232,190,000	+118,810,000	-41,551,926
	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration						
.....	Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund)	.....	.....	-20,000,000	.....	.....	+20,000,000
	Federal Railroad Administration						
.....	Northeast corridor improvement program	.....	-7,768,000	-7,768,000	-9,707,000	-1,939,000	-1,939,000
.....	National MAGLEV prototype development (Highway Trust Fund)	.....	.....	-250,000,000	-250,000,000	-250,000,000	.....
	Total, Federal Railroad Administration	.....	-7,768,000	-257,768,000	-259,707,000	-251,939,000	-1,939,000
	Federal Transit Administration						
.....	Transit planning and research	.....	-8,800,000	.....	-7,000,000	+1,800,000	-7,000,000
	Discretionary grants:						
.....	(Limitation on obligations) (Highway Trust Fund)	.....	(-131,651,000)	(-67,293,000)	(-33,911,500)	(+97,739,500)	(+33,381,500)
.....	Rescission	.....	.....	.....	-33,911,500	-33,911,500	-33,911,500
	Total, Federal Transit Administration	.....	-8,800,000	.....	-40,911,500	-32,111,500	-40,911,500
	GENERAL PROVISIONS						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-20,000,000	-10,000,000	-15,000,000	+5,000,000	-5,000,000
	Total, Chapter VIII:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	-473,383,000	-498,498,000	-2,566,454,074	-2,728,572,500	-2,230,074,500	-162,118,426
	Emergency appropriations	(28,297,000)	(28,197,000)	.....	.....	(-28,197,000)	.....
	Emergency rescissions	.....	(-355,400,000)	(-54,400,000)	(-104,400,000)	(+251,000,000)	(-50,000,000)
	Rescissions	(-501,680,000)	(-171,295,000)	(-2,512,054,074)	(-2,624,172,500)	(-2,452,877,500)	(-112,118,426)
	(Limitations on obligations)	(-208,000,000)	(-201,791,000)	(-190,863,000)	(-166,101,500)	(+35,689,500)	(+24,761,500)
	(By transfer)	(611,950)	(611,950)	(611,950)	(611,950)	.....	.....
	CHAPTER IX						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
	United States Customs Service:						
.....	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	.....	.....	(13,200,000)	(13,200,000)	(+13,200,000)	.....
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
.....	Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	.....	.....	500,000	.....	.....	-500,000
	Office of Personnel Management:						
104-4	Government payment for annuitants, employee life insurance benefits	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	.....	.....
	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
.....	Departmental offices	.....	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	.....	.....
	Federal Law Enforcement Training Center:						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	.....	.....	11,000,000	+11,000,000	+11,000,000
.....	Acquisition, construction, improvements, and related expenses	.....	-11,000,000	.....	-11,000,000	.....	-11,000,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
.....	Financial Management Service	.....	-160,000	-160,000	-160,000	.....	.....
.....	Bureau of the Public Debt	.....	-1,500,000	-1,500,000	-1,500,000	.....	.....
.....	Internal Revenue Service: Information systems	.....	-1,490,000	-1,490,000	-1,490,000	.....	.....
	Total, Department of the Treasury	.....	-14,250,000	-3,250,000	-3,250,000	+11,000,000	.....
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT						
.....	The White House Office	.....	-171,000	-171,000	-171,000	.....	.....
	Federal Drug Control Programs:						
.....	Special Forfeiture Fund	.....	.....	13,200,000	13,200,000	+13,200,000	.....
.....	Rescission	.....	-13,200,000	-13,200,000	-13,200,000	.....	.....
	Total, Executive Office of the President	.....	-13,371,000	-171,000	-171,000	+13,200,000	.....
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	General Services Administration:						
.....	Federal Buildings Fund: Rescissions	.....	-136,593,000	-1,894,840,000	-580,412,000	-443,819,000	+1,314,428,000
.....	Operating expenses	.....	-2,065,000	.....	.....	+2,065,000	.....
	Total, General Services Administration	.....	-138,658,000	-1,894,840,000	-580,412,000	-441,754,000	+1,314,428,000
.....	Federal Election Commission	.....	-2,792,000	.....	-1,396,000	+1,396,000	-1,396,000
	Office of Personnel Management:						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	-3,140,000	-3,140,000	-3,140,000	.....	.....
	Total, Chapter IX:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	9,000,000	-163,211,000	-1,891,901,000	-579,369,000	-416,158,000	+1,312,532,000
	Appropriations	(9,000,000)	(9,000,000)	(22,700,000)	(33,200,000)	(+24,200,000)	(+10,500,000)
	Rescissions	.....	(-172,211,000)	(-1,914,601,000)	(-612,569,000)	(-440,358,000)	(+1,302,032,000)
	(By transfer)	.....	.....	(13,200,000)	(13,200,000)	(+13,200,000)	.....
	CHAPTER X						
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY						
104-4	Disaster relief (emergency)	6,700,000,000	5,360,000,000	1,900,000,000	3,350,000,000	-2,010,000,000	+1,450,000,000
.....	Advance appropriation, FY 1996 (emergency)	.....	.....	4,800,000,000	3,350,000,000	+3,350,000,000	-1,450,000,000
104-4	National flood insurance fund (by transfer)	(5,331,000)	.....	(5,331,000)	(5,331,000)	(+5,331,000)	.....
	Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency..	6,700,000,000	5,360,000,000	6,700,000,000	6,700,000,000	+1,340,000,000	.....
	CORPORATIONS						
	Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:						
.....	Bank Enterprise Act	.....	.....	.....	36,000,000	+36,000,000	+36,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS						
	Veterans Health Administration						
.....	Medical care	.....	.....	-50,000,000	-50,000,000	-50,000,000	.....
	Departmental Administration						
.....	Construction, major projects	.....	.....	-50,000,000	-31,000,000	-31,000,000	+19,000,000
	Total, Department of Veterans Affairs	.....	.....	-100,000,000	-81,000,000	-81,000,000	+19,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
	Housing Programs						
.....	National homeownership trust demonstration program	.....	-50,000,000	-50,000,000	-50,000,000	.....	.....
104-28	Annual contributions for assisted housing	-439,200,000	-5,733,400,000	-3,721,289,000	-5,031,400,000	+702,000,000	-1,310,111,000
.....	(Deferral)	.....	.....	(465,000,000)	(405,900,000)	(+405,900,000)	(-59,100,000)
.....	Assistance for the renewal of expiring section 8 subsidy contracts	.....	.....	-1,050,000,000	-1,177,000,000	-1,177,000,000	-127,000,000
104-28	Congregate services	-37,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	Payments for operation of low-income housing projects	.....	-404,000,000	.....	.....	+404,000,000	.....
.....	Severely distressed public housing	.....	-523,000,000	.....	.....	+523,000,000	.....
.....	Drug elimination grants for low-income housing	.....	-32,000,000	.....	.....	+32,000,000	.....
.....	Youthbuild program	.....	-38,000,000	.....	-10,000,000	+28,000,000	-10,000,000
.....	Housing counseling assistance	.....	-38,000,000	-38,000,000	-38,000,000	.....	.....
.....	Flexible subsidy fund	.....	-8,000,000	.....	-8,000,000	.....	-8,000,000
.....	Nehemiah housing opportunities fund	.....	-19,000,000	-17,700,000	-10,500,000	+8,500,000	+7,200,000
.....	Total, Housing Programs	-476,200,000	-6,845,400,000	-4,876,989,000	-6,324,900,000	+520,500,000	-1,447,911,000
	Homeless Assistance						
.....	Homeless Assistance grants (deferral)	.....	(297,000,000)	.....	(297,000,000)	.....	(+297,000,000)

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	Community Planning and Development						
.....	Community development grants	.....	-349,200,000	.....	.....	+349,200,000	.....
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development	-478,200,000	-7,194,600,000	-4,876,989,000	-6,324,900,000	+869,700,000	-1,447,911,000
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board						
104-26	Salaries and expenses	-500,000	-500,000	-500,000	-500,000	.....	.....
	Community Development Financial Institutions						
.....	Community development financial institutions fund program account	.....	-124,000,000	-88,000,000	-124,000,000	.....	-36,000,000
	Corporation for National and Community Service						
.....	National and community service programs	.....	-416,110,000	-105,000,000	-210,000,000	+206,110,000	-105,000,000
	Environmental Protection Agency						
104-26	Research and development	-3,635,000	-14,635,000	-9,635,000	-14,635,000	.....	-5,000,000
104-26	Abatement, control, and compliance	-4,806,805	-4,806,805	-9,806,805	-9,806,805	-5,000,000	.....
.....	Buildings and facilities	.....	-25,000,000	-83,000,000	-83,000,000	-58,000,000	.....
.....	Hazardous substance superfund	.....	.....	-100,000,000	-100,000,000	-100,000,000	.....
104-26	Water infrastructure / State revolving fund	-3,200,000	-1,303,200,000	-1,242,095,000	-1,302,200,000	+1,000,000	-60,105,000
	Total, Environmental Protection Agency	-11,641,805	-1,347,641,805	-1,444,536,805	-1,509,641,805	-162,000,000	-65,105,000
	National Aeronautics and Space Administration						
.....	Science, aeronautics and technology	.....	-75,000,000	-68,000,000	-52,000,000	+23,000,000	+16,000,000
104-26	Construction of facilities	-27,000,000	-27,000,000	-76,000,000	-34,000,000	-7,000,000	+42,000,000
104-26	Mission support	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-6,000,000	-32,000,000	-31,000,000	-26,000,000
104-59	Space flight, control and data communications	-10,000,000	.....	.....	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000
	Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration	-38,000,000	-103,000,000	-150,000,000	-138,000,000	-35,000,000	+12,000,000
	National Science Foundation						
104-26	Academic research infrastructure	-131,867,000	-131,867,000	-131,867,000	-131,867,000	.....	.....
	CORPORATIONS						
	Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:						
.....	FDIC affordable housing program	.....	-11,281,034	-11,281,034	-11,281,034	.....	.....
	Total, Chapter X:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	6,041,791,195	-3,968,999,839	-208,173,839	-1,795,189,839	+2,173,810,000	-1,587,016,000
	Emergency appropriations	(6,700,000,000)	(5,360,000,000)	(6,700,000,000)	(6,700,000,000)	(+1,340,000,000)	.....
	Appropriations	.....	.....	.....	(36,000,000)	(+36,000,000)	(+36,000,000)
	Rescissions	(-658,208,805)	(-9,328,999,839)	(-6,908,173,839)	(-8,531,189,839)	(+797,810,000)	(-1,623,016,000)
	(By transfer)	(5,331,000)	.....	(5,331,000)	(5,331,000)	(+5,331,000)	.....
	(Deferrals)	.....	(297,000,000)	(465,000,000)	(702,900,000)	(+405,900,000)	(+237,900,000)
	Total, Title I:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	6,316,345,195	-11,714,193,239	-8,137,565,450	-9,182,125,878	+2,532,067,363	-1,044,560,428
	Emergency appropriations	(7,416,297,000)	(5,388,197,000)	(6,700,000,000)	(6,700,000,000)	(+1,311,803,000)	.....
	Emergency rescissions	.....	(-392,984,000)	(-61,784,000)	(-109,850,000)	(+283,334,000)	(-47,866,000)
	Appropriations	(434,672,000)	(85,471,600)	(306,915,600)	(365,705,600)	(+280,234,000)	(+58,790,000)
	Rescissions	(-1,536,623,805)	(-16,794,877,839)	(-15,082,697,050)	(-16,138,181,478)	(+656,696,363)	(-1,055,484,428)
	(Increases in limitations on obligations)	(24,500,000)	.....	(24,500,000)	(24,500,000)	(+24,500,000)	.....
	(Reductions in limitations on obligations)	(-206,000,000)	(-201,791,000)	(-279,168,000)	(-166,101,500)	(+35,689,500)	(+113,064,500)
	(By transfer)	(7,442,950)	(3,611,950)	(22,860,950)	(25,360,950)	(+21,749,000)	(+2,500,000)
	(Deferrals)	.....	(297,000,000)	(465,000,000)	(702,900,000)	(+405,900,000)	(+237,900,000)
	TITLE II - GENERAL PROVISIONS						
	Emergency two-year salvage timber sale program (Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management):						
.....	Salvage costs/payments	.....	3,831,000	3,831,000	3,831,000	.....	.....
.....	Receipts	.....	-35,000,000	-35,000,000	-35,000,000	.....	.....
.....	Federal administration and travel expenses	.....	.....	-342,500,000	.....	.....	+342,500,000
	Total, Title II:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	.....	-31,169,000	-373,669,000	-31,169,000	.....	+342,500,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	TITLE III						
	EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ANTI-TERRORISM INITIATIVES OKLAHOMA CITY RECOVERY						
	CHAPTER I						
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
	Office of Justice Programs						
104-62	Justice assistance	4,000,000					
	General Administration						
104-62	Salaries and expenses	8,700,000			34,220,000	+34,220,000	+34,220,000
	Legal Activities						
104-62	Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys	4,034,000			2,000,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000
104-62	Salaries and expenses, United States Marshals Service	2,521,000					
	Total, Legal activities	6,555,000			2,000,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000
	Federal Bureau of Investigation						
104-62	Salaries and expenses	49,200,000			77,140,000	+77,140,000	+77,140,000
	Drug Enforcement Administration						
104-62	Salaries and expenses	3,000,000					
	Total, Department of Justice	71,455,000			113,360,000	+113,360,000	+113,360,000
	THE JUDICIARY						
	Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services						
104-62	Court security	10,400,000			16,640,000	+16,640,000	+16,640,000
	Total, Chapter I: New budget (obligational) authority	81,855,000			130,000,000	+130,000,000	+130,000,000
	CHAPTER II						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
104-62	Departmental offices	300,000					
104-62	Financial Crimes Enforcement Network	300,000					
104-62	Federal Law Enforcement Training Center	1,100,000			1,100,000	+1,100,000	+1,100,000
104-62	Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms	16,207,000			34,823,000	+34,823,000	+34,823,000
	United States Customs Service:						
104-62	Salaries and expenses	1,200,000			1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
	Internal Revenue Service:						
104-62	Administration and management	1,000,000					
104-62	United States Secret Service	3,875,000			6,675,000	+6,675,000	+6,675,000
	Total, Department of the Treasury	23,982,000			43,598,000	+43,598,000	+43,598,000
	INDEPENDENT AGENCY						
	General Services Administration:						
	Federal Buildings Fund:						
	Limitations on availability of revenue:						
104-62	Construction and acquisition of facilities	(2,300,000)			(2,300,000)	(+2,300,000)	(+2,300,000)
	Alfred P. Murrah Federal Office Building				(40,400,000)	(+40,400,000)	(+40,400,000)
104-62	Repairs and alterations	(3,300,000)			(3,300,000)	(+3,300,000)	(+3,300,000)
104-62	Rental of space	(8,300,000)			(8,300,000)	(+8,300,000)	(+8,300,000)
104-62	Real property operations	(12,500,000)			(12,500,000)	(+12,500,000)	(+12,500,000)
	Total, limitations	(26,400,000)			(66,800,000)	(+66,800,000)	(+66,800,000)
	Total, Chapter II:						
	Budgetary resources available	50,382,000			110,398,000	+110,398,000	+110,398,000
	Emergency appropriations	(23,982,000)			(43,598,000)	(+43,598,000)	(+43,598,000)
	(Limitations on availability of revenue)	(26,400,000)			(66,800,000)	(+66,800,000)	(+66,800,000)
	CHAPTER III						
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
	Management and Administration						
104-62	Salaries and expenses	3,200,000			3,200,000	+3,200,000	+3,200,000

FY 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL (H.R. 1158) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY						
104-62	Salaries and expenses	3,523,000	.....	.....	3,523,000	+3,523,000	+3,523,000
104-62	Emergency management planning and assistance	3,477,000	.....	.....	3,477,000	+3,477,000	+3,477,000
	Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency	7,000,000	.....	.....	7,000,000	+7,000,000	+7,000,000
	Total, Chapter III:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	10,200,000	.....	.....	10,200,000	+10,200,000	+10,200,000
	Total, Title III:						
	Budgetary resources available	142,437,000	.....	.....	250,598,000	+250,598,000	+250,598,000
	Emergency appropriations	(116,037,000)	.....	.....	(183,798,000)	(+183,798,000)	(+183,798,000)
	(Limitations on availability of revenue)	(26,400,000)	.....	.....	(66,800,000)	(+66,800,000)	(+66,800,000)
	Grand Total:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	8,432,382,195	-11,745,382,239	-8,511,234,450	-9,029,496,876	+2,715,885,363	-518,262,426
	Emergency appropriations	(7,534,334,000)	(5,388,197,000)	(6,700,000,000)	(6,883,798,000)	(+1,495,601,000)	(+183,798,000)
	Emergency rescissions	.....	(-392,984,000)	(-61,784,000)	(-109,650,000)	(+283,334,000)	(-47,866,000)
	Appropriations	(434,672,000)	(54,302,800)	(275,746,800)	(334,536,800)	(+280,234,000)	(+58,790,000)
	Rescissions	(-1,536,623,805)	(-16,794,877,839)	(-15,425,197,050)	(-16,138,181,476)	(+656,696,363)	(-712,984,426)
	(FY 1995)	(-1,536,623,805)	(-15,334,673,839)	(-15,369,477,050)	(-15,726,977,476)	(-392,303,637)	(-357,500,426)
	(FY 1996)	.....	(-1,366,204,000)	(-26,360,000)	(-356,204,000)	(+1,010,000,000)	(-329,844,000)
	(FY 1997)	.....	(-94,000,000)	(-29,360,000)	(-55,000,000)	(+39,000,000)	(-25,640,000)
	(Increases in limitations on obligations)	(50,900,000)	.....	(24,500,000)	(91,300,000)	(+91,300,000)	(+66,800,000)
	(Reductions in limitations on obligations)	(-208,000,000)	(-201,791,000)	(-279,166,000)	(-166,101,500)	(+35,689,500)	(+113,064,500)
	(Total, appropriations and increases in limitations on obligations)	(8,019,906,000)	(5,442,499,800)	(7,000,246,800)	(7,309,634,800)	(+1,867,135,000)	(+309,388,000)
	(Total, rescissions and reductions in limitations on obligations)	(-1,744,623,805)	(-17,389,652,839)	(-15,766,147,050)	(-16,413,932,976)	(+975,719,863)	(-647,785,926)
	(By transfer)	(7,442,950)	(3,611,950)	(22,860,950)	(25,360,950)	(+21,749,000)	(+2,500,000)
	(Deferrals)	.....	(297,000,000)	(465,000,000)	(702,900,000)	(+405,900,000)	(+237,900,000)

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, this debate is the not about spending levels. The President in his message yesterday indicated he wants to spend $50 million less than the amount provided in the conference report. There are some other very good reasons to vote against this bill.

First of all, this bill cuts programs for kids and old folks, and despite the denials on the Republican side of the aisle, it does so to pay for tax gifts for the wealthy and the well-connected. We just passed a budget resolution which slashed Medicare to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy. Under that proposal, we are going to go back to the ''good old days,'' such as we had between 1982 and 1985, when 47 Fortune 500 corporations, even though they made hundreds of millions of dollars in profits, paid not one dime in Federal taxes.

Even President Reagan recognized that was wrong, closed the loophole in 1985. Under the tax proposals passed by this House and endorsed by the budget resolution passed today, we are going to go back to those ''good old days.'' And this bill is going to help pay for that new loophole. We should not be doing that.

Let me trace for you the history of what has happened on so-called deficit reduction in this bill. When this bill was first in the committee, as the gentlewoman from California pointed out, the committee chairman said that the cuts in this bill were going to be used at least in part to pay for those tax cuts. Then that rhetoric was softened.

During the debate in the committee, we said we thought it was wrong to cut Healthy Start for preborn kids; we said we thought it was wrong to cut school nutrition; we said we thought it was wrong to cut public broadcasting for preschool kids; we said we thought it was wrong to cut education and training funds; we said we thought it was wrong to cut fuel assistance and housing for the elderly all in order to give somebody who was making $200,000 a year a tax cut.

The Republicans in committee voted down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], which tried to dedicate all cuts to deficit reduction. On the floor, after pressure on that subject, the Republican majority said: ''OK, we changed our mind.'' They voted for the Brewster amendment, and so did we, which said that all of the funds that were saved in the bill would be used for deficit reduction.

One day after that amendment passed the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, said that well, they could not afford to live with that language because they wanted to have the out-year savings used in order to finance that tax package. Now the chairman of the committee claims that because of the adoption of the Senate amendment in conference, that somehow the Brewster amendment is protected.

I want to ask one question: If the Brewster amendment was protected, why did the Republican conferees vote against my motion in conference to keep it? You voted against it, you killed my amendment that would have saved the Brewster amendment, 8 to 6. If the Brewster amendment had been protected in conference, $50 billion more of savings in this bill would be dedicated for deficit reduction. They would not be available to finance that turkey of a rich man's tax cut that you supported on the other side of the aisle.

The CBO, as I said earlier, fully understands that if all of the dollars that were saved in this bill were dedicated to deficit reduction, as the Brewster amendment provided, there would be $50 billion more in deficit reduction provided under this proposal. So I think that is reason enough to vote for this proposition.

And there is a second reason. It is simply because this bill represents warped priorities. It cuts education and training funds by $875 million. Is it really smart to cut our effort to preserve drug-free schools by 50 percent? Is it really smart to cut school-to-work programs? Do you really want to take deep cuts in elderly and housing projects in order to move funds down the line to use for tax cuts for wealthy people?

Someone on the other side have just suggested that the LIHEAP program, low income heating assistance program, was not all that important to old folks anymore. I want to tell you, 80 percent of the people who use that program make less than $10,000 a year. One-third of them are disabled. Two million senior citizens nationally use that program.

I will never forget a woman in my own district, in Stevens Point, I met when I walked into her house to talk to her about the program. She lived in a house that was built for her by her husband as a wedding present. She was 82 years old. She had very little money. She had every room in that house closed up except the living room, the kitchen, and the bathroom, in order to save heat. She slept on an old beat up couch in the living room.

That house meant as much to her as life itself. It was her last link with her husband. She desperately wanted to hang onto it, and it was low income heating assistance program that helped her to do so.

Do you really think you ought to cut a woman like that so you can give one of your wealthy $200,000 a year income friends an additional tax break? Pardon me, I do not agree with those kind of priorities.

I think we also ought to take a look at what you have not cut. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, got up here and defended highway demonstration projects. I like to see highway projects built just like anyone else, but not at the expense of senior citizens, not at the expense of drug-free schools, not at the expense of decent education and training opportunities for our young people.

Of all things, I do not see why this Republican-controlled Congress should have retained the Benedict Arnold tax loophole provision which allows people to renounce their American citizenship in order to avoid paying taxes to the country that made them rich in the first place.

The gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. KASICH] said that we hate rich people on this side of the aisle. Absolute nonsense. I would like everybody in this society to be rich. Profits are good for this country. High incomes are good for this country. But what is also good for this country is that when people make it, and they make it very well in this society, they should not be pulling the ladder up after them. They should be willing to pay their fair share to support the public services in this country that the entire society needs. That is all we are suggesting.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], said the vote today was about balance. There is nothing very balanced about proposals that cut back on aid to seniors, that cut back on educational opportunities, that cut back on veterans who have fought and risked their lives for this country, in order to give somebody who makes $200,000 bucks a year a tax cut. That is not balance at all. That is extreme. It is wrong economically, it is wrong morally.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the President for drawing the line in the right place. We ought to turn this bill down. We ought to reshape it, we can easily do that in a week, and we can come out here with something that we can be proud of.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate my chairman yielding. I did not intend to speak on this measure, but the fact is that over half of the funds we are talking about here, the rescissions, came out of my subcommittee. In view of the President's decision—at least it appears to be a decision—to veto this measure, I thought there were at least a couple of points I should try to make.

My colleagues, the President has proposed a list of 14 items that if restored would cause him to sign this legislation. Five of these items fall under the jurisdiction of my subcommittee. While all of them deserve mention, there are two points that I would like to make.

As you know, the AmeriCorps Program budget of 1995 has been reduced by $210 million to the 1994 funding level of $365 million. This reduction was

made not out of partisanship, but out of a true desire to review how well the AmeriCorps Program has worked, a program the President holds at the highest priority.

Many of my colleagues made it no secret that they wanted to eliminate this program. Until now, I personally had not come to a final consideration on the matter. Today I stand before you convinced that the President has already given up on the National Service Program, AmeriCorps. His veto promise has raised the stakes, and regardless of the outcome, I now believe the President will lose on that one.

Like it or not, the National Service Program has become an even larger target than ever before. Maybe not today or this week or this month, but you can rest assured the AmeriCorps Program will be the victim of this debate and this veto. The writing is now on the wall.

Mr. Speaker, there is another item that I would raise that would hopefully cause the President to reconsider his position, and that is my second point. A few months ago, before my committee, James Lee Witt, the Administrator, the Director of FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, told us that without replenishment, that as of the end of May, FEMA would run out of money. They would be out of money. No more in the pipeline.

Think of the disasters. Not just earthquakes and floods in California, but disasters across the country. Of most important recent notice, the horrible disaster of Oklahoma City. FEMA running out of money, not being able to respond to those disasters. The President is now actually thinking about turning his back on those people who had to deal with those disasters.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to rethink this position. He should not take the advice of his political advisers. He should look to the people of the country who at this moment need our assistance.

Mr. Speaker, upon completion of the conference on HR 1158 this past Tuesday morning, I had anticipated taking just a little time to briefly discuss the role my subcommittee—VA, HUD, and independent agencies—had in achieving over half of the budget savings realized in this emergency supplemental and rescissions bill.

While we certainly had difficult choices, the conferees on this chapter worked diligently to retain or restructure certain high priority items while at the same time making meaningful reductions where we thought appropriate. Our final decisions were, in my mind, legislative compromise in the truest and best sense of the word.

Perhaps more important than the specific choices we made though was the fact that our actions have gotten us headed on a track that recognizes the even more difficult budget decisions awaiting us in fiscal year 1996 and beyond. Simply put, balancing this Nation's budget will require hard choices and sacrifice on the part of each and every lawmaker and each and every citizen.

It is in this vein that I am absolutely dismayed at the announcement by the President that he will veto this legislation. The very first real opportunity this President has had to show he truly wants to get spending under control is instead squandered for what can't be described as anything other than cheap demigodary. As I mentioned the President has proposed a list of 14 items that, if restored, would cause him to sign this legislation. Again five of these items fall under the jurisdiction of my subcommittee, and a quick review of each of the other four items points out just how ridiculous is the President's announced action:

Environmental Programs: Safe Drinking Water—The President has proposed restoring $500 million for State revolving grant funds for this program which does not now and has never existed. This proposal will do nothing more than put funds aside for a program that likely will not be authorized until next year and, once it is authorized, will likely see at least another half-year of rule writing before a single dime is sent to the States. How can the President possibly justify giving money to a program that does not exist while agreeing to take funds away from others that do?

VA Medical Care—The President has suggested giving $50 million back to VA medical care, even though these funds are salary savings that the Department itself says it will not use. This rescission will not impact a single VA employee or patient, yet it clearly appears on the President's list merely for its press value.

HUD: Assisted Housing—The President has asked to restore $150 million to HUD assisted housing for residents displaced by demolition of old housing units, but apparently never checked with HUD to see what their needs are in this regard. In fact, the conferees restored half-a-billion dollars for this purpose and there is enough money now in the account to fund 20,000 families with 5-year vouchers or 50,000 families with 2-year vouchers. According to the Department, this is more than adequate to meet their needs.

HUD: Housing Opportunities for People With Aids (HOPWA)—The President's suggestion to restore $30 million in this account is truly the height of hypocrisy. The 1995 funding level of $156 million for HOPWA is exactly what the President requested for the program for 1995. Moreover, this funding level agreed to by the conferees now leaves over $400 million available for HOPWA, meaning this administration has yet to even distribute all of the funds we appropriated for HOPWA in fiscal year 1993, let alone use the funds we provided for fiscal years 1994 and 1995. Shouldn't the President be more concerned with helping the people we meant to be helped rather than raise phony issues meant to obscure the real facts?

Mr. Speaker, although I can't speak to the details of each of the 14 items, I am quite certain the story for each is similar. The President's scenario in this sorry episode is, indeed, all too clear: he decides for the first time to fully engage himself in this rescission process that for this Member started in January. He realizes he is late to the table so threatens to use his veto to get his way. For cover, he demands that 14 sexy- looking programs be restored, yet utterly fails to realize there is no substance behind restoring most if not all of the 14 items He hopes to claim a public relations victory, caring not that the real losers are the American public who most go on paying for programs that should, indeed must, be phased out.

Mr. Speaker, the President's actions so far in this regard is politics at its absolute worst and nothing short of despicable. I can only hope he somehow get a dose of honest conscience before his pen makes the wrong marks.

Mr. Speaker, in the hope that the President will in fact sign this bill, I would like to take an additional moment to clarify our intent with respect to language included in the bill dealing with EPA's Automobile Inspection and Maintenance Program provided for in the Clean Air Act.

Under the regulatory framework first developed by EPA, a premium was placed on State adoption of a centralized testing facility, while an automatic discount was applied to noncentralized facilities proposed by the States. EPA itself has recently indicated they intend to be more flexible in the granting of credits for noncentralized programs, and our bill and report language should be interpreted to support EPA in this movement toward flexibility and reasonableness.

Rather than automatically discount programs, EPA should attempt to assign credits to each State's program based on the worthiness of each program. Higher credits, even up to 100 percent, need not be granted just for programs that have expensive equipment. On the contrary, if a State presents a plan that outlines how and why a certain level of credit can be achieved, EPA should be reasonable and thoughtful in its review process toward making a decision allowing such appropriate credits. If EPA believes additional data is required to make the State's case, they should be flexible in permitting such data collection for up to 2 years or two full cycles.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that what we are doing in their regard is a step in the direction of truly permitting sound science to prevail. Sometimes laws and regulations become too prescriptive in our zeal to achieve an end result. I am absolutely committed to our national goal of clean air, but I am equally persuaded we must be flexible and allow new methods and new

technologies and new ideas to lead the way toward this goal. If the agency will not or cannot provide that flexibility I am quite certain the Congress will once again address this issue in a manner that is perhaps less appealing to those who support our clean air goals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. WALKER). Members are reminded that all remarks are to be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my ranking minority member for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1158, a bill rescinding appropriations for fiscal year 1995.

From the very beginning of deliberations on this legislation, it has been clear that Draconian and callous cuts to funds already approved for Federal programs were for the purpose of fulfilling the Republican Contract With America to cut taxes. This is abundantly clear when you consider that the conference agreement rejects the House adopted amendment which required all budgetary savings from the rescissions bill be used for deficit reduction. Under the Republican proposal, these savings can be use to finance tax cuts to benefit the wealthiest persons in this Nation.

Take for example, the $6.3 billion cut from critical housing programs serving the elderly, low income, and homeless families with children, and the disabled. The $1.9 billion cut from incremental assistance programs means a loss of 52,000 section 8 rental certificates. An additional $815 million reduction in public housing modernization will prevent public housing agencies from rehabilitating some 40,000 substandard pubic housing units. Further cuts of $620 million to public housing development will prevent the tearing down and replacement of 7,000 of the most distressed public housing units in the Nation.

On top of these reductions, there is the $1.5 billion cut to the Labor and Employment Training Program, the $844 million cut to Health and Human Services programs, and the $875 million cut to education programs. I find these reductions in quality of life programs appalling. Further, how can the Members of this House support a bill that cuts $65 million from student aid, cuts $11.2 million from TRIO, cuts $236 million from safe and drug-free schools, eliminates summer youth jobs in fiscal year 1996, and cuts by 68 percent funding for youth employment training? In an ever-increasing technological society, instead of ensuring that we provide adequate training to new and returning workers, this bill makes drastic cuts in vocational and adult education, displaced worker initiatives, and school-to-work programs.

This bill sends a signal to the rest of the world that the United States of America, a world leader, places a very low priority on the education of its youth.

While the uproar over initial rescissions figures forced restoration of some of the funds taken from VA programs, this bill still cuts $81 million from veterans programs. Therefore, Republicans are sending a message to our veterans that their needs are not as important as tax cuts for the wealthy.

I can understand and support a balanced approach to addressing our Nation's fiscal difficulties. But I cannot, and will not, support balancing the needs of the wealthy on the backs of the poor, the elderly, our children, veterans, and the disabled. I urge my colleagues to defeat this conference report.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman's position regarding the housing cuts of roughly $6 billion, but does he realize the President only asked to restore $150 million of the housing cuts? Obviously the balance of over $5 billion is okay with him.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I will accept the gentleman's comment.

□ 1745

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, Members on both sides of the aisle have worked on this rescission package for over 2½ months. We worked through the House and the Senate and for the past 2 weeks we have been meeting often, often late into the evening in order to resolve our differences.

Nowhere, nowhere in this process was the President or his representatives seen. There was no hint to any of us as to his feelings regarding sections of this bill, and I think all of us were dismayed on opening the newspaper a day or two ago to find that he has vowed to veto it.

He has not been a part of the process. He has not said to any of us he would veto it, if certain conditions were not met. And what is most dismaying, Mr. Speaker, is that he is talking about $1.5 billion or about 9 percent of a $16.5 billion bill, which is itself only 1 percent of the entire Federal budget for fiscal 1995.

He is talking about half of that in the area of education and job training or one-twentieth of 1 percent of Federal spending, a minuscule amount. He objects, even though in our area of labor, health and human services and education, the House figure was $5.9 billion in rescissions, the Senate figure was about $3 billion in rescissions, and the House went very far in accommodating the view of the Senate, which the Senate was very insistent on, and we ended up at $3.3 billion. So we were not making the heavy cuts that the House had recommended in our area. We, rather, deferred to the Senate on most of these matters. And the cuts involved are cuts that are very, very minor, although obviously in programs that we consider to be very important as well.

I find the President's lack of attention and unwillingness to be at the table irresponsible in the extreme. I find his threat to veto this legislation incomprehensible. If we are to approach our entire fiscal 1996 budget with a President who will not be at the table, who will simply say, I am going to veto it when all the work is done, I think we are going to have a very, very difficult time indeed.

No one wants to ascribe certain motivations to the President. I will not do so. But I will say that it is irresponsible for the President to threaten such a veto.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER].

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

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, this floor has been full of debate on the budget the last few days. Many Members from both sides of the aisle have spoken on the importance of deficit reduction and debt reduction.

And, yet, this conference report is classic double-speak. This conference report does not contain the Brewster-Minge lockbox, but rather contains a Pandora's Box. The Brewster-Minge lockbox, which passed the House overwhelmingly by a vote of 418 to 5, has been scored by CBO as containing $66.2 billion in savings.

Instead, this afternoon we are considering a conference report with a watered-down version of the lockbox—a true Pandora's Box. This conference report has been scored by CBO to only save $15.4 billion—over $50 billion less than the Brewster lockbox.

That's $50 billion that should be deposited in the lockbox but will instead go for additional spending.

Mr. Speaker, I will be candid about my feelings on this conference report. There are many difficult cuts in this bill that will effect education, housing, economic development and agriculture. There are programs eliminated that are very valuable to my State of Oklahoma.

I have discussed with my constituents over the last few years about the seriousness of the Federal deficit. They do not like many of these cuts either. But, these citizens are willing to once

again sacrifice in order to reduce our deficit.

But, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you, they will not support these cuts if the savings goes for anything other than deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to send this Pandora's Box back to the conferees, and let us come back with the lockbox that will make these cuts count.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 20 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the fiscal year 1995 supplemental appropriations or rescissions bill conference report there is $100.5 million provided for so-called enhanced counterterrorism. Included in this figure is over $20 million for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms and $77 million for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These have caused me some concern.

As the chairman knows, just two weeks ago the administration presented to the Subcommittee on Crime of the Committee on the Judiciary incomplete draft counterterrorism legislation that contained proposals for new federal authority, redefinitions of current authority and new jurisdiction, in addition to a request for consideration of a new counterterrorism center within the FBI.

Needless to say, the Committee on the Judiciary is conducting a careful examination of the testimony presented and is studying that which has thus far been proposed. Unfortunately, the administration has yet to finalize its proposals to the Congress and necessarily its arguments in behalf of its position are still unfinished.

Therefore, I was surprised to see that the administration has somehow organized itself to make appropriations requests of the conference. It would be most disturbing were the administration presenting differing sets of proposals to the House, one incomplete and unfinished, and still another to the conferees if an effort to sidestep its responsibility to argue for its views before the authorizing committee of jurisdiction, in this case the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, in view of these concerns and understanding our mutual desire to see important emergency funding to help the people of Oklahoma City, I want to ask, is it the gentleman's understanding that none of the funds in this rescissions package provide for new or expanded authority for any federal law enforcement and including but not limited to ATF and the FBI.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman should be pleased to know that except for one provision that permits the Attorney General to offer up to a $2 million reward to capture the people responsible for the Oklahoma City tragedy, there are no new or expanded authorities contained in this conference report. What we do in this bill is to provide the immediate resources necessary to respond to the tragedy in Oklahoma City.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, let me first congratulate the chairman of the committee, the new chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], as well as the minority spokesman on the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], for their hard work on this. But let me say at the outset, I sincerely hope that this rescission bill is defeated today on the House floor and, if it is not, I hope the President keeps his word and vetoes it. I want to tell you why.

For the past several months we have heard like Banquo's ghost rattling through the halls. The Republican tax break program rears its ugly head every time Congress tries to tackle a serious issue. We want to sit down and talk about a balanced budget, which our nation wants and both parties profess to want, and yet the Republicans insist on a tax break package which gives tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans and absolves the most profitable corporations from paying their fair share of Federal taxes.

We want to talk about a bill like this, a rescission bill to cut spending so we can come up with money to pay for disasters in California and Oklahoma City and other places. The Republicans, again, want to make sure that some of the money that we are going to save will be around to fund the tax break package for the wealthiest privileged few in America.

It just boggles my mind, and I have been around politics so long. What is in this tax break package that is so important to them that they will literally taint every debate on this floor by making certain there is money in there for their tax break? I tell you what it is, my friends. It is because for some big businesses and for some special interests, that tax break means more than every other issue on this floor.

They are sticking with it, even if it means cutting 80,000 people off of the WIC program. Women and children who would get prenatal care will not because of this spending cut bill. They are sticking with it even if it means eliminating the Food and Drug Administration reorganization plan, to make that agency more efficient so it can safeguard our families.

No, they will make these cuts, and they will have to answer, and their answers are not any good because the Republican tax break program is not what we are here to talk about. We are here to get this public's House in order, to get our budget in order, and that tax break package is not the way to do it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government.

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

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

In response to the previous speaker and all the rhetoric we have heard around here today about tax breaks and tax cuts, if BS was a dollar a pound, we would have paid off the deficit at about noon. This thing has nothing to do with tax breaks or tax cuts. What part of zero do we not understand here?

What I really came down here to talk about was the president's veto on the rescission package. It is like he is trying to Monday morning quarterback a ball game that he did not even watch. The chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], not only invited him to watch the game, he invited him to participate, clear back in the month of February.

They declined to do so at the White House. Yesterday we got the message they are going to veto the rescission package.

We asked the GSA to give us a list of the so-called pork that is in our portion of the bill. That was yesterday. Today we finally get a response. OMB has ordered GSA not to give us a list of any kind. Mr. President, where is the pork? If you say it is there, identify it so we can work on it, because we think that we took every bit of pork out of this package that was there. The unauthorized programs are gone.

So I would only say in closing that, as we look at this rescission package, we also should be cognizant that the president's approval ratings went up for the way that he handled Oklahoma City. And he is to be commended for that. But now the rubber meets the road. The money for Oklahoma City is in this bill. The investigative agencies who hopefully will put together a successful investigation that will convict and send to prison the people who perpetrated the crime in Oklahoma City are running out of money. The money for that investigation is in this bill. The President says he wants to veto it. I think when we learn someday that you can go to hell for lying the same as stealing, this will be a lot better town to live in.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to also commend the chairman of the committee on his first conference report and the ranking member

on our side, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], for working together. But regrettably, I fail to understand why we are here today. I wish we could have gone back to conference, worked out the finetuning that would have been required to bring this bill to the floor and pass it with little, if any, opposition.

The President does have a role to play and he has played it. I believe that the President's priorities are important and we need to talk about them. We look at those programs that have been cut, the safe and drug-free schools program which will have $200 million less to fight these problems on campuses across the country.

We look at the Goals 200 program, which will increase academic standards for students throughout our country, something we have worked closely on with employers and school administrators and teachers and parents and students, something that has been advocated by the Governors of our States.

□ 1800

We have cut $90 million out of their program this year. The school-to-work program, which was designed to help move children from the school system that is not always succeeding in educating them to jobs, something that has been essential to try to make our young people more effective in the job market, and to make our country more competitive in the international market we are part of, that program is reduced in this bill.

The President has good reason, therefore, to ask us to go back and take up the task again. The reason that we, I think, find it difficult to do that, the reason we seem to be so dug in that we need to be here today, is for one very good reason. That is that after we pay for the much needed disaster relief, from California to Oklahoma City and around this country, once we have paid that bill, that $7 billion bill, we wanted to take $9 billion more out of this current fiscal year, not to balance the budget, but to provide tax cuts for the wealthiest in our society. That is terrible and it is regrettable. I am hoping we can fix it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy said that a journey of a thousand miles begins with the first step. Today we took, earlier, a giant step toward a balanced budget for the year 2002. That is the passage of the budget resolution.

Now we have an opportunity to take another step. That is to support this rescission bill. I say that because many of the programs, many of the construction projects that were rescinded, would have great outyear costs. By stopping these programs, slowing them down, rescinding buildings, rescinding other expensive projects, it will save money as we go down the road. Therefore, this bill becomes very important if we are to reach the goal of a legacy of a balanced budget and a strong economy for future generations in the next century.

Mr. Speaker, I would also just add that we do deal with a forest problem that enables us, in the Forest Service, to take diseased, dead trees, trees that have been scarred by fire, and use that lumber for the benefit of the young people of this Nation that want to build homes at a reasonable cost.

I was out in California and spent 2 days looking at the program. I think it will work very well. It will not in any way harm the forests, and it will provide for their health by removing trees that could be a potential fire hazard for the future. Therefore, I think this bill has a lot of good features.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge my colleagues to support this second, very important step towards a balanced budget.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rescission bill. This rescission bill, to some degree, came out of the air. If it did not come out of the tax cut that we keep talking about, I am not sure where it came from.

The gentleman who now chairs the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government of the Committee on Appropriations did not come to me at the end of last year and say ''We ought to get this out of bill. This is wrong. It should not be in the bill.'' I did not hear any other ranking member say that in committee, as I recall, and certainly not the $16.4 or $17 billion. If that did not come simply because we needed to get money for a tax cut, I do not know where it came from. Nobody has told me where that magic figure came from.

The fact of the matter is we passed a bill which balances the budget by 2002. That is fine. I voted for one of the amendments that did exactly that; not for the one that had the tax cut in it, but for the other one, because I thought the priorities were better, and the priorities in this rescission bill stink. That is what the President said, and he was telling the truth. He was not lying.

The fact of the matter is the priorities in this bill are not for the children pictured in the last debate. Summer jobs go down the drain in this bill, for young people that need that experience and need that future. That is not a policy that is looking to have people fly, I suggest.

This rescission bill is ill-considered, in that it does not address what are really the priorities of this country. There is no priority to cut the taxes for the wealthiest 10 percent in America. I would like to cut their taxes. Very frankly, most of us fall within that category, and we will personally benefit from that tax reduction. However, the fact of the matter is there are a lot of people in this country who need the opportunity to succeed, and this bill takes it away from them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, we continue to hear over and over again how we are taking the food out of the mouths of babes. Well, as chairman of the subcommittee that funds the WIC program, let me clear the air once and for all.

Since fiscal year 1990, annual increases to the program have ranged between $200 million and $350 million. During this same time period, the unspent recovery balance has increased from $28 million to $125 million. The program couldn't absorb the large increases we were giving it every year.

The bill we have before us rescinds $20 million from the $125 million unspent fiscal year 1994 carryover balance. We have heard the Democrats say that this $20 million rescission would result in 480,000 fewer food packages. I'm not sure what this means. In the history of program, no one has ever measured the program by the number of food packages. The measurement has always been the number of women, infants, and children served.

The truth of the matter is, even with this $20 million rescission, the Department does not expect to change its estimates on how many additional women, infants, and children will be served this year. Why? Because the President is projecting an unspent recovery balance of $100 million at the end of this fiscal year, fiscal year 1995. What does this mean? It means that the average monthly participation will still increase by 500,000 this fiscal year. This rescission will have absolutely no effect on the 1995 level of participation.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill, and want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and members of the committee on both sides of the aisle, and the staff, for the work they have done. I want to change what I was going to say. I keep hearing about a tax cut. If this is for the tax cut, I say good. The American family is under more pressure today than any other time in the history of the country. Every indicator that you look at for the well-being of the family is going the wrong way. Child abuse is at an all time high, spouse abuse is at an all time high, teen suicide is at an all time high, teen pregnancy an all time high, teen violence an all time high.

I say if this is to give a mom and a dad the opportunity to keep a little

more money so they can take care of the family, I want to vote twice for it, not once, but twice, if I could. That would not be bad.

However, what we have done, I think, has been good. Additionally, I will put my statement in the RECORD on the demo projects. We are not going to have any demo projects in the transportation bill that comes out. They are all gone. I do not support them. I will never support a bill on this floor that has demos coming out of my committee, so we do not have to worry about them.

Number two, the administration has never even called us. Our staff and Jim Tarnall asked the administration on the administrative costs. We cut $20 million out, the Senate cut $10, and we asked them over and over, ''Should it be 15? Should it be 12? What should it be?'' They would not even give it to us.

I know why this bill is going to be vetoed, if it is. It is because of the reason I heard on public radio, yesterday, when they said ''It is a political reason. It is an opportunity to make a statement.'' Demos are gone. They did not talk to us, but if this money is used to help the American family, I say God bless, and we ought to be proud of it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report, which provides supplemental appropriations for emergency disaster assistance for the Northridge earthquake, west- and Gulf-coasts floods, and recovery assistance for Oklahoma City, by rescinding $16.4 billion in budget and obligational authority in fiscal year 1995.

Within the $16.4 billion, the conference report rescinds $2.728 billion from transportation programs. Rescissions in transportation programs are appropriate and necessary, particularly when the Congress is considering reductions in programs such as Headstart, hunger programs, immunizations, and breast cancer screening. Transportation programs should not be exempt. Furthermore, the transportation rescissions contained in this conference report are justified, reasonable and fair.

The conference report contains rescissions in unavailable contract authority including:

$2.1 billion for the airport improvement program; and

$250 million for the magnetic levitation [MAGLEV] prototype train development.

These balances of contract authority are moneys that cannot be spent in fiscal year 1995 due to other provisions of law, and therefore, these rescissions, when enacted, will have a negligible, if any, impact on transportation in this country.

In addition, the conference report rescinds:

$132 million in highway research and development programs, including $40 million in intelligent transportation systems;

$42 million in the coast guard; and

$40 million in transit research and discretionary grants, by reducing 50 percent of their obligated transit balances made available prior to fiscal year 1993.

The conference report does not include a reduction in highway demonstration projects, as proposed by the Senate—a proposal which I believe has a great deal of merit and for which I am sympathetic.

I am opposed to earmarking Federal moneys for highways demonstration projects, scarce transportation dollars must be carefully directed to programs addressing essential public safety needs rather than special projects. I have announced this to my colleagues, State transportation officials, industry representatives, and other interested parties.

I have written letters and outlined my position in statements and meetings, and am underscoring my position here today. Simply put, it has become a choice between paying for the truly essential public safety needs or continuing to spend for these highway demonstration projects. To me, the choice is clear. Without regard to partisan politics, and without reference to the merits of any particular projects, the fiscal year 1996 transportation appropriations bill will contain no highway demonstration projects.

With respect again to the conference report. It should be noted that since the Congress began to consider rescissions in January, and subsequent to the Senate's action in March, unobligated balance in the highway demonstration program accounts dating back to 1982 and 1987 have been reduced by nearly half. Unobligated balances have fallen from $252 million to $149 million today. And it is still dropping.

The mere threat of this Congress rescinding these balances over the past 90 days has accomplished what the Federal Highway Administration and 52 State Departments of Transportation could not do over the past 13 years—that is to get these funds out on the streets for which they were appropriated. To that end, we have been successful.

None of the transportation rescissions have been raised by the administration as egregious or needing to be restored.

I urge my colleages to support this conference report.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would, at the outset, only say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle in the majority that if they are worried about the disaster assistance for Oklahoma City, efforts that we have made, that we put into the supplemental bill, and it is not just the rescission bill, it is a supplemental, they were able to do some things within 100 days. I am proud of them. I think they could do the same things with those matters. Just pass the legislation, we will put it on the President's desk. We can deal with this issue. We can find some places to cut.

My chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has been very forthright and very candid and very honest about his position with respect to highway demonstration projects. I only question whether or not the same thing will be true for aviation projects, as well as transit projects. I think we need some clarification on that, so there is no confusion.

Let me say that, really and truly, the way this thing works, I know my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] was concerned about the fact that we were having a veto. I was looking at the Constitution the other day. Article 1, section 7, is still in here. Read it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], a member of the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have had contacts from people all over the Southwest, the Southeast, and the eastern United States asking that the rescission bill be passed, primarily for the timber consideration. We have labor unions in that area that are without jobs. We have tens of thousands of people that are waiting for the President to fulfill his commitment on option 9, which would put timber in the pipeline that would allow those people to go back to work. We have forest health being damaged because of insects, because of fire, because of the damage to the forest that could be obliterated if we could get the salvage wood out of the forest, and this bill provides a mechanism for that. It also gives the taxpayer $135 million for doing it, which would go toward the deficit. It gives us an opportunity to keep our commitment.

Reading some of the opposition, one of the folks who urged the President to veto this bill stated that it would stop clearcutting in the West. The depth of dumb cannot be fathomed in this area. These are dead and dying trees, not live trees to be clearcut.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio, [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report. For the last 2 days we engaged in debate over balancing the budget. That fight to cut spending, reduce the deficit, and balance our budget must be won. A budget balanced fairly, with no tax giveaways to the privileged few, is not beyond our abilities, though that is not the budget that passed here earlier today.

Now before us is another bill that cuts spending, but again, does not dedicate its savings to deficit reduction. In the original bill, we all supported the Brewster amendment, which overwhelmingly passed this Chamber by over 400 votes. However, what we have here is a bill that imposes draconian cuts: no summer jobs after this year, a cut this year in thousands of jobs across this country, no heating assistance for our seniors, and then it directs those precious dollars to give tax benefits to the most privileged among us. This bill deserves to be vetoed. We will have another bill here that is just and fair.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

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

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

What a difference 2 years makes, Mr. Speaker. We are paying our bills even during an emergency. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK].

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. I am insulted by the way the President of the United States is handling it. He came to Oklahoma, we wanted him to come, we were glad to have him to mourn with us. However, the money in here in response to Oklahoma is not for Oklahoma, it is for the whole country, for heightened security around the country, to defend against the possibility of something happening to the rest of you as happened to us.

The President pretending that he is wanting to veto it because of pork, it is a lie. What he is complaining about is what was put in bills last year by the Democrat leadership that he signed and put into law, and he is trying to say ''It is your fault because you are not taking out what I did.''

What a lie, Mr. President. We are sick of the rhetoric that you are using on this. Do not do it. Look at it on the merits. If you have some things you want to take out, you should have sent a list up when there is time to do it, but I am insulted by the way the President is behaving.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Members are reminded that the President of the United States is to be treated in debate in the same manner as Members of the House.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, do the rules of the House allow a Member to impugn the motives or activities of the President of the United States without being subjected to having the words taken down, as they would if he made that charge about another Member of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rules require that no Member may be personally abusive to the President of the United States, and the words may be taken down, as with Members, if such conduct takes place.

The words to be taken down, though, would be requested from the floor.

Mr. OBEY. I think the Chair is absolutely right on his ruling. I want to say that out of courtesy, I did not make that motion, even though he was obviously out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair noted for all Members the situation with regard to the President of the United States.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. The Speaker indicated that the words could have been taken down if a Member had risen.

Does the Speaker have the authority to raise that point?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair or any Members can raise the point.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Chair for his response.

□ 1815

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, today is a sad day for America's veterans. Before there was a Contract With America, America had a solemn contract with its veterans. Today House Republicans have broken that contract with our veterans.

One week before Memorial Day, on the eve of our celebration of the end of World War II, Republicans have cut $24 billion in veterans' health care. According to the VA, that means by 2002 the closure perhaps of 41 VA hospitals. It means a cut of 60,000 VA employees. It means 4 million veterans may not get health care, veterans who fulfilled their contract with America in World War II, in Korea, and Vietnam.

Now Republicans are saying $24 billion in veterans' cuts is not enough in one day. They are asking for another $50 million in cuts in critical veterans' health care and hospital equipment, equipment that our veterans desperately need and deserve. That is not fair, Mr. Speaker. It is not right. It is a breach of contract with America's veterans.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, who indicated that if these cuts were used to fund the tax cut, then God bless.

Unfortunately, that is not what that Member or 417 other Members of this body voted to do 2 months ago when the Brewster amendment was passed. That amendment would ensure that spending cuts in this bill reduced the deficit over the next 5 years.

However, that was stripped out of the conference report as Chairman KASICH and Majority Leader ARMEY indicated it would be immediately after the bill. The only conceivable reason for stripping this provision is to maintain flexibility to use these spending cuts to fund the tax cut.

If leadership planned on keeping their promise to cut spending, balance the budget and fund the tax cuts, the lock box provision would be irrelevant. So why strip it out?

I support spending cuts to balance the budget. However, this bill amounts to spending cuts for the sole purpose of paying for tax cuts. That is not the way to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I include my statement in opposition to the conference report for the RECORD as follows:

I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 1158, the omnibus rescissions and supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1995.

Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words. House leadership has claimed that it intends to balance the budget at the same time or before cutting taxes.

Yet, twice today, we have voted on leadership proposals which amount to a clear statement that they plan on passing massive tax cuts before making the tough spending decisions. Earlier today, the House budget resolution irresponsibly set up a two-step reconciliation process. Under this process, massive tax cuts will be enacted 2 months prior to enacting over 40 percent of the spending cuts needed to balance the budget.

By stripping the lockbox provision, the rescissions conference bill that leadership is bringing up for a vote now is a second clear and unambiguous sign that leadership makes spending cuts a secondary priority.

Two months ago the House voted 418-to-5 for the Brewster lockbox amendment. The lockbox amendment would ensure that the spending cuts in this bill over the next 5 years are completely dedicated to deficit reduction.

However, in conference, this provision was stripped, as Chairman KASICH and Majority Leader ARMEY said it would be immediately after the overwhelming vote in the House. They never intended to allow these spending cuts to reduce the deficit. I cannot support this irresponsible fiscal behavior. The only conceivable reason for stripping this provision is to maintain flexibility to use these spending reductions to finance tax cuts, without making the spending cuts necessary to balance the budget. The simple fact is that if leadership follows through on their promise to pass spending cuts sufficient to balance the budget and pay for the tax cuts, the lockbox provision would not matter. So why strip it out?

I support sensible spending cuts to balance the budget. However, this bill amounts to spending cuts for the sole purpose of paying for tax cuts. This is not the way to balance the budget.

I urge a ''no'' vote. Let's send this back to the conferees to reinstate the Brewster lockbox provision.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT], a member of the committee.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1158, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. This conference report provides important emergency funds for Federal disasters, and for the second time this session, Republicans have fully paid for emergency appropriations through corresponding offsets.

As has already been mentioned today, included in H.R. 1158 is a provision that will prevent future national disasters. The emergency timber salvage amendment directs the Forest

Service to remove dead, dying and diseased timber from our national forests to the maximum extent feasible.

We, in the West, know that the health of our forests has declined drastically because of prohibitions against salvage logging, thinning and controlled burns. In the summer of 1994, more than 67,000 wildfires burned almost 4 million acres of forest and rangeland. 26 firefighters lost their lives fighting these fires. In the month of August alone, a partial list of Federal expenses came to $7.8 million per day. The emergency salvage amendment is a provision that will go a long way toward preventing future forest fires by improving the health of our forests today, and being sensitive to environmental concerns. Most importantly, it will help small timber companies and rural communities.

I urge all Members to support this supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time simply to respond to comments made by 3 gentleman on the other side of the aisle.

First of all, with respect to the comments made by my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], he threatened retaliation against the President and his favorite program in this bill, AmericCorps, if the President vetoes this bill. I think that is an example of what is wrong with the mindset on that side of the aisle these days.

I recognize the Republican Party is new to power in this House, but it seems to me that if the country is to be well-served in the Republican Party's exercise of that power, that in divided government persons with responsibility on that side of the aisle need to learn how to share power, not to threaten its abuse.

Second, with respect to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] who complained that the President was not involved and that he did not know that the President was going to veto the bill, I would simply say he should not be surprised.

I pointed out in the conference that when meetings were held between the Senate and the House conferees on the labor-health-education programs in this conference, that the Republican subcommittee staff made it quite clear to Democrats on that subcommittee that we were not welcome to even attend the meetings. So if the gentleman from Illinois is surprised that the President vetoed the bill, he should not be surprised because he put himself in the isolation room.

I have a stack of letters from the President to the committee at various times during the process laying out exactly what they wanted done. We have a letter on April 28 spelling out that if the President were presented with a bill containing objectionable provisions contained in the House version of the bill as outlined below, he would veto the bill, and he proceeded to list 29 specific problems. I do not know why the sudden surprise.

With respect to the suggestion by the gentleman from Iowa that implied that the investigation of the Oklahoma bombing would somehow be delayed by the President's veto, I will simply say that is outrageously false. The Department of Justice has indicated to the committee that the Oklahoma investigation is the top priority of the department and that the extraordinary expenses related to the bombing for the FBI, U.S. Attorneys, U.S. Marshal's Service and the DEA are already being incurred and funded using available 1995 funds.

With respect to the outrageous words just directed by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] against the President of the United States, I would simply say that those words have damaged the gentleman from Oklahoma far more than they have damaged the President of the United States. I think I will simply let them go at that.

I urge a vote against this bill in the interest of fairness and deficit reduction.

The letters referred to follow:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, April 28, 1995.

Hon. BOB LIVINGSTON,

Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The purpose of this letter is to provide the Administration's views on H.R. 1158, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Additional Disaster Assistance and Rescissions Bill, FY 1995, as passed by the House and by the Senate.

The Administration is strongly opposed to the House version of the bill and believes that it would unnecessarily cut valuable, proven programs that educate our children, aid the disadvantaged, and protect our health and safety. If the President were presented a bill containing the objectionable provisions contained in the House version of the bill, as outlined below, he would veto the bill.

While the Senate version of the bill is acceptable, there are a number of provisions that could be improved. We urge the conferees to consider the concerns discussed below.

As the President stated at the April 26th Bipartisan Leadership meeting, he will shortly be sending to Congress a supplemental request for the costs of the Federal response to the Oklahoma City bombing. We urge the conferees to include such funding in H.R. 1158 and to present the President with a bill that he can sign so as not to delay providing these urgently needed funds.

DEFICIT REDUCTION

This Administration remains firmly committed to deficit reduction. In 1993, we worked with the Congress to enact the largest deficit reduction package in history. The Administration's economic plan helped bring the deficit down from $290 billion in FY 1992—to $203 billion in FY 1994, to a projected $193 billion this year—providing three straight years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

We believe that we can address the issue of deficit reduction and provide for the Middle Class Bill of Rights without putting low-income families at risk. In the FY 1996 Budget, the President has proposed significant rescissions for FY 1995 and additional program terminations in FY 1996 for numerous low-priority programs. The Administration does not believe that sound programs, especially those aimed at helping the disadvantaged, should be cut, particularly if such cuts were made to finance a tax cut for higher-income taxpayers.

CUTTING PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN, EDUCATION, AND THE DISADVANTAGED

The House-passed bill would impose severe reductions on a number of high-priority programs. These reductions would have a particularly harmful effect our Nation's children and disadvantaged by cutting funding for National Service; the Summer Jobs program; Goals 2000; the Education for the Disadvantaged program; the Safe and Drug Free School Program; the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund; and the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC).

While the Senate version of the bill represents a significant improvement over the House-passed bill with respect to funding for these programs, the Administration has concerns over any reductions to programs that assist our Nation's children and the disadvantaged. The conferees are urged to restore full funding for these programs, or, at a minimum, accept the Senate levels.

JORDANIAN DEBT RELIEF

The President has made clear that the provision of debt relief to Jordan can contribute to further progress toward a Middle East peace settlement. We strongly support the Senate language of H.R. 1158, which would appropriate the full $275 million requested for forgiveness of Jordan's debt to the United States. Every Administration since the creation of the State of Israel has determined that the promotion of peace in the Middle East is a vital U.S. National interest. Jordan has taken important steps for peace at great risk. Jordan and other countries in the region need concrete evidence that the United States supports those steps and that we stand by our commitments. For this reason, full debt relief is of paramount importance. We support providing as much of the $275 million of obligational authority in FY 1995 as possible.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

This Administration remains firmly committed to increasing the Nation's productivity and raising living standards by investing in science and technology. These investments will lead to a healthy, educated public; job creation and economic growth; world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering; and harnessed information technology. The rescissions proposed by the House and the Senate for many science and technology programs would severely threaten the United States' standing with respect to technology advancements and competitiveness. These include programs in the Department of Commerce, such as the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, the National Information Infrastructure Grants Program, and the laboratories of the National Institute of Standards and Technology; and in the Department of Education, such as grants for the development and adoption of education technology. The Senate is to be commended for restoring funding for several of these programs. The conferees are urged to restore full funding for these programs or to accept the lower of the House or Senate rescission level so as not to imperil our Nation's standing on the technology frontier.

STRIKER REPLACEMENT

The Administration strongly opposes a provision in the House version of the bill that would prohibit the Executive Branch from using FY 1995 funds to issue, implement, administer, or enforce any Executive

Order or other rule or order that prohibits Federal contracts with companies that hire permanent replacements for striking employees. This provision would impinge upon the Executive Branch's ability to ensure a stable supply of quality goods and services for the government's programs. The use of, or the threat to use, permanent replacement workers destroys opportunities for cooperative and stable labor-management relations.

Additional Administration concerns with the House and Senate versions of the bill are contained in the enclosure.

Sincerely,

ALICE M. RIVLIN,
Director.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS—H.R. 1158—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS BILL, FY 1995 (AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE AND THE SENATE)

NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAM

The $416 million rescission proposed by the House for the Corporation for National and Community Service would virtually terminate the program. Remaining funds would provide only 4,000 of the proposed 33,000 opportunities for young adults to serve their communities as AmeriCorps members and earn an education award. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for the Learn and Serve America program, which provides support for thousands of school children to learn responsibility to their community.

The Administration strongly believes that national service is a key to solving problems inside America's communities. This program has a proven track record. For example, AmeriCorps members have already reclaimed recreation areas in inner cities from gangs, and thousands of low-income and migrant children have received proper immunizations to protect their health. AmeriCorps members also have helped raise the spelling scores and reading levels of rural disadvantaged children, built homes for ''working-poor'' families, and provided disaster relief assistance to victims throughout the western part of the country.

The conferees are urged to restore full funding for this important program, or, at a minimum, to provide for a rescission of not more than $105 million, the amount recommended by the Senate.

SUMMER JOBS

The Summer Jobs program provides meaningful work experience for hundreds of thousands of economically disadvantaged youth. These young people might otherwise not have any opportunity to learn necessary job skills and workplace behaviors during crucial formative years. The Administration is pleased that the Senate version of the bill would not reduce funding for this program for the summer of 1995, as proposed by the House. However, the Senate, like the House, would eliminate funding for the Summer Youth Employment program in the summer of 1996, thereby eliminating job opportunities for about 615,000 disadvantaged youth. The Administration strongly believes that improving the job prospects of at-risk youth is an important element of a broader strategy to ensure employment opportunities for all American and a vibrant, productive workforce for U.S. business. At a minimum, the conferees are urged to accept the Senate's position on this program. If funding for the summer of 1996 is not restored in this bill, then the Administration will press for restoration in the FY 1996 budget process.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The House version of the bill would reduce funding for Goals 2000 by over one-third ($174 million), thereby greatly diminishing support to States and communities for raising academic standards and improving their local schools. The House also proposes to cut the Education for the Disadvantaged program by $148 million, which would reduce services to educationally disadvantaged children. The House version of the bill contains a sharp reduction—$65 million—in funding for education technology programs, which would enable fewer local communities to put state-of-the-art tools of learning in classrooms where they are most needed to prepare our students for the future.

The Senate version of the bill would reduce Goals 2000 by $8 million, cut the Education for the Disadvantaged program by $8 million, and cut the Federal direct student loan program by $95 million. The conferees are urged to restore full finding for Goals 2000, Education for the Disadvantaged, and education technology programs, or, at a minimum, approve the Senate levels.

SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS

The Administration opposes the House action that would rescind nearly $472 million in funding for the Safe and Drug Free School Program at the same time that every pool shows that crime and school safety are major concerns of Americans. This program is an important element of the Administration's fight against the use of drugs and stimulates by an alarmingly increasing number of our youth. The Administration is pleased that the Senate has restored funding for this important program and urges the conferees to adopt the Senate position.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (CDFI) FUND

The proposed rescission of $124 million contained in the House version of the bill would terminate the CDFI program. The Senate restored $36 million of this amount. The conferees are urged to restore full funding for the CDFI program. The conferees are urged to ensure that the program remains balanced between existing and new community development financial institutions, as provided in the current authorization law.

Without full funding, in FYs 1995 and 1996 the CDFI Fund would be unable to provide: $10 million in direct loan subsidies to support over $23 million of direct loans to CDFIs; $70.5 million in grants, technical assistance, and other financial assistance to CDFIs; and $39 million in community development incentives for depository institutions. The Fund's investments in CDFIs, banks, and thrifts would leverage an estimated $500 million in investments, loans, and financial services in the country's most distressed communities.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

The House version of the bill would reduce funds available for the WIC program by $25 million. The WIC program provides nutritious supplemental foods to low-income pregnant, post-partum, and breastfeeding women, and to infants and children up to their fifth birthday. The House's action would result in 600,000 fewer food packages for women, infants, and children. Jeopardizing the heath and welfare of these mothers and children cannot be justified. The Administration commends the Senate for restoring funding for this important program and strongly urges the conferees to accept the Senate proposal.

SCHOOL-TO-WORK

This innovative partnership, financed equally in the Departments of Education and Labor, provides seed money to States to create state-wide School-to-Work Opportunities systems. These systems will help youth acquire the knowledge, skills, abilities, and labor market information they need to make a smooth and effective transition from school to career-oriented work or further education or training. The House proposes a $12.5 million rescission for each department—a 10-percent reduction to the FY 1995 appropriation in each agency. The Senate rescission is $2.5 million for each department. The Administration prefers the Senate level and urges the conferees to support this important program, which will help youth obtain jobs and employers gain a responsible and skilled workforce.

CUTTING PROGRAMS FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

While an improvement over the House version of the bill, the proposed Senate rescission of $0.8 billion in funds to help municipalities comply with Safe Drinking Water Act requirements would still seriously exacerbate local financing problems. Municipalities need significant resources to comply with existing regulations and additional billions to comply with future rules needed to prevent problems such as the cryptosporidium outbreak in Milwaukee in 1993 that killed 100 people and caused illness in another 400,000

Most affected by this rescission would be the 27 million people who get their water from a system that has violated drinking water standards. If Congress were to fail to authorize the drinking water state revolving fund program, these funds could be used without further Congressional action to address the $137 billion in wastewater construction needs.

Reductions are also proposed by the House and the Senate for the Department of Energy's (DOE's) solar, renewable energy, and conservation research programs. Such reductions would threaten our national effort to implement fully, the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Climate Change Action Plan. Reduction to the DOE science budget also would adversely impact climate change, human genome, and neutron research. The additional reductions to the Environmental Management program would impede progress at several of the Department's cleanup sites.

FEMA DISASTER RELIEF

The Administration continues to estimate a supplemental requirement of $6.7 billion for FEMA disaster relief. Absent approval of this supplemental, FEMA estimates that under current operations, it will need to redirect funds already allocated to other disasters to meet more immediate requirements beginning in early summer.

JOBS CORPS

The House version of the bill would rescind $10 million from the Job Corps program; the Senate version, $46 million. The Senate's action would halt expansion of a youth training program with a track record of improving the employment and earnings of poor youth. It would also eliminate funds to continue work on eight new Job Corps centers that were launched with previous years' appropriations. Work is underway on these eight centers, which would create 3,200 new training slots for about 4,700 severely disadvantaged youth each year. In addition, the Senate would eliminate funds to initiate four new Job Corps centers in FY 1995, which would boost capacity by another 1,600 slots. The Administration prefers the House level.

JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT (JTPA) YOUTH TRAINING GRANTS

The JTPA Title II–C program provides grants to States for training, education, and employment services designed to provide low-income youth with marketable skills leading to productive, unsubsidized employment. The Congress already has rescinded $200 million from this program in P.L. 104–6—approximately one-third of the resources available for the 1995 program year, which

begins in July. This would mean about 105,000 youth would not perceive services. Both the House and Senate have proposed rescinding more than is contained in P.L. 104–6. Adequate funding for this program is essential to provide the Department of Labor the flexibility to work with States to re-examine the program's design and test new strategies to help youth succeed in the labor market. The Administration prefers the House level, which would reduce this program by an additional $110 million, as opposed to the $272 million reduction proposed by the Senate.

ONE-STOP CAREER SHOPPING

This initiative provides competitive grants to States to improve employment and training services by providing a common point of access to career and labor market information, occupational skill requirements, and other information about jobs and training. The House proposes rescinding $12 million, or 10 percent of the 1995 appropriation; the Senate, $20 million. These career centers are key to successful implementation of a new consolidated and integrated workforce development system serving the needs of job seekers and employers. The Administration prefers the house level.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE

Both the House and the Senate versions of the bill would threaten the well-being of our Nation's most needy and vulnerable citizens and would threaten the stability of our Nation's most distressed communities. In particular, the draconian cuts targeted by the House towards programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would deny help to 63,000 needy, low-income households, including many homeless families. The House version of the bill could also prevent another 24,000 homeless families from moving to transitional or permanent housing during this fiscal year. Hundreds of communities would lose money that they have counted on for critical community needs such as housing rehabilitation and social services for the elderly. In addition, the House's rescission of all FY 1995 funding for the Federal Government's primary rural multi-family rental housing direct loan program (section 515) would put thousands of rural residents living in existing Federal multi-family projects at risk and jeopardize the Government's investment in these projects. Many of the Department of Agriculture's projects need to be rehabilitated and, without the FY 1995 funding, would be in danger of being closed.

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PEOPLE WITH AIDS (HOPWA)

The HOPWA program provides housing and other services for people with AIDS. Without such assistance, some of the most vulnerable people in our society would become homeless. The Administration is opposed to the House action that would rescind $186 million from the HOPWA program, thus eliminating the entire amount appropriated for this program in FY 1995. We commend the Senate for restoring funding for this important program and urge the conferees to adopt the Senate position.

VIOLENT CRIME AND DRUG ABUSE CONTROL

The Administration opposes both the House and the Senate's recommendation to rescind $65 and $29 million, respectively, for violent crime prevention and drug control initiatives. Within this overall reduction, the House would reduce by $28 million and the Senate by $17 million funding for Drug courts, which will provide drug treatment and real opportunities for rehabilitation for non-violent, first-time drug offenders. The Administration also opposes the House action that would cut $32 million from the Drug Elimination grants at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Administration prefers the overall Senate level of funding for these programs.

The Administration objects to a provision in the Senate version of the bill that would delete all grant funding for the Ounce of Prevention program. This program is vital to the Administration's efforts to coordinate crime prevention programs nation-wide. The Administration prefers the House level of funding for this program.

VETERANS MEDICAL CARE AND CONSTRUCTION

The Senate version of the bill would rescind $100 million from the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans medical care and construction. These cuts would eliminate $20 million in new medical equipment for veterans health care, $30 million for veterans health services, and $50 million for expanding or improving veterans medical facilities. The Administration believes these cuts are unwise and unnecessary, and would harm the veterans who need their nation's help the most. The Administration prefers the House position.

TIMBER SALES

The Administration is opposed to a provision contained in both the House and Senate versions of the bill that would too broadly define ''salvage timber sales'' to include sales of primarily healthy trees, supersede the otherwise applicable environmental and land management statutes, and restrict citizens' access to the courts. The Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce last month announced a comprehensive plan to accelerate timber salvage sales. In addition to the measures already underway at these agencies to accelerate timber salvage sales, the Administration stands ready to work with the Congress to find appropriate, productive solutions to this pressing national problem that would not result in a return to gridlock, as may well result from the bill's provisions.

In addition, the Administration is opposed to a provision contained in the Senate version of the bill that would overturn the existing environment and land management framework of the President's Forest Plan for the Pacific Northwest (''Option 9''). The carefully crafted balance in the Forest Plan allows for a sustainable timber harvest as well as environmental protection. This Plan was key to the release of a court injunction on logging in the territory of the Northern Spotted Owl and represents a finely crafted compromise that took two years to achieve. The Administration believes that it can expedite Option 9 sales without setting aside the existing land management framework.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The Administration believes that the House's action to reduce funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) by a total of 23 percent from FY 1995 to FY 1997 is excessive and shortsighted. The Administration is committed to providing equal access to educational opportunities, particularly for young children, regardless of income or geographic location. While the Administration does not support the Senate rescission, which freezes the program at the FY 1995 level, the Administration prefers it to the House action.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION (OSHA)

The House version of the bill would rescind $19.6 million from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. This is a 6.3 percent reduction in OSHA funding although, effectively, a 12.6 percent reduction since it comes so late in the fiscal year. The rescission would have a dramatic impact on OSHA's ability to fulfill its mission to protect workers and on the Administration's efforts to make the agency more effective. This rescission would hinder OSHA's compliance assistance programs and education and training initiatives, as well as enforcement, resulting in an estimated 6,300 additional preventable injuries. The Administration is pleased that the Senate version of the bill does not include this cut and prefers the Senate funding level.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Our Nation's future economic health depends on strong public and private support for science and technology. The proposed rescission to many of the Administration's investments would jeopardize our ability to achieve sustained economic growth and competitiveness.

The Administration prefers the Senate version of the bill with respect to the funding level for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) over the House version, which would reduce the number of new centers established from 36 to 10. This would result in reduced access to state-of-the-art manufacturing technology and techniques by U.S. manufacturers—a key component of the U.S. economy.

The Administration objects to the House's proposed rescission of $30 million for the Commerce Department's National Information Infrastructure Grants program. The Administration believes that this program provides substantial benefits by facilitating access to information products and services by all Americans. P.L. 104–6 rescinded $15 million from this program. If the rescissions contained in the House version of the bill were adopted, the program would be cut by a total of 70 percent.

The Administration also opposes the $16.5 million and $19.5 million rescission of funds proposed by the House and Senate, respectively, for laboratory research at NIST. These rescissions would have a real impact on industry's ability to compete in both emerging and mature markets and would result in the diminished competitive posture of U.S. industry. NIST laboratories develop and deliver measurement techniques and services that provide a common language needed by industry in all stages of commerce.

The House's proposed rescission of $16.7 million and the Senate's proposed rescission of $12.5 million for the National Biological Service in the Department of the Interior would severely hamper the Service's ability to provide basic scientific information to the land managing bureaus within the Department, including programs in the Pacific Northwest. This rescission would force the Service to consider closing one or more of four major laboratory centers, and joint State projects underway in more than 30 States would be reduced.

The Senate has proposed rescinding $42 million in funding for upgrades to the national transonic wind tunnel. These upgrades have been planned for many years and are critical to maintaining the performance of these tunnels. The wind tunnel complex has contributed to the development of almost every U.S.-developed military and civil aircraft. Failure to modernize this facility will increase the delay in critical test data. These upgrades are needed now and are unrelated to the development of a new wind tunnel facility.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION (SSA) AUTOMATION INVESTMENT

The Senate version of the bill would reduce funding for SSA computer systems by $88 million, thus elimination all second-year funding for SSA's multi-year automation investment. This reduction would lead to deterioration in service by not allowing for the

purchase of new computer equipment as existing equipment wears out and customer demands increase. The funds proposed for rescission are already programmed to support contract awards for quantities of computers supported by the Senate and the General Accounting Office.

The Administration notes the Senate's concern about the total number of computers SSA plans to acquire over a five-year period. Under the current SSA plan, the level of funding provided in FYs 1994 and 1995 would fund the installation of less than one-third of the total number of workstations planned. The Administration believes that the Senate's concern with out-year plans would be more appropriately addressed in relation to out-year funding.

FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND

The Administration does not support the rescission of the full $1.9 billion proposed by the Senate. Most of the projects proposed for rescission by the Senate were proposed in previous budgets. The Administration continues to support the requested funding levels for these construction and repairs and alterations projects. Rescission of funding for new construction projects may result in higher costs, if long-term needs must be met in leased space. In other cases, where leasing is not an option (i.e., courthouses and border stations), it may not be possible to meet Federal agency needs in the near term. Rescission of funds for modernization projects and other repairs and alterations could lead to the gradual deterioration of government-owned assets.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

The Administration believes that the House proposal to eliminate all emergency relief funds is irresponsible, given the recent flooding in California and other requirements likely to arise this year. The Senate proposes to rescind only $50 million of emergency funds. The Administration also objects to the Senate proposal to eliminate $50 million in contract authority for the congestion pricing pilot program. This may restrict the Department's ability to pursue important projects in FY 1996 and FY 1997 currently being developed. While opposing the rescission of Coast Guard Operating Expenses because it undermines the recent supplemental, the Administration notes that the Senate bill cuts a smaller amount. Finally, both the House and Senate versions of the bill include across-the-board reductions in operating costs for transportation programs. These reductions are in addition to the government-wide reductions in the Senate bill. It is unfair for the Department to be hit twice by such reductions. The transportation-specific provisions should be dropped.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

The Senate version of the bill would rescind $104 million from the Base Realignment and Closure accounts. This action would slow local communities' productive reuse of base closure property by limiting funding for environmental restoration. It would also slow funding for construction of facilities at receiving bases, which could delay the move of some military units from closing bases to their new locations. Making property available for economic redevelopment is a key part of the Administration's Five Point Plan for assisting base closure communities. The Administration prefers the House level of funding.

NATO INFRASTRUCTURE

The Senate version of the bill would rescind $69 million from the NATO Infrastructure account. This action could undermine existing NATO Infrastructure agreements and treaty commitments and frustrate U.S. efforts to increase the burdensharing contributions of our allies. All of the FY 1995 appropriations for NATO Infrastructure have been obligated or committed for specific NATO construction projects, which would have to be terminated—with potential termination penalties—if the rescissions were enacted. Furthermore, such a rescission would set a precedent for other NATO nations to withdraw their support from the NATO Infrastructure budget. The Administration prefers the House level of funding.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

With regard to P.L. 480 food programs, the Administration strongly supports the Senate action rescinding the $142.5 million that the Administration proposed for rescission. This rescission is preferable to other rescissions in international affairs programs in the bill.

The Administration prefers the Senate position regarding the funding level for foreign operations programs. The Senate's unallocated reduction of $125 million would give the Administration greater flexibility, and would do less damage to foreign policy priorities than the House's targeted rescission totaling $192 million. For international programs under the jurisdiction of the Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Subcommittee, the Administration prefers the overall House position.

The Administration opposes the Senate proposal to rescind $27.7 million for international broadcasting activities. In accordance with the Administration's international broadcasting consolidation plan and the International Broadcasting Act of 1994, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL) and USIA's Voice of America are in the process of significant downsizing. To accomplish the reductions and relocation of RFE/RL to Prague from Munich, over $100 million was provided in FY 1995 specifically for the one-time costs of downsizing and the move. The proposed rescission, along with the Senate's failure to provide $7.3 million that is needed to offset exchange rate losses, would seriously hamper implementation of the consolidation plan passed by Congress, which is estimated to save over $400 million by the end of FY 1997. The Administration prefers the House's position.

Both the House and the Senate propose to rescind $14.6 million from the State Department's Contributions to International Peacekeeping Activities, which support peacekeeping activities around the world. This action runs counter to U.S. national security and foreign policy interests. The U.S. strives to lead the international community in promoting peaceful resolution of regional conflicts. This rescission would undermine these efforts, weaken U.S. leadership, and exacerbate the arrearage problem. In FY 1995, the U.S. is in arrears (expected to total over $650 million) on its UN treaty obligations to pay its share of peacekeeping activities. The conferees are urged to restore these funds.

S 617—SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1995

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on S. 617, the Second Supplemental and Rescissions Bill, FY 1995, as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

While the Senate Committee bill would delete or reduce several of the most objectionable rescissions contained in the House-passed bill, the Administration must strongly oppose many provisions of the Committee bill, and, therefore, finds the bill unacceptable. We believe that it unnecessarily cuts valuable, proven programs that educate our children and aid the disadvantaged, including the National Service program. The Administration also opposes reductions in programs that were established to ensure our Nation's role in the advancement of technology.

DEFICIT REDUCTION

The Administration remains firmly committed to deficit reduction. In 1993, the Administration worked with the Congress to enact the largest deficit reduction package in history. We cut Federal spending by $255 billion over five years, cut taxes for 40 million low- and moderate-income Americans, and made 90 percent of small businesses eligible for tax relief, while increasing income tax rates only on the wealthiest 1.2 percent of Americans. As we placed a tight ''freeze'' on overall discretionary spending at the FY 1993 levels, we shifted spending toward investments in human and physical capital that will help secure our future.

This Administration's economic plan helped bring the deficit down from $290 billion in FY 1992—to $203 billion in FY 1994, to a projected $193 billion this year—providing three straight years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

We believe that we can address the issue of deficit reduction and provide for the Middle Class Bill of Rights without putting low-income families at risk. The Administration does not believe that sound programs, particularly those aimed at the disadvantaged and those that will ensure our Nation's preeminent standing in science and technology, should be cut. The Administration would be particularly troubled if such cuts were made to finance a tax cut for higher-income taxpayers. It is noted that the Senate Committee bill does not include language that would direct that savings generated by the bill be set aside for deficit reduction.

In the FY 1996 Budget, the President has proposed significant rescissions for FY 1995 and additional program terminations in FY 1996 for numerous low-priority programs. In contrast, the Senate-reported bill would impose severe reductions on a number of high-priority programs. These cuts would have a particularly harmful effect on our Nation's children by cutting funding for National Service, Summer Jobs, WIC, Goals 2000, Head Start, Job Corps, Education for the Disadvantaged, direct student loans, and housing for families. Many of the cuts are short-sighted—reducing funding for education, for advanced technology programs that are critical to our Nation's future, and eliminating funding for the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund, which would be instrumental in leveraging investments in our country's most distressed communities. Other cuts would adversely affect the health of Americans by cutting funding for safe drinking water and violent crime prevention and anti-drug programs. In its consideration of the bill, we urge the Senate to restore these cuts.

FEMA EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL

The Administration is disappointed that the Committee was chosen to include in this controversial bill the urgently needed FEMA supplemental, which is appropriately designed as an emergency for which offsets are not required under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990. This could cause an unnecessary delay in assistance to victims of natural disasters in 40 states, including victims of the Northridge earthquake. If action on the Administration's request is delayed, FEMA will, beginning in May, be unable to allocate funds to meet any new disaster requirements, unless money reserved for the 40 states currently receiving disaster assistance is cut.

Additional Administration concerns with the Committee-reported bill are contained in the attachment.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAM

The proposed $210 million rescission for the Corporation for National And Community, Service would reduce significantly the President's National Service program, depriving more than 15,000 young adults of the opportunity to serve their communities as an AmeriCorps member and earn an education benefit. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for the opportunity for thousands of school children to learn about responsibility to their community for the first time.

This program has a proven track record. For example, AmeriCorps members have already reclaimed recreation areas in inner cities from gangs, and thousands of low-income and migrant children have received proper immunizations to protect their health. AmeriCorps members also have helped raise the spelling scores and reading levels of rural disadvantaged children, built homes for ''working-poor'' families, and provided disaster relief assistance to victims throughout the western part of the country. The Administration strongly believes that national service is a key to solving problems inside America's communities. The Senate is urged to restore full funding for this important program.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (CDFI) FUND

The proposed rescission of $124 million contained in the Committee-reported bill would terminate this program. Without this funding, in FYs 1995 and 1996 the CDFI Fund would not be able to provide: $10 million in direct loan subsidies to support over $23 million of direct loans to CDFIs; $70.5 million in grants, technical, assistance, and other financial assistance to CDFIs; and $39 million in community development incentives for depository institutions. The Fund's investments in CDFIs, banks, and thrifts would leverage an estimated $500 million in investments, loans, and financial services in the country's most distressed communities. The Senate is urged to restore this funding.

WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

The Committee-reported bill would reduce funds available for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) by $35 million. The WIC program provides nutritious supplemental foods to low-income pregnant, post-partum, and breastfeeding women, and to infants and children up to their fifth birthday. The Committee's action would result in 840,000 fewer food packages for women, infants, and children. Jeopardizing the health and welfare of these mothers and children cannot be justified.

HEAD START

The Administration objects to the Senate action that would reduce funding for Head Start by $42 million. At the FY 1995 estimated per-child cost of $4,530, $42 million would be sufficient to provide Head Start services to approximately 9,300 children. HHS would make every effort to minimize the number of children and families who could potentially be affected by a mid-year funding reduction. However, at a minimum, the statutorily-mandated effort to serve children under age three would be sharply reduced, with more than 3,000 children not receiving Head Start services. The rescission could also eliminate all new funding for the statutorily-mandated initiative to enhance the transition of Head Start children into the public schools.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The Committee-reported bill would reduce the funding for Goals 2000 by $68 million, which would greatly diminish support to States and communities for raising academic standards and improving their local schools. The Committee-reported bill also proposes to cut the Education for the Disadvantaged program by $80 million, which would reduce services to educationally disadvantaged children. The Administration is also opposed to the $95 million reduction proposed for the direct student loan program.

SUMMER JOBS

The Summer Jobs Program provides meaningful work experience for hundreds of thousands of economically disadvantaged youth who might otherwise not have any opportunity to learn necessary job skills and workplace behaviors during crucial formative years. The Administration is pleased that the Committee has not reduced funding for this program for the summer of 1995. However, the Administration remains concerned that the rescission contained in the Committee-reported bill would eliminate funding for the Summer Youth Employment program in the summer of 1996, thereby eliminating job opportunities for about 615,000 disadvantaged youth. The Administration strongly believes that improving the job prospects of at-risk youth is an important element in a broader strategy to ensure employment opportunities for all Americans and a vibrant, productive workforce for U.S. business.

JOB CORPS

The Administration objects to the Senate Committee action that would rescind $46 million for Job Corps. This action would halt expansion of a youth training program with a track record of improving the employment and earnings of poor youth. The Committee action would eliminate funds to continue work on the eight new Job Corps centers that were launched with previous years' appropriations. Work is underway on these eight centers, which would create 3,200 new training slots for about 4,700 severely disadvantaged youth each year. In addition, the Senate Committee action would eliminate funds to initiate four new Job Corps centers in 1995, which would boost capacity by another 1,600 slots.

VIOLENT CRIME AND DRUG ABUSE CONTROL

The Administration is concerned that the Committee has chosen to rescind nearly $100 million in funding for the Safe and Drug Free School Program at the same time that every poll shows that crime and school safety are a major concern of Americans. This program is the centerpiece of the Administration's fight against the use of drugs and stimulants by an alarming increasing number of our youth.

The Administration opposes the Committee's recommendation to rescind $53 million for violent crime prevention and drug control initiatives—$39 million of which is funded through the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund (VCRTF). Of the total amount rescinded, nearly $27 million would come from the Drug Courts program, which will provide drug treatment and real first-time drug offenders. Another $11 million would come from the Family and Community Endeavor Schools (FACES) program, which seeks to provide healthy alternatives to the streets for youth. All grant funding for the Ounce of Prevention Council would be rescinded. Another $13 million (non-VCRTF funding) would come from Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) block grants, which would reduce States' abilities to offer drug abuse treatment.

FEMA DISASTER RELIEF

P.L. 102–229, the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1992, contained a special provision on emergency designations under the Budget Enforcement Act (BEA) for FEMA Stafford Act activities. That provision specifies that all appropriations for disaster assistance in excess of the then historical annual average obligation of $320 million (or the amount of the President's budget request, whichever is lower) ''shall be considered as 'emergency requirements' pursuant to'' the BEA, and ''such amounts shall hereafter be so designated.'' This provision is permanent law applying in FY 1993 and ''thereafter,'' and expressly applies ''notwithstanding any other provision of law.'' In FY 1995, the President requested and the Congress did in fact appropriate $320 million for FEMA disaster activities.

The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has decided to disregard this provision of law and to include this emergency funding in a controversial rescission bill, which will inevitably lead to delay.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE

The Committee-reported bill would threaten the well-being of our Nation's most needy and vulnerable citizens and would wreak havoc upon the stability of our Nation's most distressed communities. The draconian cuts targeted towards programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would deny help to thousands of needy, low-income households, including many homeless families. Hundreds of communities would lose money that they have counted on for critical community needs such as housing rehabilitation.

TIMBER SALES

The Administration is opposed to a provision of the Committee-reported bill that would too broadly define ''salvage timber sales'' to include sales of primarily healthy trees, supersede the otherwise applicable environmental and land management statutes, and restrict citizens' access to the courts. The Administration remains steadfastly committed to the Northwest Forest Plan, which establishes a careful balance between sustainable timber harvest and sound ecosystem management.

The Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce last month announced a comprehensive plan to accelerate timber salvage sales. Nevertheless, the Administration is concerned that the current timber salvage program does not meet expectations. In addition to the measures already underway at these agencies to accelerate timber salvage sales, we stand ready to work with the Congress to find appropriate, productive solutions to this pressing national problem that would not result in a return to gridlock.

DAVIS-BACON PROVISION

The Administration opposes a provision in the bill that would exempt any contract associated with the construction of facilities for the National Museum of the American Indian from the Davis-Bacon Act. The Act requires that all Federally-funded or Federally-assisted construction be covered by the Davis-Bacon Act. An exception in this case would be counter the goals of the Act.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

This Administration remains firmly committed to increasing the Nation's productivity and raising living standards by investing in science and technology. These investment will lead to a healthy, educated public; job creation and economic growth; world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering; and harnessed information technology. The rescissions proposed by the Committee for many of the programs in the Department of Commerce would severely threaten the United States' standing with respect to technology advancements and competitiveness.

The proposed rescission of funds for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) contained in the Committee-reported bill would reduce the number of new centers established from 36 to 10. This would result in reduced access top state-of-the-art manufacturing technology and techniques by U.S. manufacturers—a key component of the U.S. economy.

The proposed $19.5 million rescission of funds for laboratory research at NIST would have a real impact on industry's ability to compete in both emerging and mature markets. NIST laboratories develop and deliver measurement techniques and services that provide a common language needed by industry in all stages of commerce. The rescissions would result in the elimination of new starts in the areas of Advanced Manufacturing, Biotechnology, Semiconductor Metrology, and Information Infrastructure standards development resulting in the diminished competitive posture of U.S. industry.

Reductions are also proposed by the Committee for the Department of Energy's (DOE's) solar, renewable energy, and conservation research programs. Such reductions would threaten our national effort to implement fully the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Climate Change Action Plan. Reduction to the DOE science budget also would adversely impact climate change, human genome, and neutron research. The additional reductions to the Environmental Management program would impede progress at several of the Department's cleanup sites.

The Committee's proposed rescission of $12.5 million for the National Biological Service in the Department of the Interior would severely hamper the Service's ability to provide basic scientific information to the land managing bureaus within the Department, including programs in the Pacific Northwest. This rescission would force the Service to consider closing the Great Lakes Science Center in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Also, certain laboratory facilities would be considered for closure, and joint State projects underway in more than 30 States would be reduced.

The Committee has proposed rescinding $42 million of upgrades to the national transonic wind tunnel. These upgrades have been planned for many years and are critical to maintaining the performance of these tunnels. The wind tunnel complex has contributed to the development of almost every U.S-developed military and civil aircraft. Failure to modernize this facility will increase the delay in critical test data. These upgrades are needed now and are unrelated to the development of a new wind tunnel facility.

The Senate is urged not to imperil our Nation's standing on the technology frontier.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

The Committee-reported bill does not appropriate the requested $672 million emergency supplemental for assessed U.N. peacekeeping costs that will accrue during FY 1995. The United States is bound by treaty to pay these costs. Failure to pay them by the end of the fiscal year will imperil the continuity of U.N. missions in regions of great importance to the U.S. national security and foreign policy interests. Rather than approve the requested supplemental, the Committee has proposed to rescind peacekeeping funds.

DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

While an improvement over the House-passed bill, the rescission of $0.8 billion in funds to help municipalities comply with Safe Drinking Water Act requirements contained in the Committee-reported bill would still seriously exacerbate local financing problems. Municipalities need almost $9 billion in capital costs to comply with existing regulations and additional billions to comply with future rules needed to prevent problems such as the cryptosporidium outbreak in Milwaukee in 1993 that killed 100 people and caused illness in another 400,000.

Most affected by this rescission would be the 27 million people who get their water from a system that has violated drinking water standards. If Congress fails to authorize the drinking water state revolving fund program, these funds can be used without further Congressional action to address the $137 billion in wastewater construction needs.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION (SSA) AUTOMATION INVESTMENT

The Committee bill reduces funding for SSA computer systems by $88 million, thus eliminating all second-year funding for SSA's multi-year automation investment. This reduction would lead to deterioration in service by not allowing for the purchase of new computer equipment as existing equipment wears out and customer demands increase. The funds proposed for rescission are already programmed to support contract awards for quantities of computers supported by the Committee and the General Accounting Office.

The Administration notes the Committee's concern about the total number of computers SSA plans to acquire over a five-year period. Under the current SSA plan, the level of funding provided in FYs 1994 and 1995 funds the installation of less than one-third of the total number of workstations planned. The Administration believes that the Committee's concern with out-year plans would be more appropriately addressed in relation to out-year funding.

COAST GUARD

The Administration opposes the Committee's action to reduce Coast Guard operating expenses while supplementing funding for expenses related to operations in Haiti and Cuba. Offsets to pay for those activities deemed an emergency by the Administration are counterproductive. Additional cuts would negate the effects of the supplemental, thereby rendering the Coast Guard less able to provide the level of service the public expects.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

The Committee bill would rescind $140 million from the Base Realignment and Closure accounts. This action would slow local communities' productive reuse of base closure property by delaying the departure of military units and by limiting funding for environmental restoration. Making property available for economic redevelopment is a key part of the Administration's Five Point Plan for assisting base closure communities.

NATO INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee bill would rescind $69 million from the NATO Infrastructure account. This action could undermine existing NATO Infrastructure agreements and treaty commitments and frustrate our efforts to increase the burdensharing contributions of our allies. All of the FY 1995 appropriations for NATO Infrastructure have been obligated or committed for specific NATO construction projects, which would have to be terminated—with potential termination penalties—if the rescission were enacted. Furthermore, such a rescission would set a precedent for other NATO nations to withdraw their support form the NATO Infrastructure budget.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, March 21, 1995.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The purpose of this letter is to provide the Administration's views on H.R. 1158, the supplemental appropriations and rescissions bill, as passed by the House. As the Senate develops its version of the bill, your consideration of the Administration's views would be appreciated.

The Administration strongly opposes the House-passed bill. We believe that it unnecessarily cuts valuable, proven programs that educate our children and aid the disadvantaged, including the National Service program. The Administration also opposes reductions in programs that were established to ensure our Nation's role in the advancement of technology. Further, we strongly oppose a provision in the bill that would prohibit implementation of the Executive Order on striker replacements. Based on all of these considerations, if the President were presented a bill containing these provisions, he would veto the bill.

BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT EMERGENCY DESIGNATION

As the President stated in his February 14, 1995, letter to the Speaker, the Administration is proud of its record for reducing the deficit while providing prompt assistance to the victims of natural disasters. The Budget Enforcement Act, signed by President Bush, established the authority for the President and Congress to exempt certain spending from the statutory caps, specifically for the purpose of meeting unanticipated emergency requirements. This joint designation by the President and the Congress has been used over the last four years to provide critical assistance in response to earthquakes, hurricanes, floods, extreme cold and agricultural disasters, and for other purposes.

DEFICIT REDUCTION

The Administration remains firmly committed to deficit reduction. In 1993, the Administration worked with the Congress to enact the largest deficit reduction package in history. We cut Federal spending by $255 billion over five years, cut taxes for 40 million low- and moderate-income Americans, and made 90 percent of small businesses eligible for tax relief, while increasing income tax rates only on the wealthiest 1.2 percent of Americans. As we placed a tight ''freeze'' on overall discretionary spending at the FY 1993 levels, we shifted spending toward investments in human and physical capital that will help secure our future.

This Administration's economic plan helped bring the deficit down from $290 billion in FY 1992—to $203 billion in FY 1994, to a projected $191 billion this year—providing three straight years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

We believe that we can address the issue of deficit reduction and provide for the Middle Class Bill of Rights without putting low-income families at risk. The Administration does not believe that sound programs, particularly those aimed at the disadvantaged and those that will ensure our Nation's preeminent standing in science and technology, should be cut. The Administration would be particularly troubled if such cuts were made to finance a tax cut for higher-income taxpayers. In light of the House Budget Committee action last week, it is clear that savings generated by the House version of H.R. 1158 are intended to be used for a tax cut for higher-income taxpayers.

In the FY 1996 Budget, the President has proposed significant rescissions for FY 1995 and additional program terminations in FY

1996 for numerous low-priority programs. In contrast, the House-passed bill would impose severe reductions on a number of high-priority programs. These cuts would have a particularly harmful effect on our Nation's children by cutting funding for National Service, Summer Jobs, WIC, and housing for families. Many of the cuts are shortsighted—reducing funding for education, for advanced technology programs that are critical to our Nation's future, and eliminating funding for the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund, which would be instrumental in leveraging investments in our country's most distressed communities. Other cuts would adversely affect the health of Americans by cutting funding for safe drinking water and violent crime prevention and anti-drug programs. In its consideration of the bill, we urge the Senate to restore these cuts.

NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAM

The proposed $416 million rescission for the Corporation for National and Community Service would virtually terminate the President's National Service program. Remaining funds would provide only 4,000 of the proposed 33,000 opportunities for young adults to serve their communities as AmeriCorps members and earn an education award. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for thousands of school children to learn responsibility to their community for the first time. In addition, over 1,000 young persons currently serving in communities hard hit by defense downsizing would be sent home immediately, and their camps—established on downsized military bases—would be closed.

This program has a proven track record. For example, AmeriCorps members have already reclaimed recreation areas in inner cities from gangs, and thousands of low-income and migrant children have received proper immunizations to protect their health. AmeriCorps members also have helped raise the spelling scores and reading levels of rural disadvantaged children, built homes for ''working-poor'' families, and provide disaster relief assistance to victims throughout the western part of the country. The Administration strongly believes that national service is a key to solving problems inside America's communities. The Senate is urged to restore full funding for this important program.

STRIKER REPLACEMENT

The Administration opposes a provision in the House-passed bill that would prohibit the Executive Branch from using FY 1995 funds to issue, implement, administer, or enforce any Executive Order or other rule or order that prohibits Federal contracts with companies that hire permanent replacements for striking employees. This provision would impinge upon the Executive Branch's ability to ensure a stable supply of quality goods and services for the government's programs. The use or the threat to use permanent replacement workers destroys opportunities for cooperative and stable labor-management relations.

TIMBER SALVAGE SALES

The Administration objects to a provision that would mandate a minimum level of timber salvage sales from Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands. The Department of Justice has advised that enactment of this amendment would likely result in renewed judicial review of the President's Forest Plan and could reduce timber, grazing, and mining activities in the West. The Administration is already taking steps to restore and sustain significant levels of timber harvest in the immediate future. In addition, the Administration will shortly announce changes in the consultation process designed to expedite review of timber salvage sales as well as other actions to increase timber harvest, in full compliance with environmental laws.

FEMA EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL

The Administration is disappointed that the House has chosen to include urgently needed FEMA emergency supplemental funds in this controversial bill. This could cause an unnecessary delay in assistance to victims of natural disasters. If action on the Administration's request is delayed, FEMA will, beginning in May, be unable to allocate funds to meet any new disaster requirements, unless money reserved for the 40 states currently receiving disaster assistance is cut.

Additional Administration concerns with the House-passed bill are contained in the enclosure. We look forward to working with the Senate to address our mutual concerns.

Sincerely,

ALICE M. RIVLIN,
Director.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS—H.R. 1158—MAKING EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND MAKING RESCISSIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1995, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES (AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE)

FEMA DISASTER RELIEF

P.L. 102–229, the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1992, contained a special provision on emergency designations under the Budget Enforcement Act (BEA) for FEMA Stafford Act activities. That provision specifies that all appropriations for disaster assistance in excess of the then historical annual average obligation of $320 million (or the amount of the President's budget request, whichever is lower) ''shall be considered as 'emergency requirements' pursuant to'' the BEA, and ''such amounts shall hereafter be so designated.'' This provision is permanent law applying in FY 1993 and ''thereafter,'' and expressly applies ''notwithstanding any other provision of law.'' In FY 1995, the President requested and the Congress did in fact appropriate $320 million for FEMA disaster activities.

The Administration is disappointed that the House has decided to disregard this provision of law and to include this emergency funding in a controversial rescission bill, which will inevitably lead to delay.

SUMMER JOBS

The Summer Jobs Program provides meaningful work experience for hundreds of thousands of economically disadvantaged youth who might otherwise not have any opportunity to learn necessary job skills and workplace behaviors during crucial formative years. The rescission contained in the House-passed bill would eliminate funding for the Summer Youth Employment program in each of the summers of 1995 and 1996, thereby eliminating job opportunities for about 615,000 disadvantaged youth in each of these summers. The Administration strongly believes that improving the job prospects of at-risk youth is an important element in a broader strategy to ensure employment opportunities for all Americans and a vibrant, productive workforce for U.S. business.

WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

The House-passed bill would reduce funds available for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) by $25 million. The WIC program provides nutritious supplemental foods to low-income pregnant, post-partum, and breastfeeding women, and to infants and children up to their fifth birthday. The House's action would result in 600,000 fewer food packages for women, infants, and children. Jeopardizing the health and welfare of these mothers and children cannot be justified.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The House-passed bill would reduce by over one-third ($174 million) the funding for Goals 2000, which would greatly diminish support to States and communities for raising academic standards and improving their local schools. The House-passed bill also proposes to cut the Education for the Disadvantaged program by $140 million, which would reduce services to educationally disadvantaged children. The House-passed bill's sharp reduction in funding for education technology programs ($65 million) would enable fewer local communities to put state-of-the-art tools of learning in classrooms where they are most needed to prepare our students for the future.

VIOLENT CRIME AND DRUG ABUSE CONTROL

The Administration is concerned that the House has chosen to rescind nearly $472 million in funding for the Safe and Drug Free School Program at the same time that every poll shows that crime and school safety are a major concern of Americans. This program is the centerpiece of the Administration's fight against the use of drugs and stimulants by an alarmingly increasing number of our youth.

The Administration opposes the House's recommendation to rescind $65 million for violent crime prevention and drug control initiatives funded through the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund. Of this amount, nearly $28 million would come from the Drug Courts program, which will provide drug treatment and real opportunities for rehabilitation for non-violent, first-time drug offenders. Another $37 million would come from the Family and Community Endeavor Schools (FACES) program, which seeks to provide healthy alternatives to the streets for youth.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

This Administration remains firmly committed to increasing the Nation's productivity and raising living standards by investing in science and technology. These investments will lead to a healthy, educated public; job creation and economic growth; world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering; and harnessed information technology. The rescissions proposed by the House for many of the programs in the Department of Commerce would severely threaten the United States' standing with respect to technology advancements and competitiveness.

The proposed rescission of funds for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) contained in the House-passed bill would reduce the number of new centers established from 36 to 10. This would result in reduced access to state-of-the-art manufacturing technology and techniques by U.S. manufacturers—a key component of the U.S. economy.

The $30 million rescission included in the House-passed bill for the National Information Infrastructure Grants program would eliminate grants to about 70–90 schools, hospitals, non-profits, and State and local governments. An additional rescission of $34 million is contained in the Senate version of H.R. 889. These two rescissions would eliminate all funding for this program. This action would decrease the credibility of the program as a funding source and thus discourage private sector matching grants to program applicants. The Senate is urged to rescind funds from lower-priority projects as set forth in the President's budget.

Reductions are also proposed by the House for the Department of Energy's (DOE's) solar, renewable energy, and conservation research programs. Such reductions would threaten our national effort to implement fully the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Climate Change Action Plan. Reduction to the DOE science budget also would adversely impact climate change, human genome, and neutron research. In addition, the $45 million reduction to the Environmental Management program would impede progress at several of the Department's cleanup sites.

Coming this late in the fiscal year, the House's proposed rescission of $16.8 million for the National Biological Service in the Department of the Interior (10 percent of the operating budget) will force the Service to consider closing one or more of the four major Centers located in Lafayette, Louisiana; Seattle, Washington; Ann Arbor, Michigan; and Anchorage, Alaska; as well as several other laboratories. This would severely hamper the Service's ability to provide basic scientific information to the land managing bureaus within the Department, including programs in the Pacific Northwest, and would eliminate joint State projects underway in more than 30 States.

The Senate is urged not to imperil our Nation's standing on the technology frontier.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE

The House-passed bill would threaten the well-being of our Nation's most needy and vulnerable citizens and would wreak havoc upon the stability of our Nation's most distressed communities. The draconian cuts targeted towards programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would deny help to 63,000 needy, low-income households, including many homeless families. The bill could also prevent another 24,000 homeless families from moving to transitional or permanent housing during this fiscal year. Hundreds of communities would lose money that they have counted on for critical community needs such as housing rehabilitation and social services for the elderly.

In addition, the House's rescission of all FY 1995 funding for the Federal Government's primary rural multi-family rental housing direct loan program (section 515) would put thousands of rural residents living in existing Federal multi-family projects at risk and jeopardize the Government's investment in these projects. Many of the Department of Agriculture's projects need to be rehabilitated and, without the FY 1995 funding, would be in danger of being closed.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (CDFI) FUND

The proposed rescission of $124 million contained in the House-passed bill would terminate this program. Without this funding, in FYs 1995 and 1996 the CDFI Fund would not be able to provide: $10 million in direct loan subsidies to support over $23 million of direct loans to CDFIs; $70.5 million in grants, technical assistance, and other financial assistance to CDFIs; and $39 million in community development incentives for depository institutions. The Fund's investments in CDFIs, banks, and thrifts would leverage an estimated $500 million in investments, loans, and financial services in the country's most distressed communities. The Senate is urged to restore this funding.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

The House-passed bill does not appropriate the requested $672 million emergency supplemental for assessed U.N. peacekeeping costs that will accrue during FY 1995. The United States is bound by treaty to pay these costs. Failure to pay them by the end of the fiscal year will imperil the continuity of U.N. missions in regions of great importance to the U.S. national security and foreign policy interests. Rather than approve the requested supplemental, the House has proposed to rescind peacekeeping funds.

The House-passed bill provides only $50 million of the $275 million requested for Jordan debt forgiveness. This debt forgiveness is linked to the historic steps taken by King Hussein to conclude a peace agreement with Israel, an act that markedly improved prospects for overall peace in the region and that involved considerable risk for King Hussein. We urge the Congress to provide for Jordan debt forgiveness in H.R. 889 as it passed the Senate in support of the hopeful developments in this region.

HIGHWAYS—EMERGENCY RELIEF

The House-passed bill would eliminate $351 million in funding previously appropriated in response to the Northridge earthquake and other disasters. Over $50 million of this amount is expected to be needed just to meet claims for flood damage in California and Washington. In addition to leaving the Department of Transportation unable to meet the funding needs of existing disasters, this rescission would eliminate the Department's ability to respond promptly to future disasters. Instead of recommending rescission of these needed funds, the Administration urges the Senate to cancel unobligated balances of highway demonstration projects, as proposed in the President's FY 1996 Budget.

DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

The rescission of $1.3 billion in funds to help municipalities comply with Safe Drinking Water Act requirements contained in the House-passed bill would seriously exacerbate local financing problems. Municipalities need almost $9 billion in capital costs to comply with existing regulations and additional billions to comply with future rules needed to prevent problems such as the cryptosporidium outbreak in Milwaukee in 1993 that killed 100 people and caused illness in another 400,000.

Most affected by this rescission would be the 27 million people who get their water from a system that has violated drinking water standards. If Congress fails to authorize the drinking water state revolving fund program, these funds can be used without further Congressional action to address the $137 billion in wastewater construction needs.

COAST GUARD

The Administration opposes the House action to reduce Coast Guard operating expenses while supplementing funding for expenses related to operations in Haiti and Cuba. Offsets to pay for those activities deemed an emergency by the Administration are counterproductive. Additional cuts would negate the effects of the supplemental, thereby rendering the Coast Guard less able to provide the level of service the public expects.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The Administration believes that the House's action to reduce funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) by a total of 23 percent from FY 1995 to FY 1997 is excessive and shortsighted. The Administration is committed to providing equal access to educational opportunities, particularly for young children, regardless of income or geographic location.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION (OSHA)

The House-passed bill would rescind $19.6 million from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. This is a 6.3 percent reduction in OSHA funding and effectively a 12.6 percent reduction since it comes so late in the fiscal year. The rescission would have a dramatic impact on OSHA's ability to fulfill its mission to protect workers and on the Administration's efforts to make the agency more effective. This rescission would hinder OSHA's compliance assistance programs and education and training initiatives, as well as enforcement, resulting in an estimated 6,300 additional preventable injuries.

H.R. 1158 MAKING EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND MAKING RESCISSIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1995, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on the supplemental appropriations and rescissions bill as reported by the House Appropriations Committee.

The Administration strongly opposes this bill in its present form. We believe that it unnecessarily cuts valuable, proven programs that educate our children and aid the disadvantaged. The Administration also opposes cuts for programs that were established to ensure our Nation's role in the advancement of technology. We also strongly oppose a provision in the bill that would upset the balance contained in current law concerning Federal funding of abortions for the victims of rape and incest and a provision that would prohibit implementation of the Executive Order on striker replacements. Based on all of these considerations, if the President were presented a bill containing these provisions, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget would recommend that he veto the bill.

As the President said in his February 14, 1995, letter, the Administration is proud of its record for reducing the deficit while providing prompt assistance to the victims of natural disasters. The Budget Enforcement Act, signed by President Bush, established the authority for the President and Congress to exempt certain spending from statutory caps, specifically for the purpose of meeting emergency, unanticipated requirements. This joint designation by the President and the Congress has been used over the last four years to provide critical assistance in response to earthquakes, hurricanes, floods, extreme cold and agricultural disasters, and for other purposes.

The Administration remains firmly committed to deficit reduction. In 1993, the Administration worked with the Congress to enact the largest deficit reduction package in history. We cut Federal spending $255 billion over five years, cut taxes for 40 million low- and moderate-income Americans, and made 90 percent of small businesses eligible for tax relief, while increasing income tax rates only on the wealthiest 1.2 percent of Americans. As we placed a tight ''freeze' on overall discretionary spending at the FY 1993 levels, we shifted spending toward investment in human and physical capital that will help secure our future.

This Administration's economic plan helped bring the deficit down from $290 billion in FY 1992, to $203 billion in FY 1994, to a projected $193 billion this year—providing three straight years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

We believe that we can address the issue of deficit reduction and provide for the Middle Class Bill of Rights without putting low-income families at risk. The Administration does not believe that sound programs, particularly those aimed at the disadvantaged and those that will ensure our Nation's standing in areas of science and technology, should be cut. It would be particularly unwise to make such cuts to finance a tax cut for higher-income taxpayers.

In the FY 1996 Budget, the President has proposed significant rescissions for FY 1995 and additional program terminations in FY 1996 for numerous low-priority programs. In contrast, this bill would impose severe reductions on a number of high-priority programs. These cuts would have a particularly harmful effect on our Nation's children by cutting funding for National Service, Summer Jobs, and WIC. Many of the cuts are shortsighted, reducing funding for education, for advanced technology programs that are critical to our Nation's future, and eliminating funding for the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund, which would be instrumental in leveraging investments in our country's most distressed communities. Other cuts would adversely affect the health of Americans by cutting safe drinking water funding and violent crime prevention programs.

The Administration is opposed to an amendment that was added by the Committee that would allow states to decide to stop using public funds to pay for abortions in cases of rape and incest. The President believes that abortion should be safe, legal, and rare. The Administration is committed to ensuring that women who are victims of rape and incest have the right to choose abortion as an option. A woman should not be precluded from choosing this option if she is poor.

The Administration opposes a provision in the bill that would prohibit the Executive Branch from using FY 1995 funds to issue, implement, administer, or enforce any Executive Order or other rule or order that prohibits Federal contracts with companies that hire permanent replacements for striking employees. This provision would impinge upon the Executive Branch's ability to ensure a stable supply of quality goods and services for the government's programs.

The Administration objects to an amendment that was added by the Committee that would mandate a minimum level of timber salvage sales from Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands. The Department of Justice has advised that enactment of this amendment would likely result in renewed judicial review of the President's Forest Plan and could reduce timber, grazing, and mining activities in the West. The Administration is already taking steps to restore and sustain significant levels of timber harvest in the immediate future. In addition, the Administration will shortly announce changes in the consultation process designed to expedite review of timber salvage sales as well as other actions to increase timber harvest, in full compliance with environmental laws.

The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has chosen to include urgently needed FEMA emergency supplemental funds in this controversial bill. This could cause an unnecessary delay in assistance to victims of natural disasters. If action on the Administration's request is delayed, FEMA will, beginning in May, be unable to allocate funds to meet any new disaster requirements, unless money reserved for the 40 states currently receiving disaster assistance is cut.

Additional Administration concerns with the Committee-reported bill are contained in the attachment.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS AS REPORTED BY THE HOUSE FULL COMMITTEE

FEMA DISASTER RELIEF

P.L. 102–229, the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1992, contained a special provision on emergency designations under the Budget Enforcement Act (BEA) for FEMA Stafford Act activities. That provision specifies that all appropriations for disaster assistance in excess of the then historical annual average obligation of $320 million (or the amount of the President's budget request, whichever is lower) ''shall be considered as 'emergency requirements' pursuant to'' the BEA, and ''such amounts shall hereafter be so designated.'' This provision is permanent law applying in FY 1993 and ''thereafter,'' and expressly applies ''notwithstanding any other provision of law.'' In FY 1995, the President requested and the Congress did in fact appropriate $320 million for FEMA disaster activities.

The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has decided to disregard this provision of law and to include this emergency funding in a controversial rescission bill, which will inevitably lead to delay.

SUMMER JOBS

The Summer Jobs Program provides meaningful work experience for hundreds of thousands of economically disadvantaged youth who might otherwise not have any opportunity to learn necessary job skills and workplace behaviors during crucial formative years. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for the Summer Youth Employment program in each of the summers of 1995 and 1996, thereby eliminating job opportunities for about 615,000 disadvantaged youth in each of these summers. The Administration strongly believes that improving the job prospects of at-risk youth is an important element in a broader strategy to ensure employment opportunities for all Americans and a vibrant, productive workforce for U.S. business. The House is urged to restore funding for this important initiative.

NATIONAL SERVICE

The proposed $210 million rescission for the Corporation for National and Community Service would reduce significantly the President's National Service program, depriving more than 15,000 young adults of the opportunity to serve their communities as an AmeriCorps member and earn an education benefit. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for the opportunity for thousands of school children to learn about responsibility to their community for the first time.

This program has a proven track record. For example, AmeriCorps members have already reclaimed recreation areas in inner cities from gangs, and thousands of low-income and migrant children have received proper immunizations to protect their health.

The Administration strongly believes that national service is a key to solving problems inside America's communities. The House is urged to restore funding for this important program.

WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

The bill would reduce funds available for the Special Supplemental nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) by $25 million. The WIC program provides nutritious supplemental foods to low-income pregnant, post-partum, and breastfeeding women, and to infants and children up to their fifth birthday. The Committee's action would result in 600,000 fewer food packages for women, infants, and children. Jeopardizing the health and welfare of these mothers and children cannot be justified.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The bill would reduce by over one-third ($174 million) the funding for Goals 2000, which would greatly diminish support to States and communities for raising academic standards and improving their local schools. The bill also proposes to cut the Education for the Disadvantaged program by $105 million, which would reduce services to educationally disadvantaged children. The bill's sharp reduction in funding for education technology program ($65 million) would enable fewer local communities to put state-of-the-art tools of learning in classrooms where they are most needed to prepare our students for the future.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

This Administration remains firmly committed to increasing the Nation's productivity and raising living standards by investing in science and technology. These investments will lead to a healthy, educated public; job creation and economic growth; world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering; and harnessed information technology. The rescissions proposed in this bill for many of the programs in the Department of Commerce would severely threaten the United States' standing with respect to technology advancements and competitiveness.

The proposed rescission of funds for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) would reduce the number of new centers established from 36 to 10. This would result in reduced access to state-of-the-art manufacturing technology and techniques by U.S. manufacturers—a key component of the U.S. economy.

The $30 million rescission proposed for the National Information Infrastructure Grants program would eliminate grants to about 70–90 schools, hospitals, non-profits, and state and local governments. This action would decrease the credibility of the program as a funding source and thus discourage private sector matching grants to program applicants.

Reductions are also proposed for the Department of Energy's (DOE) solar, renewable energy, and conservation research programs. Such reductions would threaten our national effort to implement fully the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Climate Change Action Plan. Reduction to the DOE science budget also would adversely impact climate change, human genome, and neutron research. In addition, the $45 million reduction to the Environmental Management program would impede progress at several of the Department's cleanup sites.

The proposed rescission of $16.8 million, or 10 percent of the operating budget of the National Biological Service in the Department of the Interior, this late in the fiscal year, will force the Service to consider closing one or more of the four major Centers located in Lafayette, Louisiana; Seattle, Washington; Ann Arbor, Michigan; and Anchorage, Alaska; as well as several other laboratories. This would severely hamper the Service's ability to provide basic scientific information the land managing bureaus within the Department, including programs in the Pacific Northwest, and would eliminate joint State projects underway in more than 30 States.

The House is urged not to imperil our Nation's standing on the technology frontier.

VIOLENT CRIME AND DRUG ABUSE CONTROL

The Administration is concerned that the Committee has chosen to rescind nearly $482 million in funding for the Safe and Drug Free School Program at the same time that every poll shows that crime and school safety are a major concern of Americans. This program is the centerpiece of the Administration's fight against the use of drugs and stimulants by an alarmingly increasing number of our youth.

The Administration opposes the Committee's recommendation to rescind $65 million for violent crime prevention and drug control initiatives funded through the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund. Of this amount, nearly $28 million would come from

the Drug Courts program, which will provide drug treatment and real opportunities for rehabilitation for non-violent, first-time drug offenders. Another $37 million would come from the Family and Community Endeavor Schools (FACES) program, which seeks to provide healthy alternatives to the streets for youth.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE

As currently drafted, this bill would threaten the well-being of our Nation's most needy and vulnerable citizens and would wreak havoc upon the stability of our Nation's most distressed communities. The draconian cuts targeted towards programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would deny help to 63,000 needy, low-income households, including many homeless families. The bill would also prevent another 24,000 homeless families from moving to transitional or permanent housing during this fiscal year. Hundreds of communities would lose money that they have counted on for critical community needs such as housing rehabilitation and social services for the elderly. The House is urged to restore funding to these vital areas.

In addition, the rescission of all FY 1995 funding for the Federal Government's primary rural multi-family rental housing direct loan program (section 515) would put thousands of rural residents living in existing Federal multi-family projects at risk and jeopardize the Government's investment in these projects. Many of the Department of Agriculture's projects need to be rehabilitated and, without the FY 1995 funding, would be in danger of being closed.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (CDFI) FUND

The proposed rescission of $124 million would terminate this program. Without this funding, the CDFI Fund would not be able to provide: $10 million in direct loan subsidies to support over $23 million of direct loans to CDFIs; $50 million in grants, technical assistance, and other financial assistance to CDFIs; and $20 million in community development incentives for depository institutions. The Fund's investments in CDFIs, banks, and thrifts would leverage an estimated $500 million in investments, loans, and financial services in the country's most distressed communities. The House is urged to restore this funding.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

The bill does not appropriate the requested $672 million emergency supplemental for assessed U.N. peacekeeping costs that will accrue during FY 1995. The United States is bound by treaty to pay these costs. Failure to pay them by the end of the fiscal year will imperil the continuity of U.N. missions in regions of great importance to the U.S. national security and foreign policy interests. Rather than approve the requested supplemental, the Committee has rescinded peacekeeping funds.

This bill provides only $50 million of the $275 million requested for Jordan debt forgiveness. This debt forgiveness is linked to the historic steps taken by King Hussein to conclude a peace agreement with Israel, an act that markedly improved prospects for overall peace in the region and that involved considerable risk for King Hussein. We urge the House to provide the requested funds for Jordan debt forgiveness in support of the hopeful developments in this region.

HIGHWAYS—EMERGENCY RELIEF

This bill would eliminate $351 million in funding previously appropriated in response to the Northridge earthquake and other disasters. Over $50 million of this amount is expected to be needed just to meet claims for flood damage in California and Washington. In addition to leaving the Department of Transportation unable to meet the funding needs of existing disasters, this rescission would eliminate the Department's ability to respond promptly to future disasters.

Instead of recommending rescission of these needed funds, the Administration urges the House to cancel unobligated balances of highway demonstration projects, as proposed in the President's FY 1996 Budget.

DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

The rescission of $1.3 billion in funds to help municipalities comply with Safe Drinking Water Act requirements would seriously exacerbate local financing problems. Municipalities need almost $9 billion in capital costs to comply with existing regulations and additional billions to comply with future rules needed to prevent problems such as the cryptosporidium outbreak in Milwaukee in 1993 that killed 100 people and caused illness in another 400,000.

Most affected by this rescission would be the 27 million people who get their water from a system that has violated drinking water standards. If Congress fails to authorize the drinking water state revolving fund program, these funds can be used without further Congressional action to address the $137 billion in wastewater construction needs.

COAST GUARD

The Administration opposes action to reduce Coast Guard operating expenses while supplementing funding for expenses related to operations in Haiti and Cuba. Offsets to pay for those activities deemed an emergency by the Administration are counterproductive. Additional cuts would negate the effects of the supplemental, thereby rendering the Coast Guard less able to provide the level of service the public expects.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The Administration believes that the Committee's action to reduce funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) by a total of 23 percent from FY 1995 to FY 1997 is excessive and shortsighted. The Administration is committed to providing equal access to educational opportunities, particularly for young children, regardless of income or geographic location.

H.R. 1158—MAKING EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND MAKING RESCISSIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1995, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

H.R. 1159—MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1995 AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on the two supplemental appropriations and rescissions bills, H.R. 1158 and H.R. 1159, as reported by the House Appropriations Committee.

The Administration strongly opposes both of these bills in their present form. We believe that they unnecessarily cut valuable, proven programs that educate our children and aid the disadvantaged. The Administration also opposes cuts for programs that were established to ensure our Nation's role in the advancement of technology. We also strongly oppose a provision in the bill which would upset the balance contained in current law concerning Federal funding of abortions for the victims of rape and incest and a provision that would prohibit implementation of the Executive Order on striker replacements. Based on all of these considerations, if the President were presented a bill containing the provisions of these two bills, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget would recommend that he veto the bill.

As the President said in his February 14, 1995, letter, the Administration is proud of its record for reducing the deficit while providing prompt assistance to the victims of natural disasters. The Budget Enforcement Act, signed by President Bush, established the authority for the President and Congress to exempt certain spending from the statutory caps, specifically for the purpose of meeting emergency, unanticipated requirements. This joint designation by the President and the Congress has been used over the last four years to provide critical assistance in response to earthquakes, hurricanes, floods, extreme cold and agricultural disasters, and for other purposes.

The Administration remains firmly committed to deficit reduction. In 1993, the Administration worked with the Congress to enact the largest deficit reduction package in history. We cut Federal spending by $255 billion over five years, cut taxes for 40 million low- and moderate-income Americans, and made 90 percent of small businesses eligible for tax relief, while increasing income tax rates only on the wealthiest 1.2 percent of Americans. As we placed a tight ''freeze'' on overall discretionary spending at the FY 1993 levels, we shifted spending toward investments in human and physical capital that will help secure our future.

This Administration's economic plan helped bring the deficit down from $290 billion in FY 1992, to $203 billion in FY 1994, to a projected $193 billion this year—providing three straight years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

We believe that we can address the issue of deficit reduction and provide for the Middle Class Bill of Rights without putting low-income families at risk. The Administration does not believe that sound programs, particularly those aimed at the disadvantaged and those that will ensure our Nation's standing in areas of science and technology, should be cut. It would be particularly unwise to make such cuts to finance a tax cut for higher-income taxpayers.

In the FY 1996 Budget, the President has proposed significant rescissions for FY 1995 and additional program terminations in FY 1996 for numerous low priority programs. In contrast, the two House bills, H.R. 1158 and H.R. 1159, would impose severe reductions on a number of high-priority programs. These cuts would have a particularly harmful effect on our Nation's children by cutting funding for National Service, Summer Jobs, and WIC. Many of the cuts are shortsighted, reducing funding for education, for advanced technology programs that are critical to our Nation's future, and eliminating funding for the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund, which would be instrumental in leveraging investments in our country's most distressed communities. Other cuts would adversely affect the health of Americans by cutting safe drinking water funding and violent crime prevention programs.

The Administration is opposed to an amendment that was added by the Committee to H.R. 1159 that would allow states to decide to stop using public funds to pay for abortions in cases of rape and incest. The President believes that abortion should be safe, legal, and rare. The Administration is committed to ensuring that women who are victims of rape and incest have the right to choose abortion as an option. A woman should not be precluded from choosing this option if she is poor.

The Administration opposes a provision in the bill that would prohibit the Executive Branch from using FY 1995 funds to issue,

implement, administer, or enforce any Executive Order or other rule or order that prohibits Federal contracts with companies that hire permanent replacements for striking employees. This provision would impinge upon the Executive Branch's ability to ensure a stable supply of quality goods and services for the government's programs.

The Administration objects to an amendment that was added by the Committee that would mandate a minimum level of timber salvage sales from Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands. The Department of Justice has advised that enactment of this amendment would likely result in renewed judicial review of the President's Forest Plan and could reduce timber, grazing, and mining activities in the West. The Administration is already taking steps to restore and sustain significant levels of timber harvest in the immediate future. In addition, the Administration will shortly announce changes in the consultation process in order to expedite review of timber salvage sales as well as other actions to increase timber harvest, in full compliance with environmental laws.

The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has chosen to include urgently needed FEMA emergency supplemental funds in a controversial bill such as H.R. 1158. This could cause an unnecessary delay in assistance to victims of natural disasters. If action on the Administration's request is delayed, FEMA will, beginning in May, be unable to allocate funds to meet any new disaster requirements, unless money reserved for the 40 states currently receiving disaster assistance is cut.

Additional Administration concerns with the Committee-reported bill are contained in the attachment.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS H.R. 1158—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL/RESCISSION BILL

FEMA DISASTER RELIEF

P.L. 102–229, the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1992, contained a special provision on emergency designations under the Budget Enforcement Act (BEA) for FEMA Stafford Act activities. That provision specifies that all appropriations for disaster assistance in excess of the then historical annual average obligation of $320 million (or the amount of the President's budget request, whichever is lower) ''shall be considered as 'emergency requirements' pursuant to'' the BEA, and ''such amounts shall hereafter be so designated.'' This provision is permanent law applying in FY 1993 and ''thereafter,'' and expressly applies ''notwithstanding any other provision of law.'' In FY 1995, the President requested and the Congress did in fact appropriate $320 million for FEMA disaster activities.

The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has decided to disregard this provision of law and to include this emergency funding in a controversial rescission bill, which will inevitably lead to delay.

SUMMER JOBS

The Summer Jobs Program provides meaningful work experience for hundreds of thousands of economically disadvantaged youth who might otherwise not have any opportunity to learn necessary job skills and workplace behaviors during crucial formative years. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for the Summer Youth Employment program in each of the summers of 1995 and 1996, thereby eliminating job opportunities for about 615,000 disadvantaged youth in each of these summers.

The Administration strongly believes that improving the job prospects of at-risk youth is an important element in a broader strategy to ensure employment opportunities for all Americans and a vibrant, productive workforce for U.S. business. The House is urged to restore funding for this important initiative.

NATIONAL SERVICE

The proposed $210 million rescission for the Corporation for National and Community Service would reduce significantly the President's National Service program, depriving more than 15,000 young adults of the opportunity to serve their communities as an AmeriCorps member and earn an education benefit. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for the opportunity for thousands of school children to learn about responsibility to their community for the first time.

This program has a proven track record. For example, AmeriCorps members have already reclaimed recreation areas in inner cities from gangs, and thousands of low-income and migrant children have received proper immunizations to protect their health.

The Administration strongly believes that national service is a key to solving problems inside America's communities. The House is urged to restore funding for this important program.

WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

The bill would reduce funds available for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) by $25 million. The WIC program provides nutritious supplemental foods to low-income pregnant, post-partum, and breastfeeding women, and to infants and children up to their fifth birthday. The Committee's action would result in 600,000 fewer food packages for women, infants, and children. Jeopardizing the health and welfare of these mothers and children cannot be justified.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The bill would reduce by over one-third ($174 million) the funding for Goals 2000, which would greatly diminish support to States and communities for raising academic standards and improving their local schools. The bill also proposes to cut the Education for the Disadvantaged program by $105 million, which would reduce services to educationally disadvantaged children. The bill's sharp reduction in funding for education technology programs ($65 million) would enable fewer local communities to put state-of-the-art tools of learning in classrooms where they are most needed to prepare our students for the future.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

This Administration remains firmly committed to increasing the Nation's productivity and raising living standards by investing in science and technology. These investments will lead to a healthy, educated public; job creation and economic growth; world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering; and harnessed information technology. The rescissions proposed in this bill for many of the programs in the Department of Commerce would severely threaten the United States' standing with respect to technology advancements and competitiveness.

The proposed rescission of funds for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) would reduce the number of new centers established from 36 to 10. This would result in reduced access to state-of-the-art manufacturing technology and techniques by U.S. manufacturers—a key component of the U.S. economy.

The $30 million rescission proposed for the National Information Infrastructure Grants program would eliminate grants to about 70–90 schools, hospitals, non-profits, and state and local governments. This action would decrease the credibility of the program as a funding source and thus discourage private sector matching grants to program applicants.

Reductions are also proposed for the Department of Energy's (DOE) solar, renewable energy, and conservation research programs. Such reductions would threaten our national effort to implement fully the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Climate Change Action Plan. Reduction to the DOE science budget also would adversely impact climate change, human genome, and neutron research. In addition, the $45 million reduction to the Environmental Management program would impede progress at several of the Department's cleanup sites.

The proposed rescission of $16.8 million, or 10 percent of the operating budget of the National Biological Service in the Department of the Interior, this late in the fiscal year, will force the Service to consider closing one or more of the four major Centers located in Lafayette, Louisiana; Seattle, Washington; Ann Arbor, Michigan; and Anchorage, Alaska; as well as several other laboratories. This would severely hamper the Service's ability to provide basic scientific information to the land managing bureaus within the Department, including programs in the Pacific Northwest, and would eliminate joint State projects underway in more than 30 States.

The House is urged not to imperil our Nation's standing on the technology frontier.

VIOLENT CRIME AND DRUG ABUSE CONTROL

The Administration is concerned that the Committee has chosen to rescind nearly $482 million in funding for the Safe and Drug Free School Program at the same time that every poll shows that crime and school safety are a major concern of Americans. This program is the centerpiece of the Administration's fight against the use of drugs and stimulants by an alarmingly increasing number of our youth.

The Administration opposes the Committee's recommendation to rescind $65 million for violent crime prevention and drug control initiatives funded through the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund. Of this amount, nearly $28 million would come from the Drug Courts program, which will provide drug treatment and real opportunities for rehabilitation for non-violent, first-time drug offenders. Another $37 million would come from the Family and Community Endeavor Schools (FACES) program, which seeks to provide healthy alternatives to the streets for youth.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE

As currently drafted, this bill would threaten the well-being of our Nation's most needy and vulnerable citizens and would wreak havoc upon the stability of our Nation's most distressed communities. The draconian cuts targeted towards programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would deny help to 63,000 needy, low-income households, including many homeless families. The bill would also prevent another 24,000 homeless families from moving to transitional or permanent housing during this fiscal year. Hundreds of communities would lose money that they have counted on for critical community needs such as housing rehabilitation and social services for the elderly. The House is urged to restore funding to these vital areas.

In addition, the rescission of all FY 1995 funding for the Federal Government's primary rural multi-family rental housing direct loan program (section 515) would put thousands of rural residents living in existing Federal multi-family projects at risk and jeopardize the Government's investment in these projects. Many of the Department of

Agriculture's projects need to be rehabilitated and, without the FY 1995 funding, would be in danger of being closed.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (CDFI) FUND

The proposed rescission of $124 million would terminate this program. Without this funding, the CDFI Fund would not be able to provide: $10 million in direct loan subsidies to support over $23 million of direct loans to CDFIs; $50 million in grants, technical assistance, and other financial assistance to CDFIs; and $20 million in community development incentives for depository institutions. The Fund's investments in CDFIs, banks, and thrifts would leverage an estimated $500 million in investments, loans, and financial services in the country's most distressed communities. The House is urged to restore this funding.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

The bill does not appropriate the requested $672 million emergency supplemental for assessed U.N. peacekeeping costs that will accrue during FY 1995. The United States is bound by treaty to pay these costs. Failure to pay them by the end of the fiscal year will imperil the continuity of U.N. missions in regions of great importance to the U.S. national security and foreign policy interests. Rather than approve the requested supplemental, the Committee has in H.R. 1159 rescinded peacekeeping funds.

HIGHWAYS—EMERGENCY RELIEF

This bill would eliminate $351 million in funding previously appropriated in response to the Northridge earthquake and other disasters. Over $50 million of this amount is expected to be needed just to meet claims for flood damage in California and Washington. In addition to leaving the Department of Transportation unable to meet the funding needs of existing disasters, this rescission would eliminate the Department's ability to respond promptly to future disasters. Instead of recommending rescission of these needed funds, the Administration urges the House to cancel unobligated balances of highway demonstration projects, as proposed in the President's FY 1996 Budget.

DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

The rescission of $1.3 billion in funds to help municipalities comply with Safe Drinking Water Act requirements would seriously exacerbate local financing problems. Municipalities need almost $9 billion in capital costs to comply with existing regulations and additional billions to comply with future rules needed to prevent problems such as the cryptosporidium outbreak in Milwaukee in 1993 that killed 100 people and caused illness in another 400,000.

Most affected by this rescission would be the 27 million people who get their water from a system that has violated drinking water standards. If Congress fails to authorize the drinking water state revolving fund program, these funds can be used without further Congressional action to address the $137 billion in wastewater construction needs.

COAST GUARD

The Administration opposes action to reduce Coast Guard operating expenses while supplementing funding for expenses related to operations in Haiti and Cuba. Offsets to pay for those activities deemed an emergency by the Administration are counterproductive. Additional cuts would negate the effects of the supplemental, thereby rendering the Coast Guard less able to provide the level of service the public expects.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The Administration believes that the Committee's action to reduce funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) by a total of 23 percent from FY 1995 to FY 1997 is excessive and shortsighted. The Administration is committed to providing equal access to educational opportunities, particularly for young children, regardless of income or geographic location.

H.R. 1159—NON-EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL/RESCISSION BILL

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

This bill provides only $50 million of the $275 million requested for Jordan debt forgiveness. This debt forgiveness is linked to the historic steps taken by King Hussein to conclude a peace agreement with Israel, an act that markedly improved prospects for overall peace in the region and that involved considerable risk for King Hussein. We urge the House to provide the requested funds for Jordan debt forgiveness in support of the hopeful developments in this region.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, Mar. 1, 1995.

Hon. BOB LIVINGSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The purpose of this letter is to provide the Administration's views on the two supplemental appropriations and rescission bills that are being considered by the House Appropriations Committee. The Administration strongly opposes these bills in their present form. We believe that they unnecessarily cut valuable, proven programs that aid the disadvantaged in our society and programs that were established to ensure our Nation's role in the advancement of technology.

The Administration remains firmly committed to deficit reduction. In 1993, the Administration worked with the Congress to enact the largest deficit reduction package in history. We cut Federal spending by $255 billion over five years, cut taxes for 40 million low- and moderate-income Americans, and made 90 percent of small businesses eligible for tax relief, while increasing income tax rates only on the wealthiest 1.2 percent of Americans. While placing a tight ''freeze'' on overall discretionary spending at the FY 1993 levels, we shifted spending toward investments in human and physical capital that will help secure our future.

This Administration's economic plan helped bring the deficit down from $290 billion in FY 1992, to $203 billion in FY 1994, to a projected $193 billion this year—providing three straight years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

We believe that we can address the issue of deficit reduction and provide for the Middle Class Bill of Rights without putting low-income families at risk. The Administration does not believe that sound programs, particularly those aimed at the disadvantaged and those that will ensure our Nation's standing in areas of science and technology should be cut. It would be particularly unwise to make such cuts to finance a tax cut for higher income taxpayers.

In the FY 1996 Budget, the President has proposed significant rescissions for FY 1995 and additional program terminations in FY 1996 for numerous low-priority programs. In contrast, the draft House bills would impose severe reductions on a number of high-priority programs. These cuts would have a particularly harmful effect on our Nation's children by cutting funding for National Service, Summer Jobs, and WIC. Many of the cuts are shortsighted, reducing funding for education and for advanced technology programs which are critical to our Nation's future. Other cuts would adversely affect the health of Americans by cutting Ryan White and safe drinking water funding. Examples of the Administration's concerns on specific items are discussed in more detail in the enclosure.

The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has chosen to include urgently needed FEMA emergency supplemental funds in this controversial bill. This could cause an unnecessary delay in assistance to victims of natural disasters. If action on the Administration's request is delayed, FEMA will, beginning in May, be unable to allocate funds to meet any new disaster requirements, unless money reserved for the 40 states currently receiving disaster assistance is cut. We strongly urge the Committee to consider funding for this emergency program in a separate bill.

The Administration believes that the emergency spending provided by the pending legislation is not required to be offset. The Budget Enforcement Act emergency authority was established specifically to provide for the funding of such unanticipated requirements.

As the President said in his February 14, 1995, letter, the Administration is proud of its record for reducing the deficit while providing prompt assistance to the victims of natural disasters. The Budget Enforcement Act, signed by President Bush, established the authority for the President and Congress to exempt certain spending from the statutory caps, specifically for the purpose of meeting emergency, unanticipated requirements. This joint designation by the President and the Congress has been used over the last four years to provide critical assistance in response to earthquakes, hurricanes, floods, extreme cold and agricultural disasters, and for other purposes.

We would encourage the Committee to review its recommendations and adopt a rescission package that is more consistent with the one submitted by the President in his FY 1996 Budget. We look forward to working with the Committee to address our mutual concerns.

Sincerely,

ALICE M. RIVLIN,
Director.

Enclosure.

EXAMPLES OF CONCERNS

MAKING EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND MAKING RESCISSIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1995, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1995, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL/RESCISSION BILL

FEMA Disaster Relief

P.L. 102–229, the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1992, contained a special provision on emergency designations under the Budget Enforcement Act (BEA) for FEMA Stafford Act activities. That provision specifies that all appropriations for disaster assistance in excess of the historical average obligation of $320 million (or the amount of the President's budget request, whichever is lower) ''shall be considered as 'emergency requirements' pursuant to'' the BEA, and ''such amounts shall hereafter be so designated.'' This provision is permanent law applying in 1993 and ''thereafter,'' and expressly applies ''notwithstanding any other provision of law.'' In FY 1995, Congress did in fact appropriate $320 million for FEMA disaster activities.

The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has decided to disregard this provision of law and include this emergency funding in a controversial rescission bill, which will inevitably lead to delay.

Housing Assistance

As currently drafted, this bill would threaten the well-being of our Nation's most needy and vulnerable citizens and would wreak havoc upon the stability of our Nation's most distressed communities. The draconian cuts targeted towards programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would eliminate subsidized housing assistance to 63,000 needy, low-income households, and would prevent 24,000 homeless families from moving to transitional or permanent housing this fiscal year. Hundreds of communities would lose money that they have counted on for critical community needs such as housing rehabilitation and social services for the elderly. The Committee is urged to restore funding to these vital areas.

In addition, the rescission of all FY 1995 funding for the Federal Government's primary rural multi-family rental housing direct loan program (section 515) would put thousands of rural residents living in existing Federal multi-family projects at risk and jeopardizes the Government's investment in these projects. Many of the Department of Agriculture's projects need to be rehabilitated and without the FY 1995 funding are in danger of being closed.

Summer Jobs

The Summer Jobs Program provides meaningful work experience for hundreds of thousands of economically disadvantaged youth who might otherwise not have any opportunity to learn necessary job skills and workplace behaviors during crucial formative years. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for the Summer Youth Employment program in each of the summers of 1995 and 1996, thereby eliminating job opportunities for about 615,000 disadvantaged youth in each of these summers. The Administration strongly believes that improving the job prospects of at-risk youth is an important element in a broader strategy to ensure employment opportunities for all Americans and a vibrant productive workforce for U.S. business. The Committee is urged to restore funding for this important initiative.

National Service

The proposed $210 million rescission for the Corporation for National and Community Service would reduce significantly the President's national service program, depriving more than 15,000 young adults of the opportunity to serve their communities through AmeriCorps and earn an education benefit. The proposed rescission would eliminate funding for thousands of school children learning about responsibility to their community for the first time.

This program has a proven track record. For example, AmeriCorps has already reclaimed recreation areas in inner cities from gangs, and thousands of low-income and migrant children have received proper immunizations to protect their health.

The Administration strongly believes that national and community service is a key to solving problems inside America's communities. The Committee is urged to restore funding for this important program.

Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)

The bill would reduce funds available for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) by $25 million. The WIC program provides nutritious supplemental foods to low-income pregnant, post-partum, and breastfeeding women, and to infants and children up to their fifth birthday. The Subcommittee's action would result in 600,000 fewer food packages for women, infants, and children. Jeopardizing the health and welfare of these mothers and children cannot be justified.

Education Programs

The bill would reduce by over one-third ($174 million) the funding for Goals 2000, which would greatly reduce support to States and communities to raise academic standards and improve their local schools. The bill also proposes to cut the Education for the Disadvantaged program by $105 million, which would reduce services to educationally disadvantaged children. The bill's sharp reduction in funding for education technology programs ($65 million) would enable fewer local communities to put state-of-the-art tools of learning in classrooms where they are most needed to prepare our students for the future.

Science and Technology

This Administration remains firmly committed to increasing the Nation's productivity and raising living standards by investing in science and technology. These investments will lead to a healthy, educated public; job creation and economic growth; world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering; and harnessed information technology. The rescissions proposed in this bill for many of the programs in the Department of Commerce would severely threaten the United States' standing with respect to technology advancements and competitiveness.

The proposed rescission of funds for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) would reduce the number of new centers established from 36 to 10. This would result in reduced access to state-of-the-art manufacturing technology and techniques by U.S. manufacturers—a key component of the U.S. economy.

The $30 million rescission proposed for the National Information Infrastructure Grants program would eliminate grants to about 70–90 schools, hospitals, non-profits, and state and local governments. This action would decrease the credibility of the program as a funding source and thus discourage private sector matching grants to program applicants.

Reductions are also proposed for the Department of Energy's (DOE) solar, renewable energy, and conservation research programs. Such reductions would threaten our national effort to fully implement the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Climate Change Action Plan. Reduction to the DOE science budget also would adversely impact climate change, human genome, and neutron research. In addition, the $45 million reduction to the Environmental Management program would impede progress at several of the Department's cleanup sites.

The Committee is urged not to imperil our Nation's standing on the technology frontier.

Violent Crime and Drug Abuse Control

The Administration opposes the decision to rescind $67 million for violent crime prevention and drug control initiatives funded through the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund. Of this amount, nearly $28 million would come from the Drug Courts program, which will provide drug treatment and real opportunities for rehabilitation for non-violent, first-time drug offenders. All funding for the Ounce of Prevention Council would be rescinded. Over $36 million would come from the Family and Community Endeavor Schools (FACES) program, which seeks to provide healthy alternatives to the streets for youth.

The Administration is concerned that the Subcommittees have chosen to rescind nearly $482 million in funding for the Safe and Drug Free School Program at the same time that every poll shows that crime and school safety are a major concern of Americans. This program is the centerpiece of the Administration's fight against the use of drugs and stimulate by an alarmingly increasing number of our youth.

Highways

This bill would eliminate $351 million in funding previously appropriated in response to the Northridge earthquake and other disasters. Over $50 million of this amount is expected to be needed just to meet claims for flood damage in California and Washington. In addition to leaving the Department Transportation unable to meet the funding needs of existing disasters, this rescission would eliminate the Department's ability to respond promptly to future disasters. Instead of recommending rescission of these needed funds, the Administration urges the Committee to cancel unobligated balances of highway demonstration to projects, as proposed in the President's FY 1996 Budget.

Drinking Water State Revolving Funds

The rescission of $1.3 billion in funds to help municipalities comply with Safe Drinking Water Act requirements would seriously exacerbate local financing problems. Municipalities need most $9 billion in capital costs to comply with existing regulations and additional billions to comply with future rules needed to prevent problems such as the crytosporidium outbreak in Milwaukee that killed 100 people and caused illness and another 400,000.

Most affected by this rescission would be the 27 million people who get their water from a system that has violated drinking water standards. If Congress fails to authorize this program, these funds can be used without further Congressional action to address the $137 billion in wastewater construction needs.

Coast Guard

The Administration opposes action to reduce Coast Guard operating expenses while supplementing funding for expenses related to operations in Haiti and Cuba. Offsets to pay for those activities deemed an emergency by the Administration are counterproductive. Additional cuts would negate the effects of the supplemental, thereby rendering the Coast Guard less able to provide the level of service the public expects.

Non-Emergency Supplemental/Rescission Bill

Striker Replacements

The Administration opposes a provision in the bill that would prohibit the Executive Branch from using FY 1995 funds to issue, implement, administer, or enforce any Executive Order or other rule or order that prohibits Federal contracts with companies that hire permanent replacement for striking employees. This provision would impinge upon the Executive Branch's ability to ensure a stable supply for quality goods and services for the government's programs. We urge the Committee to strike this provision.

International Programs

Neither of the bills under consideration appropriates the requested $672 million emergency supplemental for assessed U.N. peacekeeping costs that will accrue during FY 1995. The United States is bound by treaty to pay these costs. Failure to pay them by the end of the year will imperil the continuity of U.N. missions in regions of great importance to the U.S. national security and foreign policy interests.

The non-emergency supplemental/rescission bill provides only $50 million of the $275 million requested for Jordan debt forgiveness. This debt forgiveness is linked to the historic steps taken by King Hussein to conclude a peace agreement with Israel, and act that markedly improved prospects for overall peace in the region and that involved considerable risk for King Hussein. We urge the

Committee to provide the requested funds for Jordan debt forgiveness in support of the hopeful developments in this region.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS)

The Administration objects to the $10 million in unrequested supplemental appropriations for salaries and expenses for the former Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS), now part of the Department of Agricultural's Consolidated Farm Service Agency (AFSA). The additional funds are not needed, particularly since FY 1995 appropriations for the ASCS were already $13 million greater than requested by the Administration. At a time when Federal employees are being reduced government-wide, it is inappropriate to provide additional funds to more county office personnel managed by a Federal agency. The presence of surplus funds in CFSA would not facilitate a timely transition to the streamlined CFSA organization of the future.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, today is a historic day, finally a balanced budget. I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER],

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Americans who are concerned about the proposed veto threat by their President.

Mr. Speaker, last summer fire storms roared through Northern California, threatening to destroy entire communities. Last spring this same area was ravaged by devastating floods which left thousands homeless. During these calamities families and communities cried out to the President for help.

Today we will give the President the means to help these people, but he is turning his back on them. We offer relief to thousands of flood victims, but the President is turning his back. We offer a timber salvage plan to protect forest communities from incinerating fires, but the President is again turning his back.

Mr. Speaker, the President is turning his back, but we are not. Today we will show these Americans who has the real compassion. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the conference report.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to bring Members' attention to language in this bill that I believe represents the opening salvo in the fight to win freedom for our States and our constituents from entrenched EPA bureaucrats and the regulatory tyranny imposed by the Clean Air Act.

There are Members of both bodies that better wake up and recognize that there's rebellion in the streets over the heavy handed, misguided, EPA directed inspection and maintenance program.

I fought hard to get strong language in this bill that would force EPA to correct their flawed program and bring immediate relief to States. The best we could get was language sending an explicit warning to EPA that if they fail to demonstrate clear flexibility in allowing States to design programs that fit their particular air situations, that we would come back and put that strong language on the next available vehicle.

Those of us who understand the arrogance and intransigence EPA has exhibited in dealing with the concerns of States will be watching EPA's actions very closely looking for the first misstep. I submit to my colleagues that EPA cannot be trusted to make the reasonable changes necessary.

Because the EPA has refused to be flexible to date, 15 States will be subject to sanctions in the next 3 months. Their I&M programs have either been delayed or suspended or the State has refused to comply with the requirement altogether. Some States have grass roots efforts pushing for total repeal.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, this is just round one. If EPA has any sense at all, they will take a good look at the language in this bill and think long and hard before they reject a State plan, like the one Texas has proposed, that addresses the unique air problems of that State.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rescission bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGTON] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of our time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished minority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to first answer the charge that has been made that this President is not concerned about victims of natural disasters.

In my view this President and this Federal Emergency Administration has done more faster to help people who are in need in natural disasters than any administration I can remember. We will get a piece of legislation to his desk that will handle those problems.

But I rise today to make one fundamental point. Shame on those who vote for tax cuts for the wealthy and budget cuts for children from struggling families. Make no mistake about it, that is what this bill does. It cuts food and nutrition for pregnant women and babies, a program that saves nearly 4 times what it costs.

It eliminates the summer jobs program, which has enabled so many young people to lift themselves out of poverty and off of welfare.

It even cuts medical equipment that is desperately needed to care for our veterans. And heat for the low-income elderly, a program that literally saves people from freezing to death.

These cuts would be reckless and unfair no matter what purpose they served. But to make these deep and dangerous cuts to pay for a tax cut for the wealthiest people in the country, to give a $20,000-a-year windfall to the people who do not need it, those earning more than $350,000 a year, is simply unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill was originally passed in the House, we at least had a guarantee because we had voted for the guarantee that not a dime of these cuts would be used for tax breaks for the privileged few. Now that guarantee has been stripped out of this bill. The money saved by these cuts goes right from the hardworking middle class to the wealthiest people in the country, the most outrageous redistribution of income since the days of the robber barons. That is why we have to vote against this bill in the name of the deficit but also in the name of common decency.

I urge Members of defeat this wrongheaded rescission bill. We do not need more tax perks for the privileged at a devastating cost to the people of this country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, a few housekeeping matters. There is no rescission in this conference agreement for any VA construction projects or equipment purchases. There are no tax cuts in this bill. And for the benefit of anyone in the White House, this committee has no jurisdiction over tax cuts.

This bill does not pay for tax cuts. What it does do is provide billions of dollars for many deserving Americans who need help to rebuild their lives after the Oklahoma City tragedy, after the California earthquake and floods, after the Texas and Louisiana floods and all those other disasters across the land.

□ 1830

This bill, Mr. Speaker, provides $250 million for Oklahoma City, just as the President asked. It provides $275 million for the Jordan debt relief that he asked for. It provides $6.7 billion for FEMA emergency assistance that he asked for.

Unfortunately, it struck the striker-replacement language that I favored, but he asked us to strike it; and in

order to get a compromise with the other body it was struck.

It includes emergency salvage timber sales language that will allow tens of thousands of people in the Northwest to go back to work, and the bill also cuts the deficit by $16.4 billion, the largest single rescission of existing appropriations in the history of the Nation. It gives us a net savings to the American taxpayer in fiscal year 1995 of $9.1 billion, the largest savings to the American taxpayer in the history of the country.

What this bill says to the American people is that we can meet our emergencies, that we can pay for them, and that we can move toward a balanced budget for the first time since 1969. We can protect the future of our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a good deal. A good deal for present and current Americans and their children and their grandchildren, and a no vote against this bill would be irresponsible and a veto by the President of the United States would be irresponsible.

I urge the Members of this body to adopt this conference report.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, earlier the majority in this body passed their budget resolution to effectively restructure future Federal tax and spending policies to benefit the most well-to-do individuals and largest corporations in the United States at the expense of hardworking Americans and their families. We now have before us a piece of legislation which reaches back into last year's appropriations and cruelly snatches away already allocated Federal funding for numerous initiatives vital to our local communities and constituents. Like the Energizer Bunny, the ''Contract on America'' just keeps going and going and going.

The GOP leadership likes to give lip service to the issue of empowerment, to helping people help themselves. However, this rescissions package flies in the face of such a philosophy. What the Republicans are really saying with this conference report, with the budget resolution which just passed, is ''We just don't care.''

However, residents of the Seventh Congressional District in Illinois, my constituents, care deeply about the reckless nature of the GOP budget axe and its disastrous impact on them, their families, and their communities.

Of great concern is the status of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP], which helps 2 million struggling senior citizens meet the high costs of their winter heating bills without having to make a choice between those bills and their daily meals and medicine. Yet the GOP indiscriminately guts LIHEAP by 25 percent. As a result, tens of thousands of Chicago households that were served in fiscal year 1995 will be threatened, not to mention those who have been on waiting lists.

Mr. Chairman, in a city such as mine, where on an average winter day the temperature hovers around 10 degrees, with the wind chill in the negative double digits, you tell me this is a sound policy decision. Tell the family of 60-year-old Earline Hooker, who froze to death in January in Chicago because she wasn't able to get LIHEAP assistance, that this program is wasteful or unnecessary. I challenge you.

In keeping with the GOP assault on our children and our future as a nation, this bill steals all hope and opportunity away from 600,000 of our disadvantaged youngsters through the eradication of the summer jobs program in 1996—a proven program that provides basic skills, income, and work experience. Across the Chicago metropolitan area next summer, kids who had looked forward to being entrusted with responsibility and leadership will now be faced with hanging on the streetcorner with nothing to do but get into trouble. So much for promoting positive alternatives for our youth. But again, the Republican leadership just doesn't care.

The GOP also doesn't care that this legislation punishes low-income babies and their moms with a $20 million cut from the Women, Infants, and Children Nutrition Program, an $85 million cut in the lead-based paint abatement program. They're poor, who cares?

Yet one of the most disturbing portions of this bill is its complete lack of regard for the plight of public housing residents in this Nation and the neighborhoods in which they live and work. Although the Department of Housing and Urban Development has already begun a serious effort to restructure and make Federal housing and development programs more efficient and responsive to local needs, the Republicans don't want to hear it. They just want to slash, cut, and burn without regard to the necessity or productivity of the program or who gets hurt.

HUD has estimated that the $6.3 billion in housing cuts in this bill will result in the elimination of thousands of low-income housing units in my city of Chicago. Assistance will be lost for public housing modernization and operating subsidies, seriously disrupting already weakened maintenance and security for residents. In addition, needed funds to help the homeless and individuals with AIDS find suitable shelter is out the window. Explain to me how in the world this helps meet the goal of ''a kinder, gentler nation,'' for which former President Bush and his Republican friends reportedly advocated. I don't think so.

With respect to the issue of disaster relief for the California earthquakes and the tragedy in Oklahoma, no one in Congress wishes to hold up that aid and charges that opposition to this conference report will do that are unfounded. The Republican majority knows full well that they could craft a bill today for these important purposes, pass it, and send it to the President's desk for signature without delay.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Republican rescissions conference report and put a quick halt to the GOP's careless, reckless beginning to this second 100 days. Take a stand—the President has.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to H.R. 1158.

Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of the House, I voted for a balanced budget amendment knowing full well that such a measure would require tough choices. While some contend that we don't need such an amendment, personally I felt that our Nation's future depended on it.

Our national debt is staggering, our annual deficit continues to grow, and our actions today on this conference report mark the first real step to protect future generations. We are here for our children and grandchildren, pure and simple. If we act today we give them a greater measure of security. Most important, this first tough vote may give them a chance to have the opportunities we enjoy: a great education, the prospect of a real job and an opportunity for a better future. Our vote today is a downpayment on a balanced budget.

Let's be clear this package is a $16.4 billion reduction out of a total of a $1.5 trillion budget. It is less than a 1 percent reduction.

The bottom line is that we need to start the process. What better steps than to consolidate a horde of programs, some highly duplicative, some unauthorized by Congress itself, some with unjustified increases, and others paralyzed in the money pipeline with little likelihood of being spent.

I am astonished that President Clinton is considering using his first veto on this bill that would reduce Federal spending by $16.4 billion and provide emergency funding for the California floods and the Oklahoma City bombing recovery effort.

The President and the Democrats have made their position clear—which is that they intend to sit on the sidelines while the Republicans balance the Federal budget. As I said early, this reduction represents less than 1 percent of the Federal budget, and yet the President thinks that is too much. It is ironic and saddening that the very day the House will vote on the first real balanced budget plan in 25 years, the President would rather keep spending money we don't have and stick our children and grandchildren with the tab. This is living proof that Washington will not stop spending without a balanced budget amendment.

With this bill we are making it clear that we will set priorities, we will limit the size of government, and we will do what we said we would—reduce the deficit, balance the budget, and restore the future to our children.

I urge the passage of this important conference report.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV the years and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 189, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No 346]

YEAS—235

Allard	Bonilla	Coble
Archer	Bono	Coburn
Armey	Brownback	Collins (GA)
Bachus	Bryant (TN)	Combest
Baker (CA)	Bunn	Condit
Baker (LA)	Bunning	Cooley
Ballenger	Burr	Cox
Barr	Burton	Crane
Barrett (NE)	Buyer	Crapo
Bartlett	Callahan	Cremeans
Barton	Calvert	Cubin
Bass	Camp	Cunningham
Bateman	Canady	Davis
Bereuter	Castle	Deal
Bilbray	Chabot	DeLay
Bilirakis	Chambliss	Diaz-Balart
Bliley	Chenoweth	Dickey
Blute	Christensen	Dooley
Boehlert	Chrysler	Doolittle
Boehner	Clinger	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
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
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
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—189

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
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)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—11

Berman
Jacobs
King
Kleczka
McNulty
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Quillen
Stenholm
Tucker
Weldon (FL)

□ 1852

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Weldon of Florida for, with Mr. McNulty against.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR, BIOLOGICAL AND CHEMICAL WEAPONS AND THEIR MEANS OF DELIVERY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—(H. DOC. NO. 104–76)

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. WALKER] laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On November 14, 1994, in light of the dangers of the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons and their means of delivery (''weapons of mass destruction''), I issued Executive Order No. 12938 and declared a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*).

As I described in the report transmitting Executive Order No. 12938, the new Executive order consolidated the functions of and revoked Executive Order No. 12735 of November 16, 1990, which declared a national emergency with respect to the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons, and Executive Order No. 12930 of September 29, 1994, which declared a national emergency with respect to nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and their means of delivery. The new Executive order also expanded certain existing authorities in order to strengthen the U.S. ability to respond to proliferation problems.

The following report is made pursuant to section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act regarding activities taken and money spent pursuant to the emergency declaration. Additional information on nuclear, missile, and/or chemical and biological weapons (CBW) nonproliferation efforts is contained in the annual report on the proliferation of missiles and essential components of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, provided to the Congress pursuant to section 1097 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102–190), also known as the ''Nonproliferation Report,'' and the annual report provided to the Congress pursuant to section 308 of the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–182).

The three export control regulations issued under the Enhanced Proliferation Control Initiative (EPCI) are fully in force and continue to be used to control the export of items with potential use in chemical or biological weapons or unmanned delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction.

In the 6 months since I issued Executive Order No. 12938, the number of countries that have ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) has reached 27 (out of 159 signatory countries). I am urging the Senate to give its advice and consent to ratification as soon as possible. The CWC is a critical element of U.S. nonproliferation policy that will significantly enhance our security and that of our friends and allies. I believe that U.S. ratification will help to encourage the ratification process in other countries and, ultimately, the CWC's entry into force.

The United States actively participates in the CWC Preparatory Commission in The Hague, the deliberative body drafting administrative and implementing procedures for the CWC. Last month, this body accepted the U.S. offer of an information management system for the future Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons that will implement the CWC. The United States also is playing a leading role in developing a training program for international inspectors.

The United States strongly supports international efforts to strengthen the 1972 Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC). In January 1995, the Ad Hoc Group mandated by the September 1994 BWC Special Conference to draft a legally binding instrument to strengthen the effectiveness and improve the implementation of the BWC held its first meeting. The Group agreed on a program of work and schedule of substantive meetings, the first of which will occur in July 1995. The United States is pressing for completion of the Ad Hoc Group's work and consideration of the legally binding instrument by

the next BWC Review Conference in 1996.

The United States maintained its active participation in the 29-member Australia Group (AG), which now includes the Czech Republic, Poland, Slovakia, and Romania. The AG reaffirmed in December the members' collective belief that full adherence to the CWC and the BWC provides the only means to achieve a permanent global ban on CBW, and that all states adhering to these Conventions have an obligation to ensure that their national activities support these goals.

The AG also reiterated its conviction that harmonized AG export licensing measures are consistent with, and indeed actively support, the requirement under Article I of the CWC that States Parties never assist, in any way, the manufacture of chemical weapons. These measures also are consistent with the undertaking in Article XI of the CWC to facilitate the fullest possible exchange of chemical materials and related information for purposes not prohibited by the Convention, as they focus solely on preventing assistance to activities banned under the CWC. Similarly, such efforts also support existing nonproliferation obligations under the BWC.

The United States Government determined that three foreign nationals (Luciano Moscatelli, Manfred Felber, and Gerhard Merz) had engaged in chemical weapons proliferation activities that required the imposition of sanctions against them, effective on November 19, 1994. Similar determinations were made against three foreign companies (Asian Ways Limited, Mainway International, and Worldco) effective on February 18, 1995, and imposed sanctions against them. Additional information on these determinations is contained in a classified report to the Congress, provided pursuant to the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991. The United States Government continues to monitor closely activities that may be subject to CBW sanctions provisions.

The United States continued to control vigilantly U.S. exports that could make a contribution to unmanned delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction, exercising restraint in considering all such transfers consistent with the Guidelines of the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR). The MTCR Partners shared information not only with each other but with other possible supplier, consumer, and transshipment states about proliferation problems and also stressed the importance of implementing effective export control systems.

The United States initiated unilateral efforts and coordinated with MTCR Partners in multilateral efforts, aimed at combatting missile proliferation by nonmembers and at encouraging nonmembers to adopt responsible export behavior and to adhere to the MTCR Guidelines. On October 4, 1994, the United States and China signed a Joint Statement on Missile Nonproliferation in which China reiterated its 1992 commitment to the MTCR Guidelines and agreed to ban the export of ground-to-ground MTCR-class missiles. In 1995, the United States met bilaterally with Ukraine in January, and with Russia in April, to discuss missile nonproliferation and the implementation of the MTCR Guidelines. In May 1995, the United States will participate with other MTCR Partners in a regime approach to Ukraine to discuss missile nonproliferation and to share information about the MTCR.

The United States actively encouraged its MTCR Partners and fellow AG participants to adopt ''catch-all'' provisions, similar to that of the United States and EPCI, for items not subject to specific export controls. Austria, Germany, Norway, and the United Kingdom actually have such provisions in place. The European Union (EU) issued a directive in 1994 calling on member countries to adopt ''catch-all'' controls. These controls will be implemented July 1, 1995. In line with this harmonization move, several countries, including European States that are not actually members of the EU, have adopted or are considering putting similar provisions in place.

The United States has continued to pursue this Administration's nuclear nonproliferation goals. More than 170 nations joined in the indefinite, unconditional extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) on May 11, 1995. This historic decision strengthens the security of all countries, nuclear weapons states and nonweapons states alike.

South Africa joined the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), increasing NSG membership to 31 countries. The NSG held a plenary in Helsinki, April 5–7, 1995, which focused on membership issues and the NSG's relationship to the NPT Conference. A separate, dual-use consultation meeting agreed upon 32 changes to the dual-use list.

Pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, I report that there were no expenses directly attributable to the exercise of authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency in Executive Order No. 12938 during the period from November 14, 1994, through May 14, 1995.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 18, 1995.*

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for votes on May 10, 12, 16, and 17, and regretfully was not present for rollcall numbers 311, the rule under which H.R. 961, the Clean Water Amendments of 1995 was considered; 312, the Saxton amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 961; 313, the Mineta amendment striking various provisions in the bill which allow waivers, exemptions, or modifications of current Clean Water Act requirements; 314, the Boehlert amendment regarding the Coastal Zone Management Program; 327, the Bateman substitute to the Lipinski amendment to change the formula for allocating sewage treatment plant construction funds; 328, the Lipinski amendment changing the formula for allocating Federal funds for sewage treatment plant construction among States; 330, to suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 1590 to require the Trustees of the Medicare trust funds to report recommendations on resolving projected financial imbalance in Medicare trust funds; 331, the Armey motion to permit standing committees and subcommittees to sit during proceeding of the House under the 5-minute rule; 332, the Boehlert amendment to define ''wetland'' more broadly under the Clean Water Act; 333, the Gilchrest amendment to strike language establishing a new definition of what constitutes a wetland as well as its detailed wetlands classification system; the Frelinghuysen amendment to allow States that are administering their own federally approved wetlands permit programs as of the date of enactment to continue administering their own programs rather than the new program established in the bill; 335, the Wyden amendment to provide that the Federal Government would not have to pay compensation for losses in property value caused by wetlands regulation in certain cases; 336, the Bonior motion to recommit the bill H.R. 961 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions; 337, final passage of the bill H.R. 961, the Clean Water Act Amendments of 1995; and 338 to approve the Journal of Tuesday, May 16, 1995.

Had I been present I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall votes 311, 312, 313, and 314; ''no'' on 327; ''aye'' on 328; ''no'' on 330 and 331; ''aye'' on 332, 333, 334, 335, and 336; ''no'' on 337; and ''yea'' on 338.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the schedule for next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, the House will meet in pro forma session on Monday, May 22. There will be no recorded votes.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour and 12 o'clock noon for legislative business to consider three bills under open rules previously adopted by the House. The bills are: H.R. 614, the New London Fish Hatchery Conveyance; H.R. 584,

the Fairport National Fish Hatchery Conveyance; and H.R., 535, the Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance.

We then plan to take up the rule and begin consideration of H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interest Act.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to continue consideration of H.R. 1561. We intend to finish H.R. 1561 on Thursday afternoon, and it is our hope to have Members on their way home to their families and their districts for the Memorial Day district work period by 3 p.m., Thursday.

The House will not be in session on Friday.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I would say to the gentleman I know of his interest in fish hatcheries and trying to improve fishing conditions all over the country. So I know of the importance of this legislation to the gentleman and to other people who are so interested around the country.

I would like to ask when the first vote would be expected on Tuesday, approximately what time?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman. We are instructing people to be prepared for a vote as early as 12 o'clock on Tuesday next.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he could advise us when the last vote might be expected on Tuesday.

Mr. ARMEY. Tuesday evening we expect the last vote to be between 6 and 6:30.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman. Could you also advise us what rule he would expect on the American Overseas Interest Act?

Mr. ARMEY. The Committee on Rules will meet on Monday. We anticipate a time-structured rule, but one that is as open as possible for the benefit of our Members.

Mr. GEPHARDT. And, finally, I would ask the majority leader, when we return from the Memorial Day recess, will we return for votes on Monday, June 5, or do you think it will be on Tuesday, June 6?

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's interest. We have not yet resolved that, and the gentleman is correct to make the inquiry. We will try to get that resolved and announce it next week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 22, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MAY 23, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, May 22, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, May 23, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–77)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on developments since the last Presidential report on November 18, 1994, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order No. 12170 of November 14, 1979, and matters relating to Executive Order No. 12613 of October 29, 1987. This report is submitted pursuant to section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa–9(c). This report covers events through April 18, 1995. It discusses only matters concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order No. 12170 and matters relating to Executive Order No. 12613. Matters relating to the March 15, 1995, Executive Order regarding a ban on investment in the petroleum sector, and the May 6, 1995, Executive Order regarding new trade sanctions, will be covered in separate reports. My last report, dated November 18, 1994, covered events through October 18, 1994.

1. There have been no amendments to the Iranian Transactions Regulations, 31 CFR Part 560, or to the Iranian Assets Control Regulations, 31 CFR Part 535, since the last report.

2. The Office of Foreign Assets Control (''OFAC'') of the Department of the Treasury continues to process applications for import licenses under the Iranian Transactions Regulations. However, a substantial majority of such applications are determined to be ineligible for licensing and, consequently, are denied.

During the reporting period, the U.S. Customs Service has continued to effect numerous seizures of Iranian-origin merchandise, primarily carpets, for violation of the import prohibitions of the Iranian Transactions Regulations. OFAC and Customs Service investigations of these violations have resulted in forfeiture actions and the imposition of civil monetary penalties. Additional forfeiture and civil penalty actions are under review.

3. The Iran-United States Claims Tribunal (the ''Tribunal''), established at The Hague pursuant to the Algiers Accords, continues to make progress in arbitrating the claims before it. However, since my last report, the Tribunal has not rendered any awards although payments were received by claimants in late November for awards rendered during the prior reporting period. Thus, the total number of awards remains at 557. Of this total, 373 have been awards in favor of American claimants. Two hundred twenty-five (225) of these were awards on agreed terms, authorizing and approving payment of settlements negotiated by the parties, and 150 were decisions adjudicated on the merits. The Tribunal has issued 38 decisions dismissing claims on the merits and 85 decisions dismissing claims for jurisdictional reasons. Of the 59 remaining awards, three approved the withdrawal of cases and 56 were in favor of Iranian claimants. As of April 18, 1995, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York reported that the value of awards to successful American claimants for the Security Account held by the NV Settlement Bank stood at $2,365,160,410.39.

Iran has not replenished the Security Account since October 8, 1992, and the Account has remained continuously below the balance of $500 million required by the Algiers Accords since November 5, 1992. As of April 10, 1995, the total amount in the Security Account was $191,219,759.23, and the total amount in the Interest Account was $24,959,218.79.

The United States continues to pursue Case A/28, filed in September 1993, to require Iran to meet its obligations under the Algiers Accords to replenish the Security Account. Iran has yet to file its Statement of Defense in that case.

4. The Department of State continues to present United States Government claims against Iran, in coordination with concerned government agencies, and to respond to claims brought against the United States by Iran.

On April 18, 1995, the United States filed the first of two parts of its consolidated submission on the merits in Case B/61. Case B/61 involves a claim by Iran for compensation with respect to

primarily military equipment that Iran alleges it did not receive. The equipment was purchased pursuant to commercial contracts with more than 50 private American companies. Iran alleges that it suffered direct losses and consequential damages in excess of $2 billion in total because of the U.S. Government's refusal to allow the export of the equipment after January 19, 1981, in alleged contravention of the Algiers Accords. As directed by the Tribunal, the United States' submission addresses Iran's claims regarding both liability and compensation and damages.

5. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission (''FSCS'') on February 24, 1995, successfully completed its case-by-case review of the more than 3,000 so-called ''small claims'' against Iran arising out of the 1979 Islamic revolution. These ''small claims'' (of $250,000 or less each) were originally filed before the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal, but were transferred to the FCSC pursuant to the May 13, 1990 Settlement Agreement between Iran and the United States.

The FCSC issued decisions on 3,066 claims for total awards of $86,555,795. Of that amount, $41,570,936 represented awards of principal and $44,984,859 represented awards of interest. Although originally only $50 million were available to pay these awards, the funds earned approximately $9 million in interest over time, for a total settlement fund of more than $59 million. Thus, all awardees will receive full payment on the principal amounts of their awards, with interest awards paid on a pro rata basis.

The FCSC's awards to individuals and corporations covered claims for both real and personal property seized by Iran. In addition, many claims arose out of commercial transactions, including contracts for the sale of goods and contracts for the supply of services such as teaching, medical treatment, data processing, and shipping. The FCSC is now working with the Department of the Treasury to facilitate final payment on all FCSC awards.

6. The situation reviewed above continues to implicate important diplomatic, financial, and legal interests of the United States and its nationals and presents an unusual challenge to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. The Iranian Assets Control Regulations issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 12170 continue to play an important role in structuring our relationship with Iran and in enabling the United States to implement properly the Algiers Accords. Similarly, the Iranian Transactions Regulations issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 12613 continue to advance important objectives in combating international terrorism. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to deal with these problems and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 18, 1995.*

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. WALKER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mr. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MARTINI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KIM addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

HOW BUDGET AND RESCISSION BILL AFFECT PROGRAMS FOR OUR STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, much of the debate today and yesterday about the budget and also the rescissions bill focused on programs for seniors, particularly Medicare and also Medicaid to the extent that it also impacts senior citizens, and I had previously spoken on the floor and stated emphatically how part of my opposition to the budget was based on the fact that it does have significant cuts in Medicare and how that will negatively impact our senior citizens. What I wanted to speak about today very briefly though are the parts of the budget, as well as the rescissions bill that we voted on today, that affect programs for students at our universities and or colleges.

Mr. Speaker, I happened to have a forum during the April break at Rutgers University, which is in my district, and at the forum a number of students expressed concern with the cost of higher education, how tuition continues to rise, how difficult it is not only at private schools, but also at public schools such as Rutgers University, to continue to meet educational expenses and how many students increasingly have to simply drop out of school because they cannot afford to pay the cost of higher education.

I say to my colleagues, ''If you look at the two resolutions or bills that we passed today, in one case the budget and in the other case the rescissions bill, both of them in my opinion rely too heavily on cuts in programs for higher education, particularly as it affects students who are looking for scholarships, grants or student loans. The budget itself actually assumes a change in the current law to require college students to pay interest on student loans while they are still in school. Many students rely on Stafford loans or guaranteed student loans to pay for their colleges education or to pay for a significant portion of it.''

Mr. Speaker, part of the problem is that under this budget measure the assumption is that while the students are at school they will have to pay back the interest on the loans. It is variously estimated, depending on how long you stay in school, for example, for undergraduate education, if you were to take the maximum student loan over the course of the four years, that you would end up paying as much as 20 percent more for your student loan after you graduate. If you defer your higher education and go to graduate school or professional school, the cost of that interest could even be higher as a percentage of what you have to pay back.

The rescission bill today also makes some significant rescissions or cuts, if you will, in Pell grants, which are grants that students receive to go to college who tend to be lower income, and also rescinds other additional money that is available for Federal direct student loans.

Now some people have said to me, ''Well, what does it matter, Congressman PALLONE, that you know students have to pay more for their student loans or they don't get as much money for grants or scholarships? After all, they can always go out and work for a

few years and then come back to college later.'' But I think that is ignoring two realities. One is that increasingly the cost of higher education is such that it is not that easy to take time off, and make up the money, and then go back to school; and, secondly, that we are in a world where we are competing with other countries, and, if we have to set up the higher education system where many of our students have to defer going to college for a number of years before they can go because they have to work on the private sphere in order to pay for it, well, we are losing people, a lot of people, who would otherwise receive a higher education and be a productive member of the work force in the career that they have chosen and perhaps that they will be best at.

I also think it ignores the fact that in the last 29 or 30 years many of us were able to take advantage, including myself, of these student loan programs and grants programs, and now we are seeing those of future generations will not be able to take advantage of them. I think it is a mistake on our part to cut back on funding for higher education. You have to think about educating our students and educating our fellow Americans. If we do not provide that commitment that has been traditionally provided for the last generation or two to pay and provide Federal help for higher education the way we have, then it really says a lot about the value of education in our society. It says we do not value it very much.

So, even though both measures, both the budget and the rescission bill passed today; I did vote against both of them in part because of the impact on Medicare and Medicaid on senior citizens, but also in a major part because of the effect on higher education, and the student loans, and the student grants that so many of our students increasingly depend upon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MYRICK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. NORWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE REINCARNATION OF TV MARTI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Madam Speaker, I am certainly not a fan of the Republican budget resolution. But there was one item in it that made a whole lot of sense—the idea of terminating TV Marti. It is long past time we stopped spending $12 million a year to beam to Cuba in the middle of the night TV programs that nobody sees.

I was pleased when Chairman KASICH took on the powerful Cuban-American lobby and proposed eliminating their pet project. And on this point, it sure looked like the committee intended to go along with that proposal.

At the markup on May 10th, the Budget Committee had before it both budget figures and a document with policy assumptions on how to meet those budget goals. The policy document listed a decision to ''terminate broadcasting to Cuba'' as one of the cuts needed to achieve the budget-cutting goals for the international assistance portion of the budget.

The draft committee report circulated on May 12, after the committee passed the budget resolution, stated:

> Overseas broadcasting played an important role during the cold war, but has become and expensive anachronism with the advent of global satellite television broadcasting. Likewise, the technology used by Voice of America and WorldNet limits their potential audiences and makes those systems inefficient and expensive. TV Marti has achieved little success broadcasting to Cuba.

Any reasonable person would interpret all this to mean that the Committee supported termination. Many observers of the budget process reached this conclusion. The Federal Page of the Washington Post on May 11 listed ''Terminate Voice of America and Radio Marti broadcasts to Cuba'' as one of the items in its ''House Republicans' Blueprint to Balance the Budget.'' (p.A21) The Miami Herald in a May 14 page one story called ''Cuban exiles losing clout in D.C.'' reported, ''To help balance the U.S. budget by 2002, the House budget committee called for eliminating funding for (Radio and TV Marti) next fiscal year.'' (p.1.)

Then a most amazing thing happened. The final version of the committee report that was filed on May 15 reversed the Committee's apparent policy decision to terminate TV Marti. The sentence ''TV Marti has achieved little success broadcasting to Cuba'' was deleted. All the rest of the paragraph declaring overseas broadcasting ''an expensive anachronism'' remained intact. But where first appeared the admission that TV Marti was a flop, there now magically appeared the wholly contradictory statement that ''Funding, however, is available for Radio and TV Marti.''

This is an interesting situation. The report now recommends getting rid of all USIA broadcasting programs—VOA, Radio Liberty, Radio Free Europe—but makes a specific exception for TV and Radio Marti.

What happened over the weekend that resulted in this complete reversal? Who pressured Chairman KASICH to turn around on this and rewrite the report language? And what else in this budget has been changed after the committee vote? This is yet another demonstration of how difficult it is to kill a program, even when the program does not work.

I want to give credit to Chairman KASICH for his effort to go beyond generalities, to details, in his budget resolution. This experience with TV Marti gives new meaning to that old saw, that the devil is in the details. It also, I am afraid, undermines the credibility of the entire exercise.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce today, along with a number of our colleagues, the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995.

This legislation, which is the product of many months of careful deliberation, would be the first comprehensive refuge reform bill since the enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966. While that landmark statute, which was authored by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL, nearly 30 years ago has served our Nation well, it is time that we update that law and, by so doing, improve the management of our Nation's wildlife refuge system.

At present, the system is comprised of 504 refuges, which are located in all 50 States and the 5 U.S. Territories, totaling about 91.7 million acres. These units range in size from the smallest, the 1-acre Mille Lacs National Wildlife Refuge in Minnesota, to the largest, the 19.3-million-acre Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. In the last decade, 81 refuges and approximately 3.6 million acres have been added to the system.

While millions of Americans engage in various recreational activities each year on public lands within the system, there have been several recent developments that have caused great concern.

For instance, in October of 1993, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service settled a lawsuit filed by the National Audubon Society by agreeing to undertake a comprehensive system-wide ''compatibility'' study, to expeditiously terminate certain secondary uses, and to redirect their funds away from recreational and wildlife-dependent activities.

In addition, the Clinton administration has recommended that refuge funding be sharply reduced by deferring maintenance projects and upkeep of public use facilities, including trails, observation towers, and information kiosks. This recommendation is worrisome because without proper maintenance, the service may prohibit certain uses on our refuge lands.

While it is appropriate to periodically review the compatibility of certain activities, there is no statutory list of purposes for the national wildlife refuge system and no statutory definition of what constitutes a compatible use of a refuge. Without this guidance, individual wildlife managers have broad discretion to prevent or disallow recreational activities which do not materially affect the purposes of the refuge or the refuge system.

In fact, earlier this week my committee held a hearing on a bill to transfer the management of the Tishomingo National Wildlife Refuge to the State of Oklahoma. The overriding reason for H.R. 1112 was a decision by the local refuge manager to prohibit boating, camping, fishing, and picnicking in portions of the

Tishomingo Refuge. These restrictions will prevent many people from enjoying activities that have occurred since the refuge was created nearly 50 years ago. It is time to manage the refuge system on a nationwide basis and to make compatibility determinations based on clear statutory language and not emotion or individual bias.

Another issue that has caused great concern for many Americans involves the Fish and Wildlife Service's refuge land acquisition policy. When a new refuge is created or additional acreage is added to an existing unit, all traditional activities, including fishing and hunting, are prohibited until a management plan is completed. This can take several years and, in the meantime, millions of Americans are denied the opportunity to enjoy the natural resources that exist on these lands.

Finally, while the number of refuges continues to increase, there is no requirement to complete a conservation plan for each refuge. In my judgment, these plans are essential because they would identify the purposes of the refuge; the fish, wildlife, and plant populations; their habitats; any archaeological values; opportunities for fish- and wildlife-dependent recreation; potential sites for administrative or visitors facilities; and ways to correct or mitigate any problems. The general public would be strongly encouraged to participate in the writing of these plans.

Our Nation's wildlife refuge system must be managed more effectively in the future. This system, which was first envisioned by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1903, needs to have a statutory list of purposes, uniform guidelines to determine what activities are permissible, comprehensive conservation plans, and the enthusiastic support of the American people who finance this system not only with the payment of their tax dollars, but also by purchasing duck stamps and paying excise taxes on fishing and hunting equipment.

These are the goals of the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995. This legislation will build upon and improve current law by: making wildlife-dependent recreation, including fishing and hunting, a purpose of the refuge system; defining the term ''compatible use''; allowing historical uses to continue on newly acquired lands unless those uses are determined to be incompatible; requiring conservation plans for each refuge within 15 years; providing that fishing and hunting are permitted unless a finding is made that these activities are inconsistent with either the purpose of the refuge or public safety; and emphasizing a cooperative relationship with the States who have primacy on the management of fish and wildlife.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will restore the wildlife refuge system to the goals and intent of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966. It will ensure that this system is alive and well for all our constituents in the 21st century.

This measure has been endorsed by the California Waterfowl Association, the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, the National Rifle Association, Safari Club International, and the Wildlife Legislative Fund of America. Furthermore, the views of the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and the Wildlife Management Institute have been sought and incorporated into this process.

I would urge my colleagues to join with me, JOHN DINGELL, JIM HANSEN, BILL BREWSTER, JOHN DOOLITTLE, BILLY TAUZIN, PETE GEREN, SOLOMON ORTIZ, ELTON GALLEGLY, JIMMY HAYES, KEN CALVERT, BLANCHE LAMBERT LINCOLN, J.D. HAYWORTH, FRANK CREMEANS, BARBARA CUBIN, WES COOLEY, JOHN SHADEGG, and J.C. WATTS in this important effort by cosponsoring the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. POSHARD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CONTINUATION OF REMARKS ON 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF WORLD WAR II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, a pretty exciting and historical day today. What I wanted to do was to add to this history by keeping a promise I made last month that I would finish my remarks on what was happening 50 years ago this week. The war in Europe had ended, but the struggle for the small series of islands comprising Okinawa and a smaller group of subsidiary islands was one of the bloodiest fights of the Pacific campaign.

Before I move forward to 1945, let me point out the stories of two friends of mine. Today, 30, years ago, in 1965, my best friend in the Air Force, David Hrdlicka, was shot down over Laos. He was only TDY, down from the wing on that island of Okinawa that so many young men had died on just 20 years before, and during the 20th anniversary of that 1945 struggle there we were taking the first small steps back into combat in Asia. David was in what I thought at the time was the world's greatest aircraft. I was desperately asking the Air Force to recall me to active duty so that I could fly Mach II, the world's only Mach II, twice the speed of sound, aircraft, the F–105 Thunderchief, which was eventually nicknamed after Robert Strange, evil, McNamara's no-win war. It was the thud, semi-affectionately given that name because of the number shot down coming into the Red River Valley, into the target area over Hanoi and Haiphong, the sound of the big F–105 hitting the ground, the thuds. More Republic F–105 aircraft were lost in combat, prorated to the number of planes that flew in Southeast Asia, than any other plane in the war. It carried the major burden of bombing up north along with magnificent efforts on the part of the Navy's A–4's, F–8's, and F–4's, and then eventually A–6 Intruders.

□ 1915

But the l05 was a special airplane. I remember sitting with Dave Hrdlicka in the base theater at George Air Force base when some test pilots came over from Edwards Air Force Base, our Air Force test center, and threw up on the screen big pictures of the F–105. We had only seen pictures of the Mach–2 F–104 Starfighter a few months ago, but unlike the Starfighter, a tiny airplane, with small, 7-foot wings, the F–105 was the biggest fighter aircraft ever made, longer from the pitot boom and its nose to the tip of its vertical stabilizer than was the World War II four-engine B–17 Flying Fortress.

So there was Dave, having completed with his lovely wife Carol and their little babies, a great tour in England, flying another outstanding aircraft, the F–101 Voodoo. David flew at Bentwaters, which had the only fighter version of the F–101, all the rest were interceptors or reconnaissance versions. A unique situation to have only one Air Force wing of three squadrons in the whole world where they, a two-engine fighter, the predecessor to the four-generation, four-decade Phantom, David, I thought, was leading a charmed life from George Air Force Base in the beautiful Mojave Desert to England with all of its culture, defending Europe from the evil empire, and then home for a while and then to this great assignment at Okinawa. And suddenly here he is, flying over a country that only a few years ago became famous because of a young President's accent talking about chaos in Laos. And Dave gets hit from the ground.

Not a damaging hit to him personally, but hit the rear of the airplane, made a radio call calmly that he was going to have to eject. His wing man saw him come down into a clearing. As he was disengaging from his parachute, trying to come up on his radio, they saw men surround him, probably Communist Pathet Lao soldiers. And he was taken off into the woods at the edge of a clearing.

Years later, a photograph appears in Moscow, reprinted in the Long Beach, CA newspaper and sent to Carol where she had gone home to her family to be near a ranch which was her upbringing with young children. And somebody who knew the Hrdlickas from the Air Force said, I think this is David's picture in this Long Beach newspaper. And they sent it to Carol.

She looked. Sure enough. Dave was very distinctive, stocky, typical fighter pilot, handsome face. And Carol called the Air Force at the closest base, which was probably Lowry and said, ''Where is the briefing on my husband? Here is his picture.''

They were so embarrassed. I remember Carol telling me that they got the highest ranking officer in the entire area, a brigadier general, a man who knew absolutely nothing about the missing in action cause, and they sent him out to Carol Hrdlicka's house to say something, anything. It was embarrassing for her and for him.

Thirty years later to this very day, Carol is still finding out things from

records that are being released that were never told to her, including a rescue operation to free David who at one point in the late 1960's, he was a known prisoner for 5 or 6 years, was held in a cave with Charlie Shelton.

Charlie had been shot down in a reconnaissance aircraft, David being the first fighter aircraft downing in Laos. Charlie had gone down on his 33d birthday, on April 29, 1965.

I meant to come to the well and remember Charlie, too, although I did not know him. He was my vintage, a pilot training graduate. David was a year behind me. I got to know his wife Marian as well as I knew Carol over the years. Marian committed suicide during the 25th year of Charlie's imprisonment. He was kept on record as a POW, the last one, the one and only POW until a few months ago.

I went to his remembrance ceremony at Arlington with his five grown children, children that would have been Charlie's grandchildren. His oldest son is a Franciscan priest. The Hrdlicka family is also Catholic.

These two men were known to be held together in a cave, Charlie and Dave. For years reports coming out through intelligence sources of several escape attempts, a report once that Charlie had been wounded twice, recovered from his wounds, same kind of rumors about David. Then, as I said on Jefferson's birthday last month when I declared for the Presidency, they just sort of disappeared into the mist of Asian history. I will not accept that.

That is why next month, as chairman of the military personnel subcommittee, I am going to have hearings with a focus just on Laos, what happened to Col. Charlie Shelton and what happened to then a young major, now a colonel, when he was declared presumptive finding of death, what happened to David Hrdlicka?

What happened to the other 300 men that all went down somewhere around Laos?

It is interesting that the current Assistant Secretary for Asian Affairs, Winston Lord, a former Ambassador, wrote the memo to Kissinger that Henry Kissinger fed to Nixon that had Nixon go on national television when the fourth and final big C–141 Starlifter brought our men back on those freedom flights from Hanoi in the spring of 1973. The first flight landed appropriately on Lincoln's birthday, February 12.

Six weeks later the fourth and final freedom flight came out, and they all flew nonstop from Hanoi's main Mig base airfield, still shot up from Linebacker II operations. They flew nonstop to Manilla. For men like our own Sam Johnson, who served so brilliantly and loyally on this side of the aisle, who was part of this historic vote today of 238 to 193, Sam had not had a warm shower in 7 years until he hit Clark Air Force Base in the Philippines, let alone a decent, warm meal. Several of the men told me they consumed five hamburgers and then would go to waffles and bacon and eggs. And the flight surgeons were sitting right there and said, ''Go ahead, gorge yourselves.'' But it was amazing to see so much passage of time, twice as long as World War II at 3½ years, twice as long as World War II was Sam Johnson imprisoned. And there was one Green Beret, Floyd Thompson, who was in exactly a week shy of 9 years.

It brings back memories of mine, made me want to run for Congress, to see if I could change this Government. It was so insufferable that an evil man like McNamara could allow the best and the brightest of our military academies, the best and brightest of our aviation cadets and ROTC graduates to rot in prison for 9 years, 8 years for Ed Alvarez and 7 for men like Sam Johnson, in Laos. Nothing.

Then Winston Lord feeds this memo to Henry Kissinger, by then Secretary of State, and he feeds it to Nixon. And Nixon goes on television and says, all the men who were prisoners in Laos have been accounted for. Well, that absolutely was not true.

The North Vietnamese Communists, in an ugly little effort at the very end on that bright morning in Hanoi, end of March 1973, took 10 men who had been captured in Laos by North Vietnamese troops and all taken into the Hanoi prison system, except for one, a CIA Air America man named Ernie Brace, who had been in a small prison at Dien Bien Phu, where the French had lost their final battle in the spring of 1954. Ernie Brace was held at Dien Bien Phu for 3 weeks. And then he, like the other nine, was immediately moved into the Hanoi prison system. So these were North Vietnamese, Hanoi-held prisoners.

Nixon either deliberately or knowingly announced to the world, all the Laotian-held prisoners are home. And not a one was home. Not Charlie Shelton, not David Hrdlicka, not any of the other roughly 298.

I remember saying at the time, I have been saying it for the last two decades, where was the warning to our men that if your plane is shot up over the target areas over North Vietnam and you are smoking or you are losing power, or your pieces are coming off your airplane, do not try to get across Laos, back to your Thailand bases? Do not try to rendezvous with a helicopter, that rescue, Jolly Green Giant chopper in sight, bend it around, punch out, and parachute into North Vietnam, because there your odds are about 75, 80 percent that you will be coming home someday. But if you bail out over Laos and that chopper does not jerk you out, the penetrator cable does not come down and pull you out of a triple canopy jungle, you will never be heard from again by your fellow citizens. What an ugly shame.

So at the hearings next month, maybe I will have one of the grown Shelton sons or daughters come and tell us what these 30 years and 20 days have been like for them. I know Carol, Carol Hrdlicka has said she will come to tell us what her struggle has been like, trying to get justice out of her Government for 30 years.

And because Carol is watching on television, I wanted to tell another story involving another hero who passed away a few days ago on May 7. He was a family friend. I only met him once as a young boy. My mother had met him when he was assigned to Palm Springs Army Air Force Base. Basically a P–38 base, and a B–26 wing was coming through, the B–26 Martin Marauder, the 22d bomb wing was on its way to the South Pacific, the first medium bomb wing to go over, the first B–26 Marauders to go into combat.

Walter Krell was a young captain. My mother had on the dresser in her room a picture of herself, my aunt, who is still alive and vigorous, I hope she is watching, Flo Haley, the wife of the tin man in the Wizard of Oz, and some other friends. They were trying to buck up the spirits of these young P–38 and B–26 pilots on their way to the South Pacific.

They would sometimes pool their money and see if they could not get a plane ticket or very rare DC–3 flight to have the wives come and join them in Palm Springs. And my mother used to tell me about this picture. He was handsome, Walter Krell, looking a little bit older than the other young fighter pilots. There was one very young handsome pilot named Pepino. My mom would point to him and say, Pepe, as the men called him, said:

> Why are they making us get all of the various shots, going into a jungle area, inoculations, because none of us P–38 pilots are coming back; we are all going to get killed in combat; we are working out how to use this big heavy P–38 against these light superior Japanese zeros, and the young men that come after us, they will whip the Japanese zeros, but we are the guinea pigs.

And she said he pointed over to Walter Krell and said:

> Walt over here, he will probably come back because he has got bomber duty.

Well, for the bomber pilots, it is every bit, if not even more hazardous. But Walter Krell, in this photograph with four or five fighter pilots and himself, he was the only one who came back.

I remember meeting him on Waldron Drive in Beverly Hills when he came to see us. He was so old looking and mature. I was 12 years of age. He could not have been more than 26 or 27. And I remember him having dinner with my parents and spending the day with us and telling a few stories about the South Pacific. After I came to this Congress, on my second tour here in the mid-1980's, I got a letter from a Walter Krell, a veterinarian in Yreka, Northern California.

□ 1930

He said ''Are you BOB DORNAN, the son of Mickey Dornan,'' my mother, ''who gave me a small St. Christopher

to wear around my neck, which I wore through 120 combat missions in the South Pacific? Is that you? Because your mother wrote me in 1953 and asked for that small St. Christopher back, so that her son could wear it through pilot training.''

Madam Speaker, here is that St. Christopher medal, on the back of a larger medal with the face of Christ. This little St. Christopher took Walt Krell, who died Sunday, May 7, took him through 120 combat missions, including flying lead when President-to-be Lyndon Baynes Johnson was getting his one combat ride, for which Sam Rayburn engineered a Silver Star, amazingly. When Lyndon Johnson was in the back of another B–26 it was off Walt Krell's wing, then first lieutenant, soon to be Captain Krell, was leading—he was a captain by then—he was leading this flight when Japan's leading ace, who is still alive, I believe, Saboro Sakai, was rolling in trying to shoot down one of these B–26's, the one with Johnson on it, or the one that was leading the flight with Walter Krell.

When I got in touch with Walter and found out there was a painting out there of his beautiful B–26 in combat, from the point of view of Saboro Sakai rolling in on him, I sent it to Saboro Sakai. He autographed it and last year Walter sent it back to me with his autograph on it.

Here is an article that Walt sent me that I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last year. I would like to read part of it to America here, to the million or so people that watch this, to give a little bit of the flavor of a young Walt Krell in the South Pacific in 1942, the darkest year in American history since the Civil War, and maybe after the hearings next month with Carol Hrdlicka, I will do something from the Shelton children and something from the Hrdlicka children. I have gotten to know Dave, Jr., who flew F–18 hornets in the Navy and is now an American Airlines 727 pilot, I think, domiciled out of Houston.

By the way, today, Madam Speaker, I chaired my first subcommittee ever, the Military Personnel Subcommittee. It was a good chairman's mark in that we have 39 pages of the best legislation I have ever seen, section 563, ''Determination of the Whereabouts and Status of Missing Persons.''

The gentleman from New York, BEN GILMAN, originated this legislation in the Committee on International Relations, and Senate majority leader BOB DOLE, a World War II veteran over on the Senate side. I am very proud of this. I hope that anybody that is interested in this and wants to see it will write to the Committee on Armed Services and get this legislation. Anything we have missed here we will perfect with this focus on Laos next month.

By the way, when Walter Krell, about 24 or 25 years old, was flying B–26's in 1942 out of New Guinea, BOB DOLE would have been 18 years of age, thinking about becoming an Army officer and going either to the Pacific or to Europe.

Here is Walter Krell's article entitled ''Incendiary Bombs to Rabaul.''

''In early 1942, Army Air Force Ordnance developed an aerial incendiary bomb, a device 4 feet long and 16 inches or so in diameter. It consisted of 36 individual incendiary units, tiny bomblets with fins and detonators all wired together. The entire bundle, or contained unit, was attached to the shackles on our Martin B–26 Marauder bomb bay racks like an ordinary bomb, to be released in the standard way. Each B–26 would carry 30 or more of these incendiary clusters.

There was one simple difference between high explosive bombs and incendiary bombs. When the arming wire was pulled away upon release of these new incendiaries, a shotgun shell would fire a slug that would cut the wires holding together the bundle of bomblets. Then the 36 individual bomblets would break up, releasing each separate incendiary unit to fall on the target. The arming wire was supposed to be of sufficient length to allow the incendiary mother-bomb to clear the aircraft before the arming wire pulled loose and fired the shotgun shell thereby dispersing the cluster. Of course, nobody bothered to tell that to the B–26 aircrew/gunners who helped with bomb loading, so they routinely clipped the wire short as was done with ordinary iron bombs. The result was that upon 'bombs away', the clusters came apart while still within our bomb bays, clattering around and bouncing off the structural members of the aircraft. These incendiary bomblets were magnesium, and had any of them lodged in the many angular recesses of the fuselage, it would have been very exciting indeed.

''When I experienced the first release of incendiaries my B–26 was flying only 15 feet above those powerful little bomblets tumbling away, when many of them began igniting and burning. After that the bomb loading of incendiaries had the undivided attention of our entire crew of 6.'' In those days they did use two side door gunners.

''Now that we, in the 22d Bomb Group, had interesting new bombs, it was decided they should be delivered all over the docking facilities at Rabaul. The first mission to try to do just that would be a flight of three Marauders. Lt. Chris Herron would lead and Lt. George Kersting would be flying his right wing with me on his left.''

For all I know, the family members of one of these two men are hearing their name now on the House floor.

''After an early morning take-off from 7-Mile Airfield near Fort Moresby, New Guinea, our Marauders flew northeast, climbed over the Owen-Stanley Mountains, descended over the north coast of New Britain, and then turned east to Rabaul Harbor. Unhappily, for an undetermined cause, gasoline siphoned from my right wing tanks for a full 45 minutes after take-off. Because we never returned home from those long Rabaul missions with much fuel to spare, my crew was obviously worried. To turn back, however, would have aborted the raid for the other two crews. We flew on.

Chris Herron was clever the way he took us in to the target. Still heading east, we kept descending and skirted the north side of the Rabaul Harbor at low level, then banked right and pulled into a hard 180-degree turn up and over the rim of the volcanic hills that circled the harbor on the north side.''

I might remind people that this was the major Japanese forward staging air base and harbor for capital ships in all of the South Pacific.

''I remember clearly from my left wing position in our very tight turn, looking to my right across Herron's B–26 and seeing George Kersting's propwash mash down the tops of coconut trees. Chris then rolled us right down on the deck and along the wharfs, and headed west.

''There was a Japanese cargo vessel tied up broadside along the first dock with dozens of loading personnel moving about on the freighter's deck, and at dockside. All of them were totally surprised. I vividly remember their reaction of panic. Two Japanese loaders were carrying something up a gangplank that resembled a litter. Suddenly they dropped the litter and while the guy in the back was still looking up, the guy in front wheeled around and charged back right over the top of the litter thing, and slammed into the guy staring up at us.''

Madam Speaker, I flew the B–2, the flying wing, the ''Spirit,'' B–2 ''Spirit,'' on the first of this month, 6 days before Walt died. I was going to call him and see if I could come and see him, traveling around the country in this quest. That is a two-engine airplane. He would have gotten a big thrill, and I'm sure he is listening now—if he is not, he was busy in his first—he is in his 12th day up there in that big hangar in the sky.

This is a story that is hard for pilots to realize how things are burned into your brain, little quick shots. Imagine coming across the water at full speed, a full load of bombs, a surprise attack on the biggest Japanese harbor in the South Pacific, and your eye is picking up this scene on the dock of a guy turning around and running into the guy at the back of the litter, staring up at Walt Krell's B–26.

''I could see that Lt. Herron intended to try to take out this ship, which was positioned parallel to our line of flight. This would have forced me to waste my bombs out in the open harbor to my left, so I dropped down and moved ahead of Chris and took the lead, forcing our formation to the right over the docking area with its stacked supplies and many warehouses: ''Bombs away.'' I immediately banked left and headed south towards the Rabaul channel and

away from the exploding docks, thinking Herron and Kersting would hang onto my right wing until we were clear and I could slide back into position.

''Chris apparently went his own way, but in my left turn I could not see where he was. Not wanting to roll back into him, I continued my hard turn, yelling to my co-pilot to try and pick up the formation. I was now heading back around toward the east rim of the harbor with anti-aircraft flak popping all around us, and some of it starting to explode much too close.

''I twisted my Marauder back and forth to foil the anti-aircraft gunners until I was back across the harbor east rim and above an active smoking volcano. In spite of this fast-moving action, I was fascinated by the volcano's shimmering, silvery walls as I pushed over and dipped down inside the crater itself. I banked again changing course back to the right, and then flew up and over the volcano's western lip.

''There below, streaking out through the Rabaul Channel,'' right on the deck, ''were Herron and Kersting, so I winged over and swooped down to join up. We were back in a three ship 'V' formation just as the Japanese Navy Zero fighters jumped us. It was touch and go for about 20 minutes, when straight ahead loomed a sheer wall of thick clouds, black, with torrential rain. We spread out and plunged into the weather, very happy to wipe off the swarming enemy fighters. Tropical fronts were not new to the pilots of our bomb group, but never before had we encountered anything to equal the intensity of this storm.

''Within minutes our 2,000 horsepower radial engines started to run roughly because of the excessive cooling of the heavy rain. The rainwater was also driving into the magnetos, which are mounted up forward on the Pratt and Whitney engines. We closed our oil shutters and cowl flaps, but that did not seem to help much. In most South Pacific rainstorms, we found there was usually a clear gap for your aircraft to fly between the ocean and the bottom layer of the weather front. But not this time. In order to see, so I could stay above the waves, I was aided in flying by opening my side window.''

I can hardly imagine this.

''After about 25 intense minutes, I flew out of the extremely turbulent storm clouds and made a climbing turn to see if we could pick up the other two B–26's. The skies were empty, and with no radio response to our many calls, we headed for home.

''My co-pilot was I.B. Against my sense of justice, I withhold his full name.''

Actually, Walt Krell had his name in. It was my sense of justice when I helped rewrite this that took out his name.

My co-pilot ''had not been overjoyed with my maneuvers in dodging the flak back at Rabaul. He was particularly unhappy when I had to whack him across the mouth with the back of my hand to get him off the controls during my in-and-out-of-the-volcano caper.''

I guess you would not find this in a Hollywood script, Madam Speaker.

''He was sulking as we gained altitude to clear the Owen Stanley Mountains once more. The weather was now clear, with some broken clouds. I told I.B. to take it, and to make sure to clear the mountains by at least 1,000 feet. Then within minutes I fell dead asleep.''

It is kind of a thrill to know that the St. Christopher that I have been wearing for 42 years was around his neck at this moment.

''I woke a short time later. We had cleared the mountains and were in a gradual descent, but my co-pilot was definitely not relaxed at the controls. Instead, he was staring straight ahead with a strange look on his face. My cockpit was in shambles, with scattered papers, maps, and manuals strewn everywhere. I turned around to check the guys in the navigator's compartment, and they were ashen-faced. 'What the hell happened?' I asked, quickly figuring out that my co-pilot had skimmed the mountain too low and had gotten into an awful thump of a turbulent downdraft. Suddenly at that moment the right engine quit, starved for that 45 minutes of fuel that had siphoned overboard on our climbout. I quickly feathered the right prop. We were very light by now and had good altitude, so we easily made our 7-Mile Airfield home base. While still on the landing roll, our left engine quit, also out of gas. I was able to coast off far enough to one side to clear the runway and wait for a tow. George Kersting's Marauder made it home shortly after us, but no sign of our lead B–26.

''Within hours we learned that Chris Herron had lost an engine because of the heavy downpour in that tropical storm. Chris' co-pilot, an Australian officer who was a former airline pilot, advised that they fly due south. The Aussie co-pilot knew of a small island with a landing strip. Herron opted to land with their gear down. Tragically, the B–26's nosewheel folded and the aircraft flipped over on them, crushing the cockpit. Chris and his Australian co-pilot were killed. The bombardier and navigator, Lieutenant Barnhill and Lieutenant Wright, survived the crash, as did the two crewchief gunners.''

If you are alive out there, Lieutenant Barnhill or Lieutenant Wright, please write Congressman BOB DORNAN.

''Chris Herron was truly one of the great ones, a natural leader who earned the praise and affection of his crew and all of his colleagues in the 22d Bomb Group. A day or two later I flew my B–26 ''Kansas Komet,'' that's right, Walter Krell grew up, just like BOB DOLE, in Kansas, ''I flew the 'Kansas Komet' back to Australia. As I chopped our engines on the ramp at Townsville Airfield, my co-pilot, the same I.B., was the first one out and on the ground. When I hit the ground, he snarled at me 'I will never fly with you again, and I will never fly in that airplane again.'

□ 1945

I told him he was breaking my heart.

And what did our outstanding group leadership do with this disgruntled lieutenant? Why, they let him hang around group operations for several weeks, assisting in the combat briefings for the rest of us who were flying missions while the colonels found somewhere else to transfer him. A General Jimmy Doolittle would have ripped off his wings, stripped him down to his jock strap and had him tethered to a mule harness to start supplies over the Owen Stanleys.

Several weeks after that first incendiary mission, Capt. Al Fletcher, our 22d Group intelligence officer, told me that a Japanese diary had been recovered from a crashed enemy aircraft. In the diary the writer told of an incendiary raid on Rabaul by three Martin B–24 Marauders that had caused many fires, all of which had been contained except for the fires caused by the incendiaries that had fallen into the open hatch of a moored freighter.

Those fires on board the ship could not be controlled. They reignited the dock and then the warehouse area, burned fiercely for hours, and came within a fraction of torching off a large ammo dump.

I am sorry I never saw that captured diary that described the impact of Lt. Chris Herron's final mission for his country. Yes, sir, he was one of the very best.

That is all I know about Chris Herron. And another of America's World War II heroes, Walter Krell, goes to his eternal reward on Sunday, May 7. A few years later on that island of Okinawa, here is what a small press report sounds like for yesterday:

''The 6th Marine Division makes its 11th attack on May 17, 1945,'' 50 years ago yesterday, ''up Sugar Loaf Hill after a pulverizing bombardment by Navy and Marine artillery, fighter bombers and naval gunfire. Once again the Marines take the hill crest but suffer heavy casualties and must withdraw.''

Madam Speaker, I want to read that again. What was happening 50 years ago as we began to clear out the German concentration camps on the other side of the world, and try and save people dying by the hundreds if not thousands because they only knew a few days of freedom, they were so malnourished, before God took them.

But here on the other side of the world, on Okinawa, far worse than what I had talked about on the House floor, the casualties at Iwo Jima, but here in this 86-day battle, still not over, that started at the beginning of last month, here on the 11th assault on Sugar Loaf, I walked this terrible ground on Okinawa once, could hardly conceive of the change of real estate, ugly real estate, back and forth. They

must withdraw after winning the ground on the 11th attack.

Nearby the First Marine Division takes Wana Draw and knocks out some of the Japanese big guns that were zeroed in on Sugar Loaf. Then the Army comes in, a surprise dawn attack by the 77th ''Statue of Liberty Division.'' They take a ridge on the Shuri line, eastern end. The 77th also reaches the top of Flat Hill Drive, takes it.

And then the 77th Division is driven off by a counterattack. What would make young American Marines and GI's give up ground that they had just taken? Only one thing: horrible casualties. Wounded and dying men all around you. Seeing in that clear Pacific air hundreds of Japanese infantry forces who were fighting with an incredible spirit, that if we had ever had to invade Japan would have killed a million of them and 300,000 of our men.

Hence the stupidity and arrogance of this argument over at the Smithsonian over how to display the fuselage of the Enola Gay, coming up on the 50th anniversary of the first two atomic bombs on August 6 and 9. It was merciful to the Japanese in this frenzy of combat.

And all this killing is still going on down in the Philippine Islands 50 years ago today. Although the Japanese down there were falling back, here they are fighting with a courageous ferocity. Offshore a kamikaze sends the destroyer Douglas H. Fox back to the States for extensive repairs.

As I recall, the day before this 50 years ago the Enterprise had been hit; the Enterprise, which had not been at Coral Sea but had survived the battle of Midway, all the serious combat around Guadalcanal and all the Solomon Islands. It had been in the battle of the Philippine Sea, in the battle of Leyte Gulf. It had more battle stars than any other carrier, had counted for shooting down, I think, 991 Japanese airplanes. It gets hit by a Japanese kamikaze, loses its forward loading elevator and is on its way back to Puget Sound on this very day 50 years ago.

Then planes from the carrier Ticonderoga further south attacked the Japanese garrisons on Taroa Island and Maloelap Atoll in the central Pacific Marshall Islands.

So we have got combat going on Okinawa, still looking for a last few snipers down in the caves in Iwo Jima, fighting in the Philippines and attacking some of the other Japanese naval bases.

Madam Speaker, here to personalize this, which I would like to do, down to one man. In my Medal of Honor book here is a story about the young Marine major and how tough people would fight to inspire their men. An incredible story.

This one more story about day before yesterday. A battalion of the 6th Marine Division led by Maj. Harry Courtney makes an American banzai charge on Okinawa's Sugar Loaf Hill. This was 2 days before this 11th attack today and yesterday.

The Marines take the hill and then are driven off. Courtney is awarded a posthumous Medal of Honor.

B–29's destroy, meanwhile, up in Japan the Mitsubishi aircraft engine plant and 3.6 square miles of Nagoya. The Japanese sowed the wind and now they were reaping the whirlwind.

Meanwhile U.S. scientists and bomb experts at Los Alamos, NM select Hiroshima, and now comes the lucky names, for target, Kokura spared by God's call, I guess, Kyoto, one of the 5 biggest cities, and Yokohama, second biggest city, all likely targets for atomic bombs.

Hiroshima, which ironically was the most Christian city in Japan, and Nagasaki, where Portuguese Christian missionaries, Jesuits, had landed years before—they were selected. Hiroshima seems especially a good target because the surrounding hills will focus the blast.

Now to Major Courtney. His name is Henry, same as my dad. Same nickname, ''Harry.'' Harry Courtney, 29 years of age, was awarded the Medal of Honor for 2 days of action, the 14th and 15th of this week, 50 years ago, May 1945.

''U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, born 6 January 1916 in Duluth, MN. Appointed from Minnesota. For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty, as the exec. officer of the 2nd Battalion, 22nd Marines, the 6th Marine Division.'' None of those units exist anymore. ''In action against Japanese forces on Okinawa Shime in the Ryukyu Islands. Ordered to hold for the night in static defense behind Sugar Loaf Hill after leading the forward elements of his command in a prolonged fire fight, Major Courtney weighed the effect of a hostile night counterattack against the tactical value of an immediate Marine assault, resolved to initiate the assault, and promptly obtained permission to advance and seize the forward slope of the hill. Quickly explaining the situation to his small, tattered remaining force, he declared his personal intention of leading and moving forward and then proceeded on his way, boldly blasting nearby cave positions and neutralizing enemy guns as he went. Inspired by his courage, every man followed without hesitation, and together the intrepid Marines braved a terrific concentration of Japanese guns to skirt the hill on the right and reach the reverse slope. Harry Courtney sent guides to the rear for more ammunition and possible replacements. Subsequently reinforced by 26 men and an LDT load of grenades''—I guess that is land vehicle tank—''he determined to storm the crest of the hill and crush any planned counterattack before it could gain sufficient momentum by effecting a breakthrough. Leading his men by example rather than by command, he pushed ahead with unrelenting aggressiveness hurling grenades into cave openings on the slope with devastating effect. Upon reaching the crest and observing large numbers of Japanese forming for action to attack less than 100 yards away, he instantly attacked, waged a furious battle and succeeded in killing many of the enemy himself and forcing the remainder to take cover in the caves. Determined to hold, he told his men to dig in, and coolly disregarding the continuous hail of flying enemy shrapnel, he moved to rally his weary troops, tirelessly aiding casualties, and assigned his men to more advantageous positions. He was then instantly killed by a hostile mortar blast while moving among his men. Maj. Harry Courtney by his astute military acumen, indomitable leadership and decisive action in the face of overwhelming odds had contributed essentially to the success of the Okinawa campaign. His great personal valor throughout sustained his men and enhanced the highest traditions of the U.S. Navy. He gallantly gave his life for his country.''

Walter Krell, Chris Herron and the fledgling Army Air Force, Maj. Harry Courtney with the Marine Corps, Charley Shelton, and Dave Hrdlicka over Laos. Again the last lines of Mitchner's great story of flying in Korea comes to mind, his fictitious admiral based on a Mark Mitchner or Bull Halsey type, played so beautifully by Frederick March says, ''Where do we get such men? Why is America lucky enough to have such men?''

Madam Speaker, when I was on the floor last month about Okinawa, I mentioned that we do have one Member, BOB STUMP, who served on the ships watching the young wounded come aboard. He was barely 18. He had fudged his age to join a couple of years before, trained at Pearl Harbor and was off the coast of Okinawa.

Madam Speaker, I include the following article for the RECORD:

[From the Hill, Apr. 5, 1995]

MEMORIES OF OKINAWA—REPRESENTATIVE BOBBY STUMP RECALLS HIS ROLE IN THE HISTORIC BATTLE ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

(By David Grann)

Bobby Stump wanted to become a doctor, but when the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor in December 1941, he did what all his friends did: He enlisted.

There was only one catch. He was only 16.

''I had to boost my age up,'' the 68-year-old Arizona Republican congressman recalls. ''All my friends were seniors in high school, and, technically, I wasn't old enough.''

Training as a medical technician for the Navy on Pearl Harbor, he later helped operate at sea on dozens of U.S. servicemen wounded in the bloody battles of Luzon and Iwo Jima. On April 1, 1945, he was on board a ''flat top'' aircraft carrier steaming toward the 60-mile-long, banana-shaped island of Okinawa.

Fifty-years later, the silver-haired chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, who believes he is the only member of Congress who fought at Okinawa, recalled in an interview the beautiful clear day that launched the most devastating naval battle of World War II. Over 1,200 ships carrying more than 180,000 marines, sailors and soldiers converged on the rocky Pacific island.

''It was Easter Sunday,'' he says. ''We didn't know exactly what to expect, but we

knew it was going to be bad. We were getting ready to attack the mainland of Japan, and this was a final step.''

His aircraft carrier was part of an arsenal of 40 large and small carriers, 18 battleships and nearly 200 destroyers. As they moved through the East China Sea, sailors searched the skies for the dreaded Kamikaze suicide planes.

''They would come straight in, or drop bombs from under their bellies.'' Stump recalls. ''It didn't matter if you were on a big or little ship. They'd try to hit everything.''

Although his ship was never hit directly, he watched other ships sinking in flames. His ship rescued sailors from the stormy seas. As the battle dragged into May, there were endless alerts, as planes roared across the night sky.

Stump witnessed first hand what one war correspondent described in Ronald Spector's account of the battle, Eagle Against the Sun: ''The strain of waiting, the anticipated terror made vivid from past experience, sent some men into hysteria, insanity, breakdown.''

Stump, who turned 68 on Tuesday, downplays his personal experience. Instead, he speaks solemnly of his friends who lost more than him, those who never came home after the invasion.

''It was worse than Luzon and Iwo Jima,'' he says. ''Nothing compared.''

On June 21, when the guns finally quieted, 7,000 U.S. marines and soldiers were dead. In the protracted sea-air battle offshore, where Stump was, over 5,000 sailors were killed and 5,000 more wounded.

The toll on the Japanese was equally devastating. Over 70,000 Japanese died, along with more than 80,000, mostly civilian Okinawans. ''It was the last ditch effort for the Japanese to stop us, and they fought and fought,'' says Stump.

After the bitter struggle, Stump finally set sail for home. He had been at sea for over two years. As ships with American recruits passed him heading for Japan, President Truman ordered the first atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima, followed by a second nuclear weapon on Nagasaki.

It was the only way to stave off an even costlier invasion of the Japanese mainland, Stump says, and a death toll even larger than Okinawa. He was incensed when the Smithsonian Museum recently planned an exhibit of the Enola Gay, suggesting America did not have to bomb Hiroshima in order to end the war.

''Anyone who was at Okinawa,'' he says, ''anyone who saw that kind of fighting, knew what an invasion of Japan would really mean and what was at stake.''

And he adds: ''They would not try to rewrite history.''

Mr. DORNAN. This battle that started on Easter Sunday, April 1, had now been raging for 48 days, barely halfway through the battle. It was the last invasion before the assault on Japan's home islands. Okinawa was needed, of course, as a harbor for our U.S. fleet and to build more air bases for the fighters and heavy bombers to get them up closer. The Iwo Jima invasion was necessary as a halfway point. We lost over 6,000 men and saved, 3 to 1, 18,000 air crewmen to come back to Iwo Jima. Now we are moving in closer to finish off the war. The big island would be used as a staging area for the invasion of the southern island of Kyushu and the planned assault later on Honshu, the middle Japanese island where Tokyo is. What a campaign we avoided by all of this brave action.

These Japanese kamikaze or suicide attacks were called ''kikusui,'' floating chrysanthemums. There were flown against the invasion fleet all around the island. Most aircraft were flown by young men with hardly any hours at all as pilots. Almost half of the attacking force were kamikaze. I wonder how you got to not fly a kamikaze and get to have a parachute and enough fuel to get you home?

The attacks also included more traditional methods of attack by fighters and bombers. Most were shot down by ships of the invading forces and U.S. and British naval aircraft. The Americans and the British lost 763 aircraft. That is almost as many as we have in all of our stateside fighter squadrons now. 763. But the Japanese lost 10 times that, 7,700 aircraft. Thirty-four U.S. ships were sunk. Naval forces lost 4,900 sailors, killed or missing, and in naval combat when somebody is missing, they are gone, beneath the waves, no remains to go home, no grave to visit.

□ 2000

From March 17 to May 27, the U.S. Navy suffered its worst losses in the war; at least 90 ships sank or were out of action for 30 to 90 days, all of that during last month, this month and next month 50 years ago.

Because of Clinton's appearance in Moscow, flying over England, which was a grievous insult to the British and the French, all of our allies along the coast, the Dutch, the Belgians, the Danes, because he went to the European ceremonies in Moscow, in a strange way not honoring the fact that we fought together in an allied cause, but unfortunately recalling that Stalin, in his evil, he reigned for 29 years, Hitler for 12.

So Stalin killed millions and millions of more people than even the horrible Adolf Hitler. Stalin caused this conflict in Europe by signing a Hitler-Stalin pact in 1940. Both of them invaded Poland, cutting it in half. Then Stalin began to trade and gave war materials to Hitler so he could further crush and suppress the rest of Europe, and then as with all deals made with the approval of the devil, Hitler, on June 22, 1941, shortly before our being dragged into this by Pearl Harbor at the end of the year, he attacks the other ugly evil force of this century, the Communists in Russia; unbelievable, cataclysmic events.

Madam Speaker, I had intended to come to this floor, but I did not want to distract from our great vote, when McNamara's book first came out last month.

I got to host a radio show for 3 hours that is hosted by Ronald Reagan's son, Michael, and on the show, because McNamara's book was prominent in the news at that time, I had two important guests. One was the best military writer in America today. He has got a great article in today's Washington Times, Col. Harry Summers, the senior editor of Vietnam magazine.

Summers came on the radio with me, and I read his article from that day, last month, from that day's commentary section of the Washington Times, and he said that there were many men culpable for the terrible loss in Vietnam during those early years when we could have achieved a victory by mining Haiphong Harbor, concentrating our energies in I Corps, sealing the Ho Chi Minh trail, giving the Vietnamese the same type of aircraft we were giving the British, the Turks, and the Greeks. We were giving F–4 ''Phantoms'' to everybody, but in a racist way, we treated our South Vietnamese allies as though they were not worthy of top-line equipment. They might take the war north as Lee took it north to Antietam and Gettysburg. No, bottle them up in the South, teach them to be subservient, and we will handle all the artillery and all the air cover, so we wean them away from fighting the way they should have as a counter-guerrilla conflict.

In those early years he said there were many people culpable. He even takes a shot at honorable General Westmoreland. He said McNamara was different. NcNamara was evil. Nobody has used that word on this House floor. I bet it has never been used in the Senate. I said on the air that night on 100 stations, I said, ''Colonel Summers, you are correct, Robert Strange McNamara is an evil man. Never in my lifetime, maybe not in this century, maybe not throughout the Civil War, have we had a man personally responsible along with President Johnson for killing so many Vietnamese on both sides, 2 million or more North Vietnamese.'' All the young soldiers and peasants did not understand dialectical materialism or communism, just sent south against B–52 strikes, all sorts of punishment before they got into combat where they were used on suicide raids like these Kamakazes or Bonzai charges.

After Harry Summers, I had an unusual guest, an excellent American patriot, Tom Moorer, 4-star Navy admiral, who had been commander of the 7th Fleet in the Pacific, and he had been CINCPAC commander for all our Pacific forces, the biggest geographical military command on the planet Earth. He then became chief of naval operations, then chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff, sending memo after memo to Robert McNamara, begging him to mine Haiphong Harbor.

At this time, McNamara had already made up his mind. He made up his mind before he put the first Marine on the beach March 8, 1965; we could not win, so he was feeding young kids like cannon fodder into this death machine while he is skiing at Snow Mass, and his son is avoiding the draft. I have seen him lie on Larry King and lie on the Tom Snyder Show. I have seen him lying all over, pushing his book, driving it up to No. 1 on the New York Times bestseller list.

A caller called in from Montana. I believe his name was Bob. I hope he is watching. Bob says, ''Admiral Moorer, Bob Dornan, I think Robert McNamara was a war criminal.'' There was a pause, and I said ''Admiral, those words crossed my mind yesterday at the Vietnam Memorial.''

I thought, well, liberals love to come at me for overstating the case, and I rejected ever using those words. ''But what do you think, Admiral? Is he a war criminal?'' Admiral Tom Moorer, without a blemish on his career, in 1942, he was flying PBY Catalinas, and they were painted black, and they called them ''Black Cats.'' They were actually using it as a patrol bomber, bombing in the Solomon Islands: Distinguished Flying Cross, with Silver Stars, great combat veteran, Admiral Tom Moorer says, ''Congressman, yes, I believe Robert McNamara is a war criminal.''

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I lost my speaking privileges on this floor the day after the State of the Union for using a term that I will not complete tonight. I do not want to get into problems with our parliamentarian. I talked about aid and comfort to hostile powers with whom we were engaged in combat.

Suffice it to say, when Wolf Blitzer asked Bill Clinton at the White House if he felt McNamara's book vindicated him, Clinton said, ''Yes. Yes, I do.'' And because he is bright, he said, ''I know it sounds self-serving, but, yes I do.''

Imagine getting vindication from an evil person, a person that honorable men think of as a war criminal. You cannot get vindication there, Mr. Clinton. You just cannot!

And I have found out since then why Mr. Clinton went to Moscow alone on New Year's Eve of 1969, why he woke up in Leningrad and headed to Moscow January 1, 1970, why he was there only 3 days, 27 degrees below zero, 10 inches of snow cover. It was to go to a banquet, a banquet that a former U.S. Senator was at in the National Hotel, the best hotel in town, and he was broke, freezing, and he was only there 3 days, and then off to Prague, the banquet, the peace banquet, and then I found out yesterday from a new book called ''Clinton Confidential,'' by George Carpozzi, I hope George is listening, I would like to help his book to attain a counterbalance to McNamara's book, that Clinton had also another trip to Moscow I never knew about, June 1991, 4 months, less than 4 months before he declared for the Presidency on October 3, 1991. He was in Moscow. The Paula Jones incident was March 8, which, by the way, is V–E Day, and 1 month later, June 8, he has a personal 1½-hour meeting with the head of the KGB. What the heck was that all about, less than 4 months before he declared to be commander in chief?

So, Madam Speaker, I will say what some press people know, that I will be back trying to follow parliamentary rules, but if I get overruled. I will appeal the ruling of the Chair and I will win by a party-line vote. I polled my party members. I am going to discuss next month what the historical expression in our Constitution means about aid and comfort, what constitutes a hostile power, what constitutes an enemy force, what 58,000 deaths mean, and I will do a full hour on McNamara and why it is an absolute disgrace that he would rip open this unhealed wound of Vietnam and bring the type of agony that I have gone down to the wall and talked to some of these vets that they feel McNamara telling them it was wrong, terribly wrong, that we would try to free South Vietnam, help them stay free, with 44 newspapers in Saigon.

I went over there eight times during that conflict. I knew what the mistakes were, what the corruption was. But none of it was as evil as the human rights violations in Hanoi or what goes on to this day this North Korea, in China, in conquered Vietnam, in Cuba, for that matter.

We have a terrible century of history, and it is going out with a lot of bloodshed and hurt and pain, but we have still got these heroes from our darkest year of 1942. We have got our Walt Krells and David Hrdlickas.

Something has been bothering me lately. I have been thinking about traveling around the country, reaching maybe way beyond my reach, to offer some leadership to this country, and it has to do with something that atheists love. They call it the natural selection. I wonder if it has ever occurred to anybody the worst thing that wars do to any nation, large or small, the best, the very best die off, while the worst hide out and escape and cut corners and they get rewarded during peace, sometimes, while the best are gone, the opposite of natural selection, as atheists see it by the law of the jungle.

How many men would be running for the presidency today who had shown their strength of character in Korea or Vietnam if they had not been put into this Medal of Honor book as posthumous recipients of their Nation's greatest honor? There is only one word on that Medal of Honor: Valor. And sometimes I think it stands for ''veterans against lying or revisionism.''

Mr. McNamara's book is a sacrilege and an offense from a war criminal, and I will not stop trying to bring out the truth until my last breath, and I might tell my liberal critics that all warriors hate war. Those who were not killed to kill another mother's son in combat, like myself, but were trained to be combat ready and have a small piece of the action of melting down the evil empire, we understand why a nation should honor those that died, or those that had their young bodies ripped apart or those that managed to escape unscathed by the grace only of a merciful God, a Creator.

This Nation must come back to virtue, and our great Nation has to do something for the veterans, starting with the Korean veterans on July 27, in about 2 months and a week, when a beautiful, uplifting memorial is dedicated.

There are a thousand veterans that are going to turn out to confront Mr. Clinton if he shows up that day because in the letter to Colonel Holmes he also questioned our effort in Korea. I know what people who avoid service think. They think people are fools who go off and lose their lives. Well, they are not fools. They are the very essence of the countries' strength, and they are the salt of the Earth.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I conclude this evenings' remarks with what Douglas MacArthur said, ''I shall return.''

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 534. An act to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide authority for States to limit the interstate transportation of municipal solid waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 2 p.m., on account of family business.

Mr. BONO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), until 2:30 p.m. today, on account of recovery from surgery.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SKAGGS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKAGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POSHARD, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. DICKEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(Mr. OBEY, to include extraneous matter on the conference report on H.R. 1158 in the House today.)

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SKAGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POSHARD.
Mr. ANDREWS.
Ms. LOFGREN.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. BONIOR in two instances.
Mr. NADLER.
Mr. MFUME.
Mr. BARCIA.
Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. TORRES in two instances.
Mr. WILLIAMS.
Mr. FILNER.
Mr. PALLONE.
Mr. JACOBS.
Mr. MENENDEZ.
Mrs. MALONEY in two instances.
Mr. ACKERMAN.
Mr. OLVER.
Mr. COLEMAN.
Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.
Mr. DIXON.
Mr. HOYER.
Mr. MANTON.
Mr. WARD.
Mr. RICHARDSON in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DICKEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PORTMAN.
Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
Mr. OXLEY.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
Mr. ZIMMER.
Mr. GUNDERSON.
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. CAMP.
Mr. CLINGER.
Mr. FAWELL.
Mr. WOLF.
Mr. TATE.
Mrs. MORELLA.
Mr. POMBO.
Mr. BONO.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. RIGGS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORNAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PETERSON of Florida.
Ms. DANNER.
Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 22, 1995, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows.

886. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to adjust the tenure of the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Security.

887. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the termination of the status of the College Construction Loan Insurance Association (the Corporation) as a Government sponsored enterprise, to require the Secretary of Education to divest himself of the corporation's stock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

888. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council, pursuant to Public Law 102–1, section 3 (105 Stat. 4) (H.Doc. No. 104–75); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LEACH: Committee on Banking and Financial Services. H.R. 1062. A bill to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, and other financial service providers; with an amendment (Rept. 104–127, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION ON REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1062. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than June 16, 1995.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASTLE (by request);

H.R. 1667. A bill to authorize U.S. contributions to the International Development Association, the Asian Development Bank, and the interest subsidy account of the enhanced structural adjustment facility of the International Monetary Fund; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Ms. DANNER:

H.R. 1668. A bill to establish a program to control fraud and abuse in the Medicare Program, to increase the amount of civil monetary penalties which may be assessed against individuals and entities committing fraud against the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FURSE:

H.R. 1669. A bill to establish a science and mathematics early start grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. CLINGER (for himself, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HORN, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. TATE, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. BASS, and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

H.R. 1670. A bill to revise and streamline the acquisition laws of the Federal Government, to reorganize the mechanisms for resolving Federal procurement disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on National Security, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FURSE:

H.R. 1671. A bill to provide for Federal budgetary savings through reducing the number of political appointees; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 1672. A bill to achieve budgetary savings by reducing the funding and scope of the stockpile stewardship program of the Department of Energy; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 1673. A bill to achieve budgetary savings by terminating certain Department of Defense programs; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 1674. A bill to achieve budgetary savings by reducing the amount which may be appropriated for the nuclear energy research and development activities of the Department of Energy; to the Committee on National Security, and in addition to the Committee on Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. CREMEANS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 1675. A bill to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to improve the management of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

H.R. 1676. A bill to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 to clarify that the expenses of administering the old age, survivors and disability insurance programs are not included in the budget of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOX, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. METCALF, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 1677. A bill to waive the time limitation specified by law for the award of certain

military decorations in order to allow the posthumous award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Doris Miller for actions while a member of the Navy during World War II; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. MARTINI:

H.R. 1678. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to apply section 1001 to all branches of Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1679. A bill to make an exception to the United States embargo on trade with Cuba for the export of medicines or medical supplies, instruments, or equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. CONDIT):

H.R. 1680. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TATE (for himself and Mr. NETHERCUTT):

H.R. 1681. A bill to provide that certain regulations shall not take effect unless published in final form not later than 18 months after the date of publication of general notice of proposed rulemaking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 1682. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to use stewardship contracting in a demonstration program to restore and maintain the ecological integrity and productivity of forest ecosystems to insure that the land and resources are passed to future generations in better condition than they were found; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. DORNAN):

H.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution prohibiting funds for diplomatic relations and further advancement of economic relations with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam [SRV] unless the President certifies to Congress that Vietnamese officials are being fully cooperative and forthcoming with efforts to account for the 2,205 Americans still missing and otherwise unaccounted for from the Vietnam War, as determined on the basis of all information available to the United States Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the National Rifle Association should disavow and condemn the inflammatory and defamatory language used by its leadership and certain of its officers and employees to attack Federal law enforcement agencies and their employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. WELLER):

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that members of the Screen Actors Guild should contribute funds to a private, self-sustaining endowment for the arts; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H. Res. 153. Resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the National Association of Radio Talk Show Hosts should not honor G. Gordon Liddy because of his use of hateful speech and its potential to inflame violence against law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H. Res. 154. Resolution to amend clause 2(a) of House Rule XXIII to extend the length of time required before considering the report of a committee of conference; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII.

87. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to the physical desecration of the U.S. flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 26: Mr. HEINEMAN.

H.R. 43: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 60: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 70: Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 104: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 159: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 218: Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 246: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 248: Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 329: Mr. CAMP, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 373: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 447: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 482: Mr. HOKE.

H.R. 739: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 772: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 789: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 820: Mr. QUINN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 833: Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. KLUG, Mr. WARD, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. STARK, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 997: Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 1020: Mr. BROWDER, Mr. POSHARD, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. TALENT, Mr. KLUG, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 1023: Mr. FARR and Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 1073: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 1074: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 1085: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1103: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1138: Mr. TATE.

H.R. 1210: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1220: Mr. BONO and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 1226: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 1227: Mr. LINDER and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 1235: Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 1294: Mrs. LINCOLN.

H.R. 1363: Mr. WELLER, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1423: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. BEILENSON.

H.R. 1447: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ.

H.R. 1448: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 1484: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WARD, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1496: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1499: Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1533: Mr. DELAY and Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 1535: Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1547: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1556: Mr. FRISA and Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 1580: Mr. POMBO, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 1594: Mr. COBLE and Mrs. WALDHOLTZ.

H.R. 1597: Mr. ARCHER.

H.R. 1617: Mr. WELLER, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. SEASTRAND, and Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 1627: Mr. COBLE, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BUNN of Oregon, and Mr. LAUGHLIN.

H.J. Res. 79: Mr. PORTMAN and Mr. CASTLE.

H. Con. Res. 5: Mr. SOLOMON.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 4 by Mr. BRYANT on House Resolution 127: David E. Bonior and Jane Harman.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. FUNDERBURK

AMENDMENT NO. 2: In section 2101(1)(A) (relating to authorizations of appropriations for diplomatic and consular programs of the Department of State) strike ''$1,728,797,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and $1,676,903,000 for the fiscal year 1997'' and insert ''$1,555,917,300 for the fiscal year 1996 and $1,400,325,570 for the fiscal year 1997''.

In section 2101(2)(A) (relating to authorizations of appropriations for salaries and expenses of the Department of State) strike ''$366,276,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and $355,287,000 for the fiscal year 1997 '' and insert ''$338,648, 400 for the fiscal year 1996 and $296,683,560 for the fiscal year 1997''.