(d) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—(1) The committee of the House of Representatives to which a rescission/receipts disapproval bill is referred shall report it without amendment, and with or without recommendation, not later than the eighth calendar day of session after the date of its introduction. If the committee fails to report the bill within that period, it is in order to move that the House discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill. A motion to discharge may be made only by an individual favoring the bill (but only after the legislative day on which a Member announces to the House the Member's intention to do so). The motion is highly privileged. Debate thereon shall be limited to not more than one hour, the time to be divided in the House equally between a proponent and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order.

(2) After a rescission/receipts disapproval bill is reported or the committee has been discharged from further consideration, it is in order to move that the House resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill. All points of order against the bill and against consideration of the bill are waived. The motion is highly privileged. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on that motion to its adoption without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. During consideration of the bill in the Committee of the Whole, the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall proceed without intervening motion, shall be confined to the bill, and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent of the bill. No amendment to the bill is in order, except any Member may move to strike the disapproval of any rescission or rescissions of budget authority or any proposed repeal of a targeted tax benefit, as applicable, if supported by 49 other Members. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the bill shall not be in order.

(3) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the House of Representatives to the procedure relating to a bill described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

(4) It shall not be in order to consider more than one bill described in subsection (c) or more than one motion to discharge described in paragraph (1) with respect to a particular special message.

(5) Consideration of any rescission/receipts disapproval bill under this subsection is governed by the rules of the House of Representatives except to the extent specifically provided by the provisions of this Act.

(e) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(1) Any rescission/receipts disapproval bill received in the Senate from the House shall be considered in the Senate pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

(2) Debate in the Senate on any rescission/receipts disapproval bill and debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than ten hours. The time shall be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(3) Debate in the Senate on any debatable motions or appeal in connection with such bill shall be limited to one hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by the mover and the manager of the bill, except that in the event the manager of the bill is in favor of any such motion or appeal, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or his designee. Such leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any debatable motion or appeal.

(4) A motion to further limit debate is not debatable. A motion to recommit (except a motion to recommit with instructions to report back within a specified number of days not to exceed one, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session) is not in order.

(f) POINTS OF ORDER.—

(1) It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any rescission/receipts disapproval bill that relates to any matter other than the rescission of budget authority or veto of the provision of law transmitted by the President under this Act.

(2) It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any amendment to a rescission/receipts disapproval bill.

(3) Paragraphs (1) and (2) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by a vote of three-fifths of the members duly chosen and sworn.

SEC. 6. REPORTS OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE.

Beginning on January 6, 1996, and at one-year intervals thereafter, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to each House of Congress which provides the following information:

(1) A list of each proposed Presidential rescission of discretionary budget authority and veto of a targeted tax benefit submitted through special messages for the fiscal year ending during the preceding calendar year, together with their dollar value, and an indication of whether each rescission of discretionary budget authority or veto of a targeted tax benefit was accepted or rejected by Congress.

(2) The total number of proposed Presidential rescissions of discretionary budget authority and vetoes of a targeted tax benefit submitted through special messages for the fiscal year ending during the preceding calendar year, together with their total dollar value.

(3) The total number of Presidential rescissions of discretionary budget authority or vetoes of a targeted tax benefit submitted through special messages for the fiscal year ending during the preceding calendar year and approved by Congress, together with their total dollar value.

(4) A list of rescissions of discretionary budget authority initiated by Congress for the fiscal year ending during the preceding calendar year, together with their dollar value, and an indication of whether each such rescission was accepted or rejected by Congress.

(5) The total number of rescissions of discretionary budget authority initiated and accepted by Congress for the fiscal year ending during the preceding calendar year, together with their total dollar value.

(6) A summary of the information provided by paragraphs (2), (3) and (5) for each of the ten fiscal years ending before the fiscal year during this calendar year.

SEC. 7. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) EXPEDITED REVIEW.—

(1) Any Member of Congress may bring an action, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief on the ground that any provision of this Act violates the Constitution.

(2) A copy of any complaint in an action brought under paragraph (1) shall be promptly delivered to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and each House of Congress shall have the right to intervene in such action.

(3) Any action brought under paragraph (1) shall be heard and determined by a three-judge court in accordance with section 2284 of title 28, United States Code.

Nothing in this section or in any other law shall infringe upon the right of the House of Representatives to intervene in an action brought under paragraph (1) without the necessity of adopting a resolution to authorize such intervention.

(b) APPEAL TO SUPREME COURT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any order of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia which is issued pursuant to an action brought under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be reviewable by appeal directly to the Supreme Court of the United States. Any such appeal shall be taken by a notice of appeal filed within 10 days after such order is entered; and the jurisdictional statement shall be filed within 30 days after such order is entered. No stay of an order issued pursuant to an action brought under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be issued by a single Justice of the Supreme Court.

(c) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—It shall be the duty of the District Court for the District of Columbia and the Supreme Court of the United States to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of any matter brought under subsection (a).

Amend the title so as to read: ''An Act to give the President item veto authority over appropriation Acts and targeted tax benefits in revenue Acts.''.

Mr. DOLE. I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendments, request a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ROTH, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GLENN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRAMM of Texas, Mr. COATS, Mr. EXON, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. JOHNSTON, and Mr. DODD.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate that the Senator from Kentucky, Senator FORD, will want to make a statement on that particular item after I obtain consent.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 1995

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until the hour of 9 a.m., on Wednesday, June 21, 1995; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and under the provisions of a previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate immediately go into executive session for 3 hours of debate on the nomination of Dr. Foster; I further ask unanimous consent that if cloture is not invoked on the Foster nomination on Wednesday, the Senate then resume consideration of S. 440, the National Highway System bill and at that time the Senator from Maine be recognized to offer an amendment regarding helmets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. As a reminder for all Senators, the Senate will debate the Foster nomination from 9 a.m. to 12 noon tomorrow, with a cloture vote occurring on the nomination at 12 noon. If

cloture is not invoked at that time, the Senate will resume the highway bill.

We hope to complete the bill tomorrow evening. We will have rollcall votes throughout the day. I do not know of any conflicts tomorrow evening. Tonight, there are a number of conflicts, including the President and Mrs. Clinton have invited all Members to the White House for a picnic plus other things. I know that Senators have obligations to attend.

If cloture is not invoked Wednesday, a second vote on cloture will occur at 2 p.m. on Thursday.

If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask the Senate stand in recess under the previous order following the remarks of Senator FORD and Senator SANTORUM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LINE-ITEM VETO

Mr. FORD. As the majority leader indicated as it relates to the line—item veto, I voted for the line-item veto when it left here because I think it is important that we put that into the structure.

When I spoke earlier, just before passage of the line-item veto legislation, I tried to tell my colleagues that the proposal that left here, in my opinion, was too cumbersome; that if we had the Interior appropriations bill that we had last session, there would be 2,040 pieces of legislation under that one bill. Then the President would have to sign 2,040 pieces of legislation in order to either sign them or veto them or line item it, however it might be. So it really is not a line-item veto; it becomes a multiple choice.

It reminds me when I was Governor that we would have a commission authorized, the Governor, to go to New York to sign bonds for highway projects, or whatever it might be. They give you one pen and there would be 49 other pens up there and you sign your name down here and the other 49 pens would work and all those bonds would move aside and then you sign them again.

That is basically what we are trying to do, I think, or cause the President to have to do once these pieces of legislation come up for line-item veto.

When I was Governor I had three options. I had line-item veto. The three options: one, I could line item it and send a message to the legislature why I had vetoed or line itemed that particular piece of legislation or that item in that legislation. The legislature could consider it. They could either sustain the Governor's veto or override it.

The second option I had was to reduce an amount. If we did not need to spend all of it—we had a 2-year budget, we did not need to spend all that money in the first year. We could reduce it, and you draw a line through it, initial it, send a message to the legislature, and they could either sustain or override the veto.

The third option I had was to line item a phrase. That may be a direction—''You cannot use any money for so and so,'' or ''If you are going to use money, you have to do it this way.'' The Governor had the right to eliminate a phrase.

Those are the only three things. It was simple, direct, and the legislature had an opportunity to sustain or override the veto.

What I am asking tonight, as the conferees were appointed for the line-item veto legislation in conference, is that they look very seriously at what the Senate has done in sending their piece of legislation to conference.

I think simpler is better. It is easy, it is direct. A message must come. And that message, then, can either be accepted or declined. Either sustain the veto or override the veto. I think that is what we ought to do.

Mr. President, I voted in support of the line-item veto when it left here in the hopes that it would be reduced and made somewhat simple so we could line-item veto, we could partially veto —or a phrase; it does not have to be all.

A line-item veto, when you try to explain it to your constituents back home, they think that gives the President the right to take some pork out of the budget.

Right now he has to sign 2,040 pieces of legislation for one appropriations bill. Just one. We are getting into thousands and thousands of pieces of legislation. I think that is wrong.

I hope the conferees will take into consideration my remarks tonight. I would be glad to work with them in any way. And several in this Chamber have had experience as Governors using the line-item veto. In my 4 years as Governor, it was seldom even considered.

It can be done and I think it can be done in the right sort of way. I thank the Chair for its courtesy. I yield the floor.

WHERE IS THE BUDGET?

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President. First, I would like to thank the Chair for his indulgence in spending the time that I am supposed to be in the chair presiding and doing that for me. As customary, the Senator from Virginia is always there to do the gentlemanly thing and fill in a need. I appreciate very, very much the indulgence of the Senator.

I am back to continue my vigil in requesting the President put forward a balanced budget resolution. The last time I appeared here on the Senate floor was the night the President announced his balanced budget resolution. I had sketchy details at the time but did not have the full package that the President presented.

We have gotten it. It is about 6 or 7 pages, double-sided, about that big, that thick. That is his budget proposal, compared to his first budget proposal which was about this thick, to give the comparison, the amount of detail.

As Members have heard on the Senate floor today and in newspapers and other places, it just does not measure up. The President uses a whole lot of assumptions that are exaggerated and made to make the projections of the economic growth and interest rates and everything else look rosy, and as a result, gets to a balanced budget through his numbers with smoke and mirrors.

The Congressional Budget Office, who, in a State of the Union Address in 1993, he stated would be the numbers that he would use—that everyone should use because they are the most accurate—that he would use in determining whether we get to a balanced budget, scores the Clinton budget as continuing deficits of $200 billion or more. It is a straight line. Deficits do not come down at all under this budget proposal as scored by the Congressional Budget Office.

The people who scored his budget over 10 years as getting the deficit to zero were the Office of Management and Budget, which is over in the Department of Treasury, which is his own people scoring his own numbers, which are, as was said, rosy assumptions. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the one that the President says we have to use, says that we have $200 billion deficits into the future for the next 10 years.

So, as a result, I have to come back and add another number to this chart, which says, ''Days with no proposal to balance the budget from President Clinton.''

I gave a period of time to give him the benefit of the doubt to get the numbers up here to let us see what the specifics were, whether this would be scored by a neutral party, the Congressional Budget Office, as a balanced budget resolution. In fact it has come back to be not balanced. It is disappointing.

I just want to go over a couple of the details of the budget and then I want to address, finally, this chart which has gotten a little publicity here, of late.

First, the details of the budget. The Republican budget gets to balance by the year 2002. What are the deficits that are estimated by the Congressional Budget Office under the Clinton budget: $196 billion in 1996, $221 billion in 1997, $199 billion in 1998, $213 billion in 1999, $220 billion again in the year 2000; $211 billion in 2001, $210 billion in 2002, $207 billion in 2003, $209 billion in 2004, and $209 billion again in the year 2005; over $2 trillion in additional debt over the next 10 years under his revised budget which he says gets us to zero, which the Congressional Budget Office says gets us to even worse shape than we are now, $209 billion as opposed to $175 billion projected this year. So we have made no progress even under Clinton II.

Let us look at the specifics of Clinton II. If you compare the Clinton second budget to his first budget, the one he