minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is planning to meet today at 1 p.m. to report a rule for the consideration of H.R. 3259, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997.

The chairman of the Intelligence Committee has requested a rule which would require that amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If this request is granted, amendments to be preprinted would need to be signed by the Member and submitted at the Speaker's table.

The amendments would still need to be consistent with House rules and would be given no special protection by being printed.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

It is not necessary to submit amendments to the Rules Committee or to testify as long as the amendments comply with the House rules.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 435 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 435

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 178) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1997 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. No further general debate shall be in order. The concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those designated in section 2 of this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order designated, may be offered only by the Member designated or a designee (except that if no Member offers the amendment designated in paragraph (3) of section 2, then that amendment shall nevertheless be considered as pending at this point), shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments designated in section 2 are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. The following amendments are in order pursuant to the first section of this resolution:

(1) An amendment in the nature of a substitute by Representative Payne of New Jersey printed on May 15, 1996, in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII.

(2) An amendment in the nature of a substitute by Representative Orton of Utah printed on May 15, 1996, in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII.

(3) An amendment in the nature of a substitute by Representative Sabo of Minnesota printed on May 15, 1996, in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII, which may be offered by any Member, or that failing, shall be considered as pending under the terms of the first section of this resolution.

SEC. 3. (a) If House Concurrent Resolution 178 is agreed to, then for all purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as it applies in the House—

(1) the allocations of spending and credit responsibilities that are depicted in House Report 104–575, beginning on page 158, shall be considered as the allocations otherwise required by section 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to be included in the joint explanatory statement of the managers on a conference report to accompany a concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(2) the Congress shall be considered to have adopted House Concurrent Resolution 178 in the form adopted by the House.

(b) Upon adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997, subsection (a) shall cease to apply.

(c) This section supersedes section 603 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997.

SEC. 4. Rule XLIX shall not apply with respect to the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997.

□ 0945

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

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

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this budget resolution is to set overall national priorities in how we spend the taxpayers' money. It is not the place to haggle over the details of Federal spending. The opportunity for that will come later in the appropriation bills; and, of course, the reconciliation bills that will be brought up during June and July.

Because we are balancing competing priorities, Members submitting amendments to the Committee on Rules were asked to send up only complete substitutes for the budget of the United States, and they were asked to draft budgets which would lead to a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second year in which the Committee on Rules has demanded that every single budget proposal, every alternative, balance the budget, and that is the way it is going to be until we get that budget balanced.

Three complete substitutes were presented to the Committee on Rules, one by the Black Caucus, one by the group known as the Coalition, and one by the President of the United States. I was going to offer the President's budget myself and had brought it to the desk yesterday afternoon, but the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the ranking Democrat on the Committee on the Budget, assured us that he would be offering the President's budget this afternoon and, therefore, I withdrew my request to present the President's budget for debate.

This rule provides for a vote on each one of those alternatives, Mr. Speaker, as well as the proposal from our Committee on the Budget. Each of the three substitutes will be debated for 1 hour with the time divided equally between the proponent and the opponent. The substitutes will not be subject to further amendment and all points of order are waived to protect them.

After each of the three substitutes are debated and voted on, there will be a final 40 minutes of debate on the budget resolution that will naturally be equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget. This rule includes a provision stating that the budget allocations in the report accompanying that budget resolution will be considered as the allocations required—and this is very important to Members, especially chairmen of committees and subcommittees—will be required by section 602(a) of the Budget Act until the final allocations are made in the conference report.

These allocations are important because they tell the Committee on Appropriations and the other committees how much money they have to spend for the next fiscal year.

Finally, the rule includes a provision stating that House rule 49 will not apply to this year's budget resolution. House rule 49 provides for an automatic engrossment of a bill raising the debt limit when the conference report on the budget resolution is adopted. In other words, in years past that has been automatic, but we have put a stop to that.

Since the debt limit has already been set, it will not be necessary to have a

further increase until at least October 1997. By that time the House will have adopted the third year budget of our glidepath to a balanced budget over a 7-year period. And if we have in any way veered off that glidepath, I, for one, will lead the fight and will refuse to vote for any increase in the debt limit. I have only done it once in 18 years and, hopefully, will never have to do it again.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the budget resolution itself, first I want to commend the Committee on the Budget and particularly the gentleman from Ohio, Chairman KASICH, for making the tough choices necessary to keep this Government on the glidepath to a balanced budget. In the past there have been efforts to reach a balanced budget by setting statutory deficit reduction levels, for example in the Gramm-Rudman statute, but the Democrat-controlled Congress proved unable to stick to the glidepath toward a balanced budget over that 5-year period back in 1985. The urge to spend was just too strong.

But this budget, my friends, is staying on that glidepath. This budget also contrasts with the Clinton budget, which is being sold as leading to a balanced budget, but for next year the Clinton budget actually proposes a higher deficit. Can Members imagine a higher deficit than we have now?

And the worst part is, and this is what we should all pay attention to, the President's budget calls for 64 percent of the spending cuts to occur in the years 2001 and 2002, long after President Clinton will have left town, whether he is reelected this fall or not. In other words, all the cuts, almost all of them, come in the 6th and 7th year. In other words, when are we ever going to get to these cuts if we do not do it today? We do not get there.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on the Budget proposal has backed up a series of assumptions showing with great specificity how it is possible to implement the numbers in this resolution. For example, this budget resolution will allow for net new tax relief of at least $122 billion over the next 6 years.

What does that mean? This means there can be a $500-per-child middle-class family tax credit for hard-working American families. And believe me, they need that $500. We in the Government do not need it.

This budget provides medical care for the senior citizens of this country. Medicare is currently projected to go bankrupt by the year 2001, and we had better do something about it, and we start to do something about it in this budget.

This budget is designed to preserve Medicare. It recommends increasing Medicare spending for each beneficiary from an average of $5,200 in this budget in 1996 to $7,000 in the year 2002.

This budget also takes into consideration the debt we all owe our Nation's veterans for defending the country in time of war. I spent 10 years on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and served as its ranking member, and this, to me, is so terribly important, particularly when we see the World War II veterans, veterans like the gentleman from Kansas, BOB DOLE, who left his job when he was a young man and went to war to save his country.

And for those that are listening, that is exactly what BOB DOLE did yesterday. He left his job to go serve his country, and we sure hope he is going to be successful. I am going to do everything I can to make sure he is.

In this budget for the veterans it recommends $5.1 billion more than President Clinton for Veterans' Affairs spending, which is principally for hospital, for outpatient care, medical care. It calls for improvements to the Veterans Administration mandatory programs, including things like an increase in auto allowances for certain severely disabled veterans and improved compensation payments for surviving spouses.

This budget resolution provides also, my friends, for a strong national defense by allocating $12.9 billion more in budget authority and $4 billion more in outlays than the President had requested for fiscal year 1997, which at least allows us in the Defense Department and the defense budget to keep up with inflation, to provide for a very small increase in the wages of those young men and women serving in our all-voluntary military today, and to give them some increase, a very small increase, in housing allowances. This will make it possible to ensure a decent quality of life for military personnel and their families, and also provide for a sound missile defense for the United States of America as well.

Mr. Speaker, this budget provides assistance to students seeking higher education. Believe me, I just finished educating five children through college and that expense is just unbelievable. This budget today before us assumes continued growth in a student loan program. The volume would increase from $26.6 billion today to $37.4 billion in the year 2002.

Mr. Speaker, this budget is also designed to protect our environment so that our children and our grandchildren can enjoy a pollution-free future. It calls for increased funding to improve the quality of our national parks. It recommends reform of the Superfund Program and boosting its funding to $2 billion a year; that is a $700 million increase.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this budget saves money for the American taxpayer, and this, perhaps, is the most important thing that we have in this budget today. It assumes the termination or privatization of 130 Federal programs and the elimination of the Department of Commerce and the Department of Energy. These savings will help us to reach a balanced budget by the year 2002 by cutting back and shrinking the size and the power of the Federal Government, particularly that part that is inside this beltway today.

Why is a balanced budget so terribly important? I see some Members on that side of the aisle who strongly support a balanced budget, the gentleman from Utah, [Mr. ORTON] as well. It means their children and our children will not have to spend the rest of their lives under an ever-increasing crushing burden of interest payments. Today we have a $5 trillion debt that has accumulated over the years. To pay for the interest, just the annual interest, the yearly interest on that $5 trillion today is costing as much, almost, as we spend on our national defense budget. The real reason we need a Federal Government is to provide for a common defense for our States, and we spend almost as much on interest as we spend on the defense of our country, $250 billion.

Let me tell my colleagues something. Interest rates are fairly low today, compared to what they have been sometimes, and inflation is fairly low, but let me say this. If inflation goes from 3 to 4 percent up to 13 percent, the way it did in the mid-1970's, and if interest rates go from 8 or 9 or 10 percent now to 21½ percent prime the way they did in the 1970's, what happens to that interest payment that we have to make each year? It balloons from $250 billion up to $380 billion. That means $130 billion less that we will not have to spend on those priority programs, whether they be defense or whether they be social programs for the truly needy.

That is what this whole debate is all about. It means lower interest rates, since the Government will not have to be at the head of the line borrowing most of the available money; and lower interest rates means it will cost less to borrow money to buy things that the American people need.

What are those things? For example, an auto loan will cost $900 less over the course of that 3-year loan, $900 less by balancing the budget. A student loan will cost $2,200 less over the course of that 10-year span. Imagine. That is found money, $2,200, that the American people will not have to shell out, just giving the money away in too high interest payments.

More important than all, when we talk about young people being able to save enough money for a downpayment and being able to then meet those mortgage payments, and listen to this, if we can stay on this glidepath to a balanced budget, by the year 2002 we will reduce those interest payments on a mortgage. A mortgage on a small home will cost, listen to this, $37,000 less over the 30-year life span of that loan.

□ 1000

Thirty-seven dollars less on a very median mortgage. A large home mortgage will result in savings of about $65,000 over the term of that loan.

Mr. Speaker, that is like found money. I just mentioned having educated five children. Let me say, if you can accumulate $65,000, whether it is to your retirement, whether it is to pay off your mortgage sooner, whether it is to educate your children, let me tell you, that is worth doing.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we need to bite the bullet today, and we need to pass this very responsible budget that we have on the floor this afternoon.

I, for one, am going to do everything I can to make sure we do that and that we succeed in passing it for the next 4 years as well so that we try to bring some fiscal sanity and an end to this sea of red ink which is literally bankrupting not only the Government but local governments as well, and the private sector even more so.

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

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

[As of May 15, 1996]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-Open [2]	46	44	68	60
Structured/Modified Closed [3]	49	47	29	25
Closed [4]	9	9	17	15
Total	104	100	114	100

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

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

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

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

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of May 15, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350–71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255–172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229–100; A: 227–127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230–191; A: 229–188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282–144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252–175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253–165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271–151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257–155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234–191 A: 247–181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps	A: 242–190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217–211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423–1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228–204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253–172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414–4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252–170 A: 255–168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233–176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225–191 A: 233–183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223–180 A: 245–155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–196 A: 236–191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221–178 A: 217–175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258–170 A: 271–152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps	PQ: 236–194 A: 234–192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 235–193 D: 192–238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 230–194 A: 229–195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242–185 A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–192 A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 217–202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230–189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409–1 (7/31/95).
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255–156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323–104 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414–0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 388–2 (9/19/95).
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	PQ: 241–173 A: 375–39–1 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	A: 304–118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 743	Team Act	A: 344–66–1 (9/27/95).
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internatl. Space Station	A: voice vote (9/27/95).
H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 108	Continuing Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)	O	H.R. 2405	Omnibus Science Auth	A: voice vote (10/11/95).
H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)	MC	H.R. 2259	Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines	A: voice vote (10/18/95).
H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)	MC	H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	PQ: 231–194 A: 227–192 (10/19/95).

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

[As of May 15, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)	C	H.R. 2492	Leg. Branch Approps	PQ: 235–184 A: voice vote (10/31/95).
H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Reform	PQ: 228–191 A: 235–185 (10/26/95).
		H.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 237–190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MO	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 241–181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 216–210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: 220–200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 261 (11/9/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Resolution	A: 223–182 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2586	Increase Debt Limit	A: 220–185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	O	H.R. 2564	Lobbying Reform	A: voice vote (11/16/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 229–176 (11/15/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)	MC	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: 239–181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	A: voice vote (12/6/95).
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	PQ: 223–183 A: 228–184 (12/14/95).
H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)	O	H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands.	
H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)	C	H.Con. Res. 122	Budget Res. W/President	PQ: 230–188 A: 229–189 (12/19/95).
H. Res. 313 (12/19/95)	O	H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive	A: voice vote (12/20/95).
H. Res. 323 (12/21/95)	C	H.R. 2677	Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge	Tabled (2/28/96).
H. Res. 366 (2/27/96)	MC	H.R. 2854	Farm Bill	PQ: 228–182 A: 244–168 (2/28/96).
H. Res. 368 (2/28/96)	O	H.R. 994	Small Business Growth	
H. Res. 371 (3/6/96)	C	H.R. 3021	Debt Limit Increase	A: voice vote (3/7/96).
H. Res. 372 (3/6/96)	MC	H.R. 3019	Cont. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: voice vote A: 235–175 (3/7/96).
H. Res. 380 (3/12/96)	MC	H.R. 2703	Effective Death Penalty	A: 251–157 (3/13/96).
H. Res. 384 (3/14/96)	MC	H.R. 2202	Immigration	PQ: 233–152 A: voice vote (3/21/96).
H. Res. 386 (3/20/96)	C	H.J. Res. 165	Further Cont. Approps	PQ: 234–187 A: 237–183 (3/21/96).
H. Res. 388 (3/20/96)	C	H.R. 125	Gun Crime Enforcement	A: 244–166 (3/22/96).
H. Res. 391 (3/27/96)	C	H.R. 3136	Contract w/America Advancement	PQ: 232–180 A: 232–177, (3/28/96).
H. Res. 392 (3/27/96)	MC	H.R. 3103	Health Coverage Affordability	PQ: 229–186 A: Voice Vote (3/29/96).
H. Res. 395 (3/29/96)	MC	H.J. Res. 159	Tax Limitation Const. Amdmt.	PQ: 232–168 A: 234–162 (4/15/96).
H. Res. 396 (3/29/96)	O	H.R. 842	Truth in Budgeting Act	A: voice vote (4/17/96).
H. Res. 409 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 2715	Paperwork Elimination Act	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 410 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 1675	Natl. Wildlife Refuge	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 411 (4/23/96)	O	H.J. Res. 175	Further Cont. Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 418 (4/30/96)	O	H.R. 2641	U.S. Marshals Service	PQ: 219–203 A: voice vote (5/1/96).
H. Res. 419 (4/30/96)	O	H.R. 2149	Ocean Shipping Reform	A: 422–0 (5/1/96).
H. Res. 421 (5/2/96)	O	H.R. 2974	Crimes Against Children & Elderly	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 422 (5/2/96)	O	H.R. 3120	Witness & Jury Tampering	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 426 (5/7/96)	O	H.R. 2406	U.S. Housing Act of 1996	PQ: 218–208 A: voice vote (5/8/96).
H. Res. 427 (5/7/96)	O	H.R. 3322	Omnibus Civilian Science Auth	A: voice vote (5/9/96).
H. Res. 428 (5/7/96)	MC	H.R. 3286	Adoption Promotion & Stability	A: voice vote (5/9/96).
H. Res. 430 (5/9/96)	S	H.R. 3230	DoD Auth. FY 1997	A: 235–149 (5/10/96).
H. Res. 435 (5/15/96)	MC	H. Con. Res. 178	Con. Res. on the Budget, 1997	

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

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, for yielding me the customary half hour and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that my Republican colleagues would have learned their lesson. I was hoping that after the resounding ''no'' they got in response to their last budget that cut Medicare to pay for tax breaks for the very rich, my Republican colleagues would have quit while there were behind.

But, as today's budget bill shows, they have not.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues have not learned that the American people want something a whole lot better than the horrible budget they gave us last year.

My Republican colleagues have not learned that the American people do not want their Medicare cut under any circumstances particularly to pay for tax breaks for the very rich.

But it looks like they're at it again. This year's budget is the same old collection of bad ideas that Speaker GINGRICH came up with last year and it's still awful.

Mr. Speaker, a year may have passed but the American people still don't want Medicare cut by $168 billion to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy; they still don't want $72 billion cut from Medicaid; and they certainly don't want their children's direct student loans cut, and their Pell grants and their work study frozen.

These ideas were bad last year and they're even worse this year. This budget-for-the-special-interests is a lousy collection of cruel cuts to pay for tax breaks for the rich. It doesn't even come close to helping American families and it's an embarrassment to the Congress.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, if—God forbid—my Republican colleagues have their way, these cuts will have very, very bad consequences for the most needy Americans.

The $72 billion they cut from Medicaid and $168 billion they cut from Medicare will leave thousands and thousands of poor children and senior citizens without health care—all to pay for tax breaks for the rich.

As far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, that's not what Government is for. Government is not here to hurt the people who need help and help the people who don't need it.

But, I'm sorry to say, that's exactly what my Republican colleagues are doing.

These Medicare and Medicaid cuts will probably also force a lot of hospitals to close.

This budget could very easily cause Medicare premiums to go up or even double. Since more than a third of American seniors get by on Social Security alone, an increase in their Medicare costs could mean serious financial trouble.

And the Republican medical savings accounts are basically health care for the healthy and wealthy once again at the expense of the seniors who remain in traditional Medicare and people who are either sick or lower income.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm concerned these tax cuts for the rich come at far too high a price.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question to make in order the Orton amendment prohibiting tax cuts until the budget is balanced and the Meek amendment which will put back the earned income tax credit and take out the tax cuts for the rich.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], a very valuable member of the Committee on Rules, my right arm.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, who is well known as a tireless fighter for a balanced budget, for yielding me this time.

I rise in very strong support of this fair rule for the budget and what it brings to this House and the United States of America. The rule as advertised makes in order the fiscal year 1997 budget proposed by our Committee on the Budget under the tremendously strong leadership of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] who is the chairman of that committee.

The rule allows for three complete substitutes, as Chairman SOLOMON has said, all of which comply with the prerequisites of obtaining balance in the budget by the year 2002. That is wonderfully good news for Americans. We

should stop and think about that for a moment. This Congress has accomplished a truly remarkable feat in changing the focus of the discussion here in Washington from if we should balance our budget to how we will balance the budget.

We made a promise to the American people that we would do just that and get the Nation's fiscal house in order, and we are delivering on that pledge today. Promises made, promises kept. We have changed the terms of the debate, and now we are going to lock into place a blueprint for matching our deeds to our words.

Mr. Speaker, the budget presented to this House by Mr. KASICH reflects balance both in terms of bottom line and in terms of its priorities, what it provides for. We find in this budget that we can save the important quality of life programs that so many Americans depend on while still increasing the Federal commitment to seniors, to children, and to those most in need in our society over the next 6 years.

Mr. Speaker, we find that we can provide relief from the excessive taxation of the Clinton administration in order to promote investment, productivity, and job creation without jeopardizing our efforts to balance the books. This budget does all that. We find that we can reduce the size and scope of Federal intrusion into our lives, bringing decisionmaking power closer to the home for every average American, without undercutting the fundamental purposes of our national government.

Mr. Speaker, what Chairman KASICH and his Committee on the Budget have shown us in this budget is a blueprint that we can make the fundamental changes in the way we run this country and we can finally begin to lighten the load, the crushing national debt that otherwise would burden our children and their children for generations to come.

Americans should not be taken in by the defenders of the big government and the Washington-knows-best crowd who undoubtedly find fault with this budget plan. They are the ones who support it and in fact cheered for the largest tax increase in history, the Clinton tax hike. They are the ones that defined the very rich as anybody who is not on welfare. The truth is that we are following through on our promise to restore fiscal sanity. That is something we all should be proud of, and most of this Chamber will be.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate my commitment to seeking ways to improve our budget process.

While I firmly believe that we cannot use process to avoid the tough substantive decisions we must make to achieve a balanced budget, I believe just as firmly that the process that we are using today can be greatly improved to help force us to make those tough decisions and to ensure they stick. I look forward to working with Chairman SOLOMON on this effort and with my friend, the Budget Committee chairman, Mr. KASICH, and all of our many colleagues who have expressed interest.

Meanwhile, I suggest we stay firmly focused on this budget, get it passed today so Americans have something to cheer about, knowing that fiscal sanity has indeed returned.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the 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 from Massachusetts, the ranking member on the Committee on rules, for yielding me time.

First of all, let me thank the Committee on Rules for making in order one amendment which I have submitted, the amendment to offer as a substitute the coalition budget. I believe we will have adequate debate and discussion on that later in the day, and I look forward to that discussion. But I also filed an additional amendment which was not made in order. Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I am going to ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can bring that amendment to the floor.

That amendment, let me explain to my colleagues, is a very simple amendment. It does only one thing. It takes language from last year's conference budget resolution, language which the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, and in both the House and Senate, placed into the conference report during the last conference on the budget resolution. It is entitled in fact section 210 in the budget conference report on the budget resolution. The title of that section is ''Tax Reduction Contingent on Balanced Budget in the House of Representatives.''

Why was that section placed in the conference report last year? It was placed in the report because during last year's debate and discussion, there was much talk about tax cuts, tax cuts not as subsequent to or contingent upon a balanced budget, but simply tax cuts. Many in this body felt very strongly that we ought not to.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], my friend says when you find yourself in the bottom of a deep hole, the first thing you do is stop digging. We ought not to continue digging ourselves deeper by generating more and more tax cuts that are not paid for. The people want a balanced budget. Well, to show the commitment to obtaining that balanced budget while providing tax cuts, the leadership in both houses, to their credit, placed a guarantee in the budget resolution that in fact there would be no tax cuts unless and until we actually had certified by the CBO that we would achieve a balanced budget, including the tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, let me quote to Members what the CBO said about section 205 for the Senate and 210 for the House. This is a quote from CBO: ''Both procedures require CBO certification that enacting the proposed reconciliation legislation would lead up to a balanced budget in 2002 before the Senate or the House can consider proposals to cut taxes.'' The Senate majority leader, Senator DOLE, during the debate last year, said the following in describing these sections. He said that tax cuts, ''Do not take effect unless and until the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office certifies that we are absolutely on the path to a budget that is balanced in the year 2002. That is the safety valve. They,'' meaning the tax cuts, ''do not take effect until that has been certified,'' as the chairman has pointed out time after time.

The chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget, Chairman DECONCINI, in pointing that out also said: But let me suggest that in the final analysis, we will have tax cuts for the American people only when we get a balanced budget. That is the premise of the budget resolution. We will have bills before us ready to be enacted that will get a balance before the tax cuts will be viable.

Now, it was important to have that language in the budget resolution last year. It is also important to have it in the budget resolution this year, but it is not there. I originally felt that it had been perhaps left out by oversight. So, in the Committee on the Budget markup process, I asked the Committee on the Budget to put that very language back into the budget resolution this year, simply to guarantee to the public that our ultimate goal of balancing the budget will be achieved, that we will not repeat what occurred in the decade of the 1980s where we promised, Congress promised the people that we would balance the budget.

They said: We are going to do this by cutting taxes and cutting spending. They cut the taxes. They never got around to making the tough choices on cutting spending. Three point five trillion dollars later, here we are again, saying we are going to cut taxes and it is not contingent upon cutting spending and actually getting a balanced budget. So that is why the language was put in. That is why the language ought to be in now, but it is not in. It is purposefully left out. The people have to ask why.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit the balance, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], a very valuable Member of this body.

□ 1015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, today we are faced with several very different budget proposals. First we have the Clinton plan. The Clinton plan raises the deficit in 1997 and again in 1998, but promises somehow to balance the budget after the President leaves office.

Then we have two ''Washington knows best'' plans. The same people who passed the largest tax increase in history now offer ''business as usual'' schemes with either no take relief or actual tax increases. Anyone who believes that our deficits result because families pay too little in taxes should support these budget plans.

Finally, we have the House Committee on the Budget proposal, the only plan that puts taxpayers first. This taxpayers' budget is historic because it is the only plan that reduced both the deficit and middle-class taxes. Some special interests will attack this taxpayers' plan. These Washington insiders attack returning hard-earned money to the American families. These folks actually think that it is the Government's money.

Mr. Speaker, they are wrong. It is not the Government's money to take; it is the people's money to keep. Working Americans, not politicians, produce wealth. Businessmen and women, not the Secretary of Labor, create jobs. Family income growth, not Government spending, enhances wealth.

If my colleagues want more jobs, support the budget that returns more money to small business, the House Committee on the Budget plan, the taxpayers' bill. If my colleagues want stronger families, support the proposal that returns money, power and decisions to the families, the House Committee on the Budget plan, the taxpayers' budget. Support the only proposal that puts taxpayers first, the House Committee on the Budget plan. Only the House Committee on the Budget plan remembers that it is the family's money to keep, not the Government's money to take. That is why only the House Committee on the Budget taxpayers' budget deserves our support.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] for yielding this time to me, and I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for placing an order in the Committee on the Budget placing in order the Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus budget, which I think is the only real alternative that we are going to be hearing today and is the budget that speaks to the needs of ordinary working Americans.

When we discuss the budget situation in America today, it seems to me to be imperative to ask how did we get where we are today, how did we end up with a $5 trillion national debt? Is it because we are spending too much on health care so that all Americans have health care? I do not think so. Is it because the Federal Government is spending too much on education so that all American families could send their kids to college? Is that the reason we have the deficit? Is it because we are spending too much on affordable housing so that we have no homelessness in America, so that people are not paying 40, 50, 60 percent of their income in rent; is that why we have a $5 trillion debt? I do not think so.

Most economists understand that the reason we are in the deficit crisis we are today is that during the 1980's three things happened. First, we gave huge tax breaks to the richest people in America and to the largest corporations. Everybody knows that. What the Republican budget does today is it says, ''Guess what? Let us give more tax breaks to the richest people in America and the largest corporations. That makes a lot of sense.''

Second of all, during the 1980's, everybody knows this, this country spent huge amounts of money on the military, tremendous increases in defense spending. What the Republican budget says is let us spend more money today now that the cold war is over; let us spend more money, $13 billion more, on defense than the President wants. Let us build more B–2 bombers that the Pentagon does not need. Let us go into that absurd star wars program, that is really where we have to go.

Does that make sense? I do not think so.

And the third reason that we had, we created the deficit situation today, is the tremendous increase in medical spending, health care spending. During the 1980's all health care spending went up, including Medicare. But the question that we have to ask is why is it that the United States of America, today we spend far more per capita on health care than any other industrialized nation on Earth? Is it because all of our people have health insurance? Is that the reason why? I do not think so. Forty million Americans have no health insurance, millions more have inadequate health insurance.

So let us get to the root of the problem. What the Progressive Caucus and the Black Caucus say is, yes, let us move toward a balanced budget in 6 years, but let us not do it on the backs of the middle class, the working class and the low-income people in this country, and we are presenting a real alternative, and we hope to have the support of the Members in this body.

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I support a balanced budget. I voted for a balanced budget. But I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget and the tremendous harm it would do on American families.

This Republican budget is simply a redistribution of wealth. Some, mainly the upper income, will get a tax cut, but for the family earning $28,000 or less a year this budget would actually raise their taxes by cutting the earned income tax credit.

But there is another provision in this budget that would hurt America's middle-class families. This budget, like the last Republican budget, would mandate a doubling of flood insurance premiums, costing American families around the country $1 billion. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the average flood insurance premium of Houston's 25th Congressional District, which I represent, would double from $400 to almost $800 under the Republican budget. Homeowners along coastlines, rivers and bayous would see monthly mortgage payments increase in order to pay these higher premiums.

This is another example of the Republican proposals to redistribute income away from the middle-class families by doubling their insurance premiums and raising their taxes. We can balance the budget fairly; we can do so by rejecting this plan. Pass the coalition plan.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the rule allows for the President's budget to be considered along with some of the other options, and I think the contrast is clear between the President's budget and that of the Republican leadership. Again, the President's budget does achieve a balanced budget; it reaches a balance in 2002 that is certified by the Congressional Budget Office in the right way.

The President's budget also provides a moderate tax cut targeted to the middle class. The difference between the President's budget and the Republican leadership budget is that the President's budget preserves priorities that are important to the American people, priorities like Medicare and Medicaid, like education, particularly higher education, and also protecting the environment. The Republican budget is the same thing that we had last year. It hurts the average American because it goes against these areas that the average American is so concerned about.

When we talk about Medicare, we are talking about a $167 billion cut in Medicare in the Republican leadership budget that will force hospitals to close, that would make seniors have to pay more money out of pocket and will also move them into HMO's, into managed care systems.

On the other hand, the President's budget achieves the requirement of keeping Medicare solvent in the same way as the Republican budget, but it does not make these radical changes to Medicare that will hurt the average senior citizen.

The same could be said about education. The President's budget retains the direct student loan program, retains Goals 2000, retains the National Service Corporation, the AmeriCorps, an option which basically has allowed a lot of college students now to find another way to pay for their higher education costs. The Republican budget would either cut back or eliminate each of those programs.

And finally, on the environment, again the President's budget provides

sufficient funding for environmental protection. The Republican leadership budget goes far toward cutting back on environmental protection, about a 15-percent cut in enforcement, the environmental cop on the beat. I have said over and over again on the floor, ''If you can't enforce our environmental laws, then what's the use of having good environmental laws?'' The same is true about the Superfund Program and others.

The bottom line is the President's budget preserves the American people's priorities, the Republican budget does not.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON].

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

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the rule before us; it provides for consideration of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1997 in the traditional manner, whereby only comprehensive substitutes to the committee-reported resolution are in order. Under this rule, three such alternatives may be offered, so Members will have the choice of four different plans to guide the fiscal policy of our Nation over the next several years.

In the view of this gentleman, the coalition plan to be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] is the best alternative among the four. But any of the three plans that will be offered by Members from this side of the aisle are a better choice than the Republican budget resolution that was reported by the Budget Committee.

In Congress and within the administration, there is now a consensus that we need to achieve a balanced budget over the next few years, which has been reached largely as a result of the Republican majority's strong efforts on this issue. However, many of us believe that there are far more fair and equitable ways to balance the budget than the Republican plan provides for.

Like the budget plan the Republican majority produced last year, this year's resolution would set the stage for a huge transfer of resources from poor- and middle-income Americans, and from children and the elderly, to more affluent Americans. It is a plan that hurts those who need the most help from Government, and helps those who need it the least.

The Republican plan would do that by cutting Medicare and Medicaid substantially; by cutting the earned income tax credit, which helps low-income working families stay off welfare; by providing a child tax credit for families with incomes of up to $110,000 a year but denying it to those that are most in need of help with the expense of raising children; by cutting dozens of educational and social service programs that keep moderate income families from sinking into poverty and give them opportunities in life that would otherwise be denied to them; and by providing for contingent tax cuts that would primarily benefit the most affluent Americans.

The Republican plan would also cut domestic discretionary spending much too deeply. Under this plan, we would spend about 25 percent less, in real terms, on domestic discretionary programs than we are spending this year—after we have already made dramatic cuts in this area. Not only are these cuts unwise; they are also unrealistic. There are growing pressures on both sides of the aisle to spend more in this area. For example, the House recently voted to take transportation programs off budget, so we could spend more on transportation; and the debate on the immigration bill showed that there is a very strong support for substantially spending more on immigration control.

In addition, virtually every one of us supports spending more in other areas of law enforcement; we have more or less reached a consensus that we're not going to gut environmental protection programs or sell off our national parks; and, despite programs that have been singled out in this resolution for termination, there is broad support for continuing the Federal Government's role in a whole range of activities—from building dams, to providing weather information, to funding scientific research and development.

These are programs that are strongly supported by the American people because they protect our Nation's high standard of living. And, as our population grows—it is growing by about 2½ million a year—the demands for more infrastructure, and more services, from all levels of government will only increase. Under these conditions, it is extremely unlikely that Congress will be able to sustain the reductions in domestic discretionary spending over the next several years that are envisioned in the Republican budget resolution. And even if Congress is able to sustain them, it would not be in the best interest of our Nation for us to do so.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if our paramount budget objective is to balance the budget, it makes no sense to make that goal harder to reach by reducing revenues. It is only because the Republican majority continues to insist on a tax cut—one that could be as much as $175 billion over the next 6 years—that it is necessary to make devastating spending cuts in order to balance the budget.

The reason that the coalition budget is a much better alternative is that it omits tax cuts entirely, making it possible to achieve a balanced budget by 2002 without cutting valuable and popular programs nearly so deeply as the Republican plan. It also spreads the burden of deficit reduction more broadly and equitably than the Republican plan. And, the coalition plan offers the best possibility of any of the alternatives of keeping the budget balanced in the years beyond 2002.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the coalition budget plan, and to oppose the Republican plan.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, this rule allows the Republicans to hide a $20 billion tax increase on almost 7 million hard-working American families who have chosen work over welfare.

The majority's attack on the earned income tax credit raises taxes on 3.3 million low-income families, parents with children, who have chosen work over welfare. Low-income working people pay more even after taking account of the much ballyhooed $500 per child tax credit.

The Republican attack on the EITC will also raise taxes on 3.5 million low income families without children, the poorest of working Americans who have chosen work over welfare.

These are not Democratic statistics. These are facts from the bipartisan Joint Committee on Taxation.

The Rules Committee rejected my amendment that would have forced out into the open this plan by the Republicans to raise taxes on almost 7 million low income families who have chosen work over welfare.

Defeat the previous question. Say ''no'' to tax increases on poor people to pay for tax breaks for the rich.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Columbus, OH [Ms. PRYCE], a very, very valuable member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for this budget resolution which we will consider under the terms of this fair and balanced rule and to commend the hard work of the Committee on the Budget led by my colleague from Ohio [Mr. KASICH]. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to change the culture of deficit spending in Washington, but once again we are about to try.

Mr. Speaker, when I am home in my district, I talk with people from all different walks of life who are frustrated by higher taxes and by government's ever-increasing presence in their lives, but despite the enormous growth of government most Americans feel that public schools were better, our communities were safer and our Government was more responsive 30 years ago than they are today.

Has this growth in spending and Government programs kept America on the right track? I think the answer is, sadly, no. While we are ready to shrink government and return decisions back to our communities, the President's budget plan does just the opposite. It expands Government, shifts financial burden to future generations, and I am amazed that the same President who came to this Chamber in January and declared that the era of big government is over has sent us a budget that continues the Washington knows best approach to dealing with America's priorities.

Under our budget plan the era of big government will come to a close as ''Washington knows best'' gives way to greater State and local flexibility and as hard-working families begin working for themselves and not working to pay the high taxes that have fueled more Federal spending, that require higher taxes, that fuel more Federal spending, that require higher taxes, that fuel more Federal spending. It goes on, and on, and on.

□ 1030

It is a vicious spiral. It is an upward spiral. Mr. Speaker, with all that, I am very hopeful that as we continue to move toward a balanced budget, we will also focus on reforming the budget process itself to make it less complicated, more accountable, and more understandable to the average citizen.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity, a great opportunity, to restore America's stake in limited, effective government by adopting this resolution today. It is the right plan to replace Government dependency with self-reliance and individual initiative. Anything less, anything less will deprive our children of their potential and the safe prosperous future that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the resolution of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this year's Republican budget will hurt average Americans just as much as the one they proposed last year. Please, do not be fooled. The budget which Republicans bring to the House floor this week contains the same harsh policy, the deep cuts that hurt seniors and children and families.

Last year the American public said to President Clinton, 60 percent of them said please veto this budget, as he did. The issue is not one of balanced budgets. The President has introduced a balanced budget, the Republicans have introduced a balanced budget. The question is who gets hurt in these budgets.

In the Republican budget, once again we are looking at hard-working, middle-class families who are going to pay the price in this budget, and not the special interests, not the wealthiest of Americans, because, Mr. Speaker, as we will see in this Republican budget, the tax breaks for wealthy Americans add up to $176 billion and maybe even a little bit more.

Is it not ironic and clearly not a coincidence that the cut in Medicare is $167 billion? The money that they cut from Medicare does not go into making Medicare a more sound and solvent system, it goes to pay for those tax breaks. Let us not let them get away with it this time like we did the last time.

In addition, with regard to Medicare, what they would do is to restructure it. They will allow medical savings accounts, which the American Academy of Actuaries, no liberal group by any stretch of the imagination, says for those people who are in traditional insurance plans, they will see a 61-percent hike in their insurance premiums. They now will take those restrictions back that we have had all these years, which say that doctors and hospitals cannot charge seniors in addition to what Medicare pays for. Do not be fooled. Do not allow this budget to go through.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Philadelphia, PA [Mr. GEKAS].

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

Mr. Speaker, it is about 100 miles west of Philadelphia where I reside, but that is all right. That is close. I still root for the Phillies.

Mr. Speaker, the budget resolution that is before us today does contain language that would preserve the funding for NIH. That is very important to every Member of the Congress and, really, to every citizen in our country because of the progressive programs already established, which need continuous funding within the NIH to provide remedies and cures and new ways of treating the ill and to save lives. That alone merits favorable consideration of the budget resolution that is before us.

We have had extensive contact with operatives of the NIH over the years, and we continuously are thrilled by the advances made by our scientific community. Most recently, in a products liability bill which was, unfortunately, vetoed by the President, we had in it a biomaterials portion of it that would have continued the steady supply of vital supplies to biomedical research types of new medical devices that save lives and improve health.

In these kinds of projects, every single American has an investment. We want to commend the content of the concurrent budget resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule which will make in order two amendments: One by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] and the other by the gentlelady from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

The Orton amendment would make any tax cuts dependent upon the Congressional Budget Office certifying that the total budget would in fact be balanced by 2002. We should not be promising tax cuts until we are sure that the budget is balanced.

The Meek amendment would eliminate the earned income tax credit reductions that take $20 billion from the working poor and provide offsets by denying tax breaks to the rich. Vote ''no'' on the previous question.

I include the text of the amendment and accompanying documents for the RECORD at this point in the debate.

The material referred to is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION AMENDMENT TEXT: H. RES. 435 FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 178, BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR FY 1997

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

''SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, at the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, it shall be in order to consider, without intervention of any point of order, an amendment to be offered by Representative Orton, or his designee and an amendment to be offered by Representative Meek, or her designee. The amendments are printed in section of this resolution.

SEC. . The text of the amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. CON. RES. OFFERED BY MR. ORTON OF UTAH

At the end, add the following new section:

SEC. 15. BUDGET SURPLUS ALLOWANCE.

(a) CBO CERTIFICATION OF LEGISLATIVE SUBMISSIONS.—

(1) SUBMISSION OF LEGISLATION.— Upon the submission of legislative recommendations pursuant to section 4 and prior to the submission of a conference report on legislation reported pursuant to section 4, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and of the House of Representatives (as the case may be) shall submit such recommendations to the Congressional Budget Office.

(2) BASIS OF ESTIMATES.—For the purposes of preparing an estimate pursuant to this subsection, the Congressional Budget Office shall include the budgetary impact of all legislation enacted to date, use the economic and technical assumptions underlying this resolution, and assume compliance with the total discretionary spending levels assumed in this resolution unless superseded by law.

(3) ESTIMATE OF LEGISLATION.—The Congressional Budget Office shall provide an estimate to the chairman of the Budget Committee of the Senate and of the House of Representatives (as the case may be) and certify whether the legislative recommendations would balance the total budget by fiscal year 2002.

(4) CERTIFICATION.—If the Congressional Budget Office certifies that such legislative recommendations would balance the total budget by fiscal year 2002, the chairman shall submit such certification in his respective House.

(b) PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE.—

(1) ADJUSTMENTS.—For the purposes of points of order under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and this concurrent resolution on the budget, the appropriate budgetary allocations and aggregates shall be revised to be consistent with the instructions set forth in section 4(d)(12)(B) for legislation that reduces revenues by providing tax relief.

(2) REVISED AGGREGATES.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to section 4 and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall submit appropriately revised budgetary allocations and aggregates.

(3) EFFECT OF REVISED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates submitted under paragraph (2) shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) CONTINGENCIES.—This section shall not apply unless the reconciliation legislation—

(1) complies with the sum of the reconciliation directives for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002 provided in section 4; and

(2) would balance the total budget for fiscal year 2002 and the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section, the term ''balance the total budget'' means total outlays are less than or equal to total revenues for a fiscal year or a period of fiscal years.

In section 2(1)(A), increase the recommended level of Federal revenues by $15,031,000,000 for fiscal year 1997, by

$17,817,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, by $21,488,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, by $21,291,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, by $21,114,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and by $14,466,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

In section 2(1)(B), reduce the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed by $15,031,000,000 for fiscal year 1997, by $17,817,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, by $21,488,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, by $21,291,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, by $21,114,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and by $14,466,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

In section 2(4), reduce the amounts of the deficits by $15,031,000,000 for fiscal year 1997, by $17,817,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, by $21,488,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, by $21,291,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, by $21,114,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and by $14,466,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

AMENDMENT TO H. CON. RES. OFFERED BY MRS. MEEK OF FLORIDA [ELIMINATION OF CUTS IN EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT, EXCEPT ERRORS AND FRAUD)

In section 2(1)(A), increase the recommended level of Federal revenues by $1.7 billion for fiscal year 1997, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 1998, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 1999, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 2000, by $1.9 billion for fiscal year 2001, and by $2 billion for fiscal year 2002.

In section 2(1)(B), reduce the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed by $1.7 billion for fiscal year 1997, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 1998, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 1999, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 2000, by $1.9 billion for fiscal year 2001, and by $2 billion for fiscal year 2002.

In section 2(2), increase the levels of total new budget authority by $1.7 billion for fiscal year 1997, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 1998, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 1999, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 2000, by $1.9 billion for fiscal year 2001, and by $2 billion for fiscal year 2002.

In section 2(3), increase the levels of total budget outlays by $1.7 billion for fiscal year 1997, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 1998, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 1999, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 2000, by $1.9 billion for fiscal year 2001, and by $2 billion for fiscal year 2002.

In section 3(13) (relating to income security, functional category 600), increase the levels of new budget authority by $1.7 billion for fiscal year 1997, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 1998, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 1999, by $1.9 billion for fiscal year 2000, by $1.9 billion for fiscal year 2001, and by $2 billion for fiscal year 2002.

In section 3(13) (relating to income security, functional category 600), increase the levels of outlays by $1.7 billion for fiscal year 1997, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 1998, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 1999, by $1.8 billion for fiscal year 2000, by $1.9 billion for fiscal year 2001, and by $2 billion for fiscal year 2002.

In section 4(d)(12)(A), increase outlays for fiscal year 1997 by $1.7 billion increase outlays for fiscal year 2002 by 2 billion, and increase outlays for fiscal years 1997 through 2002 by $11 billion.

In section 4(d)(12)(B), increase revenues for fiscal year 1997 by $1.7 billion, increase revenues for fiscal year 2002 by $2 billion and increase revenues for fiscal years 1997 through 2002 by $11 billion.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describe the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House on sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who has asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution—[and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual:

''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule—When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues:

''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

The vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one for the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, first let me just say I keep hearing on that side of the aisle tax breaks for the very, very rich. Mr. Speaker, that just bothers me. Evidently, tax breaks for the rich, the Democrats think that anybody with a job is rich, because a $500 tax credit for middle-class Americans, they are not rich people. They may be rich because they have families, but they are not rich moneywise.

A capital gains tax cut. Mr. Speaker, I represent people up and down the Hudson Valley who have worked all their lives. They may have worked for Sears Roebuck, and Sears Roebuck does not pay great wages, but they have nice stock plans. Over a period of 25 years someone working, a man and woman both working for Sears, have accumulated so much stock, and that is their life's savings. That is their retirement. Now the Federal Government wants to take away a third of it that they have worked all their lives for? So a capital gains tax cut, is that for the very, very rich? I do not think so.

A repeal of the Social Security increase tax that President Clinton put on in 1993 on Social Security earnings, is that for the rich? Removal of some of the tax penalties on Social Security, on the earnings tax, is that for the very rich?

Mr. Speaker, an adoption tax credit? Today it costs $15,000 or $20,000, we just went through this debate the other day on the floor, for young working Americans to be able to adopt a child, and we given them a tax credit. Is that for the very rich, for the very, very rich, that they like to use that kind of connotation on?

A gas tax repeal, is that going to help the very, very rich? I know in the Hudson Valley where I live and over in Connecticut where the Speaker pro tempore lives, people drive in my district about 100 miles a day to work. Is repealing that Clinton gas tax, is that for the very, very rich? I do not think so. We ought to stop all this rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats are going to attempt to defeat the previous question in a few minutes; but Mr. Speaker, this rule that we have been debating on the floor here makes in order four alternatives: One on this side of the aisle, a Republican alternative, and three other alternatives by President Clinton, by the Democrat Coalition, and by the Black Caucus, so it is three to one. How fair can you be? We have bent over backward to be fair.

Mr. Speaker, they are going to try to defeat the previous question so they can amend these various alternatives. I am going to tell the Members something, I made an announcement on this floor about a week or so ago that the Committee on Rules would entertain any group that wanted to bring to us an alternative. The only qualification was that it had to be balanced. Even the Black Caucus, who does not like to cut spending, came up with a balanced budget. We have made in order all of those. Anyone who came to us, we made them in order.

Should we Republicans be allowed to amend the Black Caucus budget or any of those others and water it down with what they want to do? No. They ought to have an up-or-down vote on their

proposal. That is exactly what this rule calls for. So in fairness, I want everybody to come over here. I want Members to defeat this ridiculous attempt to defeat the previous question. I want Members to vote for the previous question and then vote for this very fair rule. Let us get on with the debate on this very responsible Republican budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. FROST. 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.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 196, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 175]

YEAS—227

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

NAYS—196

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

NOT VOTING—10

Hayes
Kennedy (RI)
Millender-McDonald
Molinari
Paxon
Peterson (FL)
Roberts
Souder
Talent
Williams

☐ 1100

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Paxon for, with Mr. Williams against.

Messrs. MURTHA, WYNN, SKELTON, MORAN, and HALL of Texas changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 435 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 178.

☐ 1101

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. 178) establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1997 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, with Mr. CAMP in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, May 15, 1996, all time for general debate pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, May 14, 1996, had expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 435, the concurrent resolution is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 178 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 178

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

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997.

The Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

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

Fiscal year 1997: $1,085,363,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: $1,130,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,176,236,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,229,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,288,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,358,219,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: -$15,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: -$17,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: -$21,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: -$21,291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: -$21,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: -$14,466,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $1,311,284,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,357,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,386,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,428,397,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,450,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,497,756,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $1,306,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,350,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,379,428,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,413,490,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,428,809,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,463,504,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $221,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $220,479,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $203,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $183,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $139,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $105,285,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $5,434,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $5,697,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,938,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,159,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,332,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,464,900,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $41,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $39,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $42,287,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $43,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $44,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $45,532,000,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $266,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $264,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $261,793,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $261,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $262,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $262,131,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1997 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $267,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,846,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $268,958,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $263,618,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $271,677,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,049,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $192,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $274,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,841,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $187,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $277,121,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,025,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $185,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $280,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,122,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $183,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $13,732,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,963,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,333,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $18,110,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,551,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,484,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,342,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $18,262,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $10,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,467,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,358,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $18,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,025,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,346,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $18,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,890,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,584,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,395,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $18,409,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,281,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,387,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $18,409,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $16,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,697,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,494,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,224,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $16,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,111,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,943,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,673,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $2,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,729,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,033,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $2,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,078,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,039,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $2,034,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,327,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,045,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $815,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,036,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $1,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $740,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $1,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $231,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,031,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $20,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,322,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $37,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $18,902,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,654,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $41,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $19,713,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,409,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $38,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $18,399,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,950,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $38,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $18,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,205,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $38,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $18,860,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,910,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $38,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $11,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,238,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,794,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $5,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,855,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,346,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,483,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,743,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,843,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,736,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $9,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,730,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,595,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,964,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,181,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,570,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,709,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $7,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,319,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,856,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $197,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $9,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,752,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,787,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $196,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $10,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,043,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,763,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $196,253,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,320,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,759,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $195,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,283,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,745,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $195,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,218,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,740,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $194,875,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $41,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,007,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $43,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,635,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $43,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,111,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $44,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,236,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $44,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,526,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $45,045,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,042,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $6,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,149,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,231,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,605,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,640,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,257,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $6,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,820,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,287,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $6,595,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,040,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,365,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $6,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,655,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,404,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $6,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,161,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,430,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,202,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $46,965,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,504,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $16,219,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $15,469,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $47,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,112,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $19,040,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $14,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $48,046,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,817,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $21,781,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $48,696,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,209,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $22,884,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $14,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $49,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,704,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $23,978,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $15,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $50,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,335,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $25,127,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $16,085,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $129,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $130,276,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $187,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $137,726,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,064,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $94,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $144,995,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,168,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $152,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,890,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $161,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,789,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $167,926,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $167,476,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $193,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $191,481,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $207,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $205,458,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $217,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $214,978,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $229,309,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $227,560,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $241,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,907,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $255,121,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,720,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $232,612,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $240,107,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $241,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $244,185,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $244,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $251,716,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $262,510,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $263,060,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $262,260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,271,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $281,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,213,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $7,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,543,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,213,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $9,219,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,922,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $9,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,662,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,775,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,458,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,290,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $39,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,654,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $935,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $38,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,321,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $962,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $37,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,063,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $987,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $37,713,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,427,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $38,002,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,882,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,189,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $39,713,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,912,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,194,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $23,668,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $22,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,930,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $22,302,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,162,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $23,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,241,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $23,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,944,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,746,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,704,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $20,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $11,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,747,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,314,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,640,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,592,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,928,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,987,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,364,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,549,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,454,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,321,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $282,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $282,653,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $288,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,947,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $292,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $292,607,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $294,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $294,004,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $298,041,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $298,041,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $302,443,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,443,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $2,671,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$1,032,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, −$1,934,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$833,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, −$2,025,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$183,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$2,038,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$271,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$2,026,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$1,770,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$2,182,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$2,139,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, −$45,574,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$45,574,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, −$35,574,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$35,574,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,350,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, −$34,762,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$34,762,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$36,540,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$36,540,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$38,322,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$38,322,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$40,586,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$40,586,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—

(1) WELFARE AND MEDICAID REFORM.—Not later than May 24, 1996, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to provide direct spending for welfare and medicaid reform 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) MEDICARE PRESERVATION.—Not later than June 14, 1996, the House committees named in subsection (c) shall submit their recommendations to provide direct spending for medicare preservation 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.

(3) TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS DIRECT SPENDING REFORMS.—Not later than July 12, 1996, the House committees named in subsection (d) shall submit their recommendations to provide direct spending, deficit reduction, and revenues 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.

(4) CONTINGENT INSTRUCTION.—In addition to any bill described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3), if the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget submits a letter to the Speaker which sets forth an additional submission date for an omnibus reconciliation bill carrying out all instructions under subsections (b), (c), and (d) and that letter is printed in the Congressional Record, then the House committees named in those subsections shall promptly submit (or resubmit) recommendations to carry out those subsections 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.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS FOR WELFARE AND MEDICAID REFORM.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending for welfare reform such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $35,604,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $36,597,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $216,199,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending for medicaid reform such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $324,314,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $476,428,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,392,181,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES.—The House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending for welfare reform such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $15,812,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $19,677,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $105,343,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending for welfare reform such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $382,631,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $563,077,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,810,370,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(c) INSTRUCTIONS FOR MEDICARE PRESERVATION.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending for medicare preservation such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $317,514,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $425,828,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,234,080,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending for medicare preservation such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $375,831,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $512,477,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,652,269,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(d) INSTRUCTIONS FOR TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS DIRECT SPENDING REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—(A) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: -$12,249,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, -$6,116,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and -$42,310,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 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 1997, $115,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and $305,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—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 does not exceed: $316,013,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $419,609,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,213,093,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES.—The House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $14,968,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $18,818,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $101,044,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—(A) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $65,130,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $82,548,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $442,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: $255,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, $575,000,000 for fiscal years 2002, and $2,886,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(5) COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.—The House Committee on International Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $13,025,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $10,311,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $67,953,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the

total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $2,784,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $4,586,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $24,982,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY.—The House Committee on National Security shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $39,787,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $49,551,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $270,749,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $2,132,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $2,057,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $11,739,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(9) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE.—The House Committee on Science shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $40,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $46,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $242,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(10) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $18,254,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $17,890,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,903,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(11) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $21,375,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $22,217,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $130,468,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(12) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(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 does not exceed: $373,764,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $509,912,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,638,286,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(B) 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 is not less than: $1,050,476,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1997, $1,319,852,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,047,865,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(e) DEFINITION.—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. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

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

(b) 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.

(c) 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. 6. CREDIT REFORM AND DIRECT STUDENT LOANS.

For the purposes of any concurrent resolution on the budget and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the cost of a direct loan under the Federal direct student loan program shall be the net present value, at the time when the direct loan is disbursed, of the following cash flows for the estimated life of the loan—

(1) loan disbursements;

(2) repayments of principal;

(3) payments of interest 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; and

(4) direct expenses, including—

(A) activities related to credit extension, loan origination, loan servicing, management of contractors, and payments to contractors, other government entities, and program participants;

(B) collection of delinquent loans; and

(C) writeoff and closeout of loans.

SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BASELINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—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 mandated under existing law.

(3) Baseline budgeting is inherently biased against policies that would reduce the projected growth in spending because such policies are depicted as spending reductions from an increasing baseline.

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

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that baseline budgeting should be replaced with a budgetary model that requires justification of aggregate funding levels and maximizes congressional accountability for Federal spending.

SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EMERGENCIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—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 as emergencies funding requirements that are predictable and do not pose a threat to life, property, or national security,

(B) designating emergencies with the sole purpose of circumventing statutory and congressional spending limitations and

(C) adding to emergency legislation controversial items that would not otherwise withstand public scrutiny.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that in order to balance the Federal budget Congress should consider alternative approaches to budgeting for emergencies, including codifying the definition of an emergency, establishing contingency funds to pay for emergencies, and fully offsetting the costs of emergencies with rescissions of spending authority that would have been obligated but for the rescission.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON LOAN SALES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that:

(1) The House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government have stated that ''more consideration should be given to the sale of nonperforming loans held not only by HUD, but by all Federal agencies that provide credit programs'' and directed the Office of Management and Budget to direct Federal agencies to evaluate the value of their credit programs and develop a plan for the privatization of such credit programs.

(2) The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies has directed that the Small Business Administration should study and report to Congress on the feasibility of private servicing of SBA loan activities.

(3) The House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies previously directed the Farmers Home Administration to ''explore the potential savings that might occur from contract centralized servicing.''

(4) The Committee on Agriculture of the House has consistently urged the Secretary of Agriculture to explore contracting out loan servicing operations.

(5) The General Accounting Office has found that ''Allowing the public and private sectors to compete for the centralized servicing (of loans) could mean reaping the benefits of the competitive marketplace - greater efficiency, increased focus on customer needs, increased innovation, and improved morale.''

(6) The House Committee on Small Business has recommended ''that 40 percent of the loan servicing portfolio (for Disaster Loans) be privatized.''

(7) The President's Budget for Fiscal Year 1997 proposes to review options for improving the quality of loan portfolio management including contracting to the private sector.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the appropriate committees of the House and the Senate should report legislation authorizing the sale of such loan assets as they deem appropriate in order to contribute to Government downsizing, administrative cost savings, and improved services to borrowers.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CHANGES IN MEDICAID.

It is the sense of Congress that any legislation changing the medicaid program pursuant to this resolution should—

(1) guarantee coverage for low-income children, pregnant women, the elderly, and the disabled as described in the National Governors' Association February 6, 1996, policy on reforming medicaid, which was endorsed unanimously by our Nation's governors;

(2) maintain the medicaid program as a matching program while providing a fairer and more equitable formula for calculating the matching rate;

(3) reject any illusory financing schemes;

(4) continue Federal minimum standards for nursing homes;

(5) continue Federal rules that prevent wives or husbands from being required to impoverish themselves in order to obtain and keep medicaid benefits for their spouse requiring nursing home care; and

(6) provide coverage of medicare premiums and cost-sharing payments for low-income seniors consistent with the unanimous National Governors' Association medicaid policy.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) domestic violence is the leading cause of physical injury to women; the Department of Justice estimates that over one million violent crimes against women are committed by intimate partners annually;

(2) domestic violence dramatically affects the victim's ability to participate in the workforce; a University of Minnesota survey reported that one-quarter of battered women surveyed had lost a job partly because of being abused and that over half of these women had been harassed by their abuser at work;

(3) domestic violence is often intensified as women seek to gain economic independence through attending school or training programs; batterers have been reported to prevent women from attending these programs or sabotage their efforts at self-improvement;

(4) nationwide surveys of service providers prepared by the Taylor Institute of Chicago, document, for the first time, the interrelationship between domestic violence and welfare by showing that between 50 percent and 80 percent of AFDC recipients are current or past victims of domestic violence;

(5) over half of the women surveyed stayed with their batterers because they lacked the resources to support themselves and their children; the surveys also found that the availability of economic support is a critical factor in poor women's ability to leave abusive situations that threaten them and their children; and

(6) proposals to restructure the welfare programs may impact the availability of the economic support and the safety net necessary to enable poor women to flee abuse without risking homelessness and starvation for their families.

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

(1) no welfare reform provision shall be enacted by Congress unless and until Congress considers whether such welfare reform provisions will exacerbate violence against women and their children, further endanger women's lives, make it more difficult for women to escape domestic violence, or further punish women victimized by violence; and

(2) any welfare reform measure enacted by Congress shall require that any welfare-to-work, education, or job placement programs implemented by the States will address the impact of domestic violence on welfare recipients.

SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPACT OF LEGISLATION ON CHILDREN.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress should not adopt or enact any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry, homeless, poor, or medically uninsured.

(b) LEGISLATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPACT ON CHILDREN.—In the event legislation enacted to comply with this resolution results in an increase in the number of hungry, homeless, poor, or medically uninsured by the end of fiscal year 1997, Congress shall revisit the provisions of such legislation which caused such increase and shall, as soon as practicable thereafter, adopt legislation which would halt any continuation of such increase.

SEC. 13. SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON DEBT REPAYMENT.

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

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

(2) 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. 14. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMITMENT TO A BALANCED BUDGET BY FISCAL YEAR 2002.

It is the sense of Congress that the President and Congress should continue to adhere to the statutory commitment made by both parties on November 20, 1995, to enact legislation to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002 as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendments are in order except those designated in section 2 of the resolution, which shall be considered only in the order designated, may be offered only by the Member designated, or a designee, except that if no Member offers the amendment designated in paragraph (3) of section 2, Then that amendment shall be considered as pending at that point, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 1 hour, Equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

The adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment.

At the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there will be a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

It is now in order to consider the amendment designated in paragraph (1) of section 2 of House Resolution 435.

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 made in order under the rule.

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 1997.

The Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

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

Fiscal year 1997: $1,140,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,216,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,777,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,345,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,407,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,483,500,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $40,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $67,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $78,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $93,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $96,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $109,700,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $1,338,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,400,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,448,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,508,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,548,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,618,600,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $1,325,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,391,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,436,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,483,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,525,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,589,200,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $184,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $175,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $159,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $138,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $117,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $105,700,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $5,417,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $5,651,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,864,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,058,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,212,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,344,300,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $41,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $39,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $42,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $43,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $44,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $46,718,000,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $267,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $266,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $266,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $267,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $267,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $269,051,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $240,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $237,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $233,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $235,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $227,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $228,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $223,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $219,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $216,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $219,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $216,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $200,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $17,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,342,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $18,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $18,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,417,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $18,628,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $18,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,518,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $19,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,618,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $19,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,739,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $19,858,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,891,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $20,431,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $15,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary 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.
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.
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.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $3,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,033,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,179,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $22,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $27,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $22,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $41,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $21,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $41,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $20,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $41,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $44,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $20,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $44,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,810,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $5,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,387,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $10,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,808,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,825,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,708,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,706,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $7,060,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,910,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $198,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $10,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $198,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,954,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $198,427,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,015,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $198,723,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,600,00,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,072,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $198,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,134,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $199,111,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $42,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $39,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $43,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $38,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $16,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $43,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $36,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $16,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $44,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $33,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $17,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $45,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $33,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $17,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $46,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $33,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $18,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $11,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,230,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,187,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $11,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,257,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,229,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

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

(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,287,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,315,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $12,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,365,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,369,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $13,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,404,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,448,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $13,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,430,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,496,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $62,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $61,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $16,219,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $15,469,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $64,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $63,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $69,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $14,760,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $68,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $66,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $21,781,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,854,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $70,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $68,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $22,884,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $14,589,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $71,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $69,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $23,978,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $15,319,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $73,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $71,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $25,127,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $16,085,000,000.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $140,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $140,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $187,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $154,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $153,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $94,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $168,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $167,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $183,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $182,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $198,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $198,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $215,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $214,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $199,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $198,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $218,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $217,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $239,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $236,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $259,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $258,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $282,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $780,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $307,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $305,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $236,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $244,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $253,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $255,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $261,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $267,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $282,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $281,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $283,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $287,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $305,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $302,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $7,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $9,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $10,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $39,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $935,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $40,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $982,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $42,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $987,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $43,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $44,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,189,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $45,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,194,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $23,668,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $23,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $24,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $25,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $25,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $15,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $281,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $281,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $285,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $287,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $287,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $286,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $289,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $289,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $293,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $293,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.
(B) Outlays, −$0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.
(B) Outlays, −$0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.
(B) Outlays, −$0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.
(B) Outlays, −$0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.
(B) Outlays, −$0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.
(B) Outlays, −$0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$43,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$43,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,838,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $8,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$31,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$31,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$32,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) Not later than June 21, 1996, the House committee named in subsection (b) shall report its recommendations to the House.

(b) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues by $40,500,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, by $377,000,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and by $486,600,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) domestic violence is the leading cause of physical injury to women; the Department of Justice estimates that over one million violent crimes against women are committed by intimate partners annually;

(2) domestic violence dramatically affects the victim's ability to participate in the workforce; a University of Minnesota survey

reported that one-quarter of battered women surveyed had lost a job partly because of being abused and that over half of these women had been harassed by their abuser at work;

(3) domestic violence is often intensified as women seek to gain economic independence through attending school or training programs; batterers have been reported to prevent women from attending these programs or sabotage their efforts at self-improvement;

(4) nationwide surveys of service providers prepared by the Taylor Institute of Chicago, document, for the first time, the interrelationship between domestic violence and welfare by showing that between 50 percent and 80 percent of AFDC recipients are current or past victims of domestic violence;

(5) over half of the women surveyed stayed with their batterers because they lacked the resources to support themselves and their children; the surveys also found that the availability of economic support is a critical factor in poor women's ability to leave abusive situations that threaten them and their children; and

(6) proposals to restructure the welfare programs may impact the availability of the economic support and the safety net necessary to enable poor women to flee abuse without risking homelessness and starvation for their families.

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

(1) no welfare reform provision shall be enacted by Congress unless and until Congress considers whether such welfare reform provisions will exacerbate violence against women and their children, further endanger women's lives, make it more difficult for women to escape domestic violence, or further punish women victimized by violence; and

(2) any welfare reform measure enacted by Congress shall require that any welfare-to-work, education, or job placement programs implemented by the States will address the impact of domestic violence on welfare recipients.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPACT OF LEGISLATION ON CHILDREN.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress should not adopt or enact any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry, homeless, poor, or medically uninsured.

(b) LEGISLATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPACT ON CHILDREN.—In the event legislation enacted to comply with this resolution results in an increase in the number of hungry, homeless, poor, or medically uninsured by the end of fiscal year 1997, Congress shall revisit the provisions of such legislation which caused such increase and shall, as soon as practicable thereafter, adopt legislation which would halt any continuation of such increase.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] and a Member opposed, each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] 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 distinguished colleague from New York, MAJOR OWENS, and our friends in the Progressive Caucus, in offering a budget plan to renew America by reordering our national priorities.

It has been the tradition of the Congressional Black Caucus each year to offer an alternative budget which embodies our vision for America. I am pleased that this year, our good friends from the Progressive Caucus have joined in this effort and I want to acknowledge the contributions of BERNIE SANDERS, chairman of the Progressive Caucus and PETER DEFAZIO, who heads the Budget Task Force.

After many months of hard work, we have produced a plan which is both fiscally sound and morally responsible. Yes, we bring about a balanced budget by the year 2002. We recognize that our Nation cannot continue to carry this heavy burden of debt. During the Reagan-Bush era, we saw an unprecedented explosion of the deficit, as it first doubled, then tripled, then quadrupled. Fortunately, under President Clinton's leadership, the budget deficit has been cut dramatically and as we all know, our economy is markedly healthier than it was in 1993 when he took office. I am proud to be among those who supported his successful deficit reduction plan.

We in the Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus want to continue to build on the President's deficit reduction success. We also want to strengthen and rebuild America by investing wisely—in education; job training; transportation and infrastructure; health care; and protection of programs on which older Americans rely—Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

We reject the path taken by our Republican colleagues over these past 2 years, a path we believe the American people have also found to be dangerous and extreme. What kind of message does Congress send when it gives the Pentagon $13 billion more than it asked for next year, while at the same time proposing to cut Medicare for our seniors by $168 billion, eliminating Goals 2000, direct student loans, and State incentive grants? It is our contention that funneling resources away from sound investments like education, employment training, vocational skills, and scientific research, in order to purchase costly and unnecessary weapons will make our Nation weaker, not stronger. We need our students to be the best and the brightest as they carry America's legacy forward into the next millenium, meeting all the challenges of a dramatically changing global marketplace.

During this past Congress, we were ultimately successful in saving items in the budget which make a difference in the lives of millions of Americans—programs like the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program so that older people can pay their heating bills in the coldest months of the winter, and the Summer Youth Employment Program to give young people the chance to become productive wage earners.

Our caring majority budget continues these important domestic investments.

We also recognize America's role as a champion of democracy worldwide. In the area of international affairs, we provide support for emerging democracies in Eastern Europe and other nations in this post-cold-war-era. We maintain the current level of foreign assistance to Africa and support foreign aid grants to Egypt and Israel. We encourage efforts to reach a fair and just peace in places like Northern Ireland. In addition, in keeping with America's tradition of lending a helping hand to those in need, we provide humanitarian assistance through the Public Law 480 food programs.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I have just a brief question to the leader of the opposition of this bill. The gentleman that is opposing this bill is my good friend from Connecticut, a moderate Republican. When he takes to the well, will he kindly explain to all of his friends on this side how he ended up being designated the person to lead the opposition to one of the finest budgets that I thought I remembered he used to compliment?

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will conclude by saying I urge my colleagues in the House to support a budget plan that will truly set us on a bold new course. We know that the policies of the 1980's brought us wasteful military spending and costly tax breaks for the affluent, while saddling our Nation with massive debt. Let us reject those worn out ideas and invest in America's people.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus Budget Task Force, who worked tirelessly on this last year and this year, and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

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

Let me start by suggesting that what we have here today is a real opportunity. I think what the Black Caucus has put together is probably the only real alternative that will be on the floor today. It balances the budget. It is a real budget, with real priorities. It is just using real numbers. What you have been able to put together is a real balanced budget.

There is no quarrel on this side I am aware of with the compliment that in fact you have done fantastic work in coming forth with that priority. I think it is maybe a way of trying to answer this gentleman's question about why we are in opposition is just a matter of priorities. Certainly that is what this debate needs to be about.

Just to set the tone, and hopefully it will work this way, hopefully you are not going to come out and say Medicare cuts. We do not cut Medicare. We can talk about reductions, we can talk about reductions in growth, we can talk about saving, we can talk about lots of things like that. But please do not come out with that, because we think we can sincerely have a debate over your budget and our budget without using the kind of rhetoric.

□ 1115

So I start with a very sincere compliment that I think is shared by my side of the aisle with regard to the budget that you presented.

Let me also suggest this. It is different than the so-called Blue Dog budget, in that the Blue Dogs really just endorsed the status quo, and, basically, it is a reendorsement of the 1993 tax increase.

The Clinton budget does not use real numbers. The deficits go up in the first couple of years and it does not get to balance by 2002. What my Democrat colleagues have been able to put together, I say sincerely, is a great effort and I compliment them on it.

Now, where do we differ? Where we differ, quite honestly, is the comment I tried to talk a little bit about yesterday, and that is when the woman came up to me after my town meeting and said:

> You know, you have it all wrong out there in Washington. It is not more government. It is not more government programs. We have tried that. We have tried growing the government. We have tried more government programs.

She was about 90 years old, and what she told me was when she was a little girl in her neighborhood, that is where they solved problems. Now, Norman Rockwell is not around anymore. There is no way it can work exactly like that. But unless we establish a partnership between the Federal Government, the State government, the local governments and, more importantly, families, individuals and communities to solve these problems, I do not think we are going to get there.

We spent $5.3 trillion on the War on Poverty since the 1960's, and I do not think there is anybody here that is suggesting we won that war. We have not even made a dent in that war in many respects.

The second thing I would just say is, I met a gentleman in Waterloo, IA, who happens to be a black American, who in his neighborhood has established, we have all heard of Neighborhood Watch, well, this is the ultimate of Neighorhood Watch. He has gone into his community, neighborhood and community, and organized neighbors to solve poverty, drugs, crime.

This guy is walking around late at night in his community with a gang of adults and parents, and what they are doing is they are saying,

> We are not going to wait for the Federal Government. We are not going to wait for the State government. We are not going to wait for Congress to pass a bill or get its act together or debate the budget. We are going to clean up our community today. We are going to solve local problems today.

What the Republicans want to do is give him the resources. We do not want to just hire more bureaucrats to get that job done. We do not want to just establish more status quo programs.

I say respectfully, while my colleagues' budget proposal balances, what we are concerned about is that it really continues much of this perpetuation of big government and more programs and more bureaucracy. So we have a difference of opinion. I know that is where my colleagues are coming from. Where we are coming from is that that has been tried, and we want to get it back to the local level. That is the difference between the two plans, in my estimation.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] and the chairman of the House Progressive Caucus, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for their support and development of this caring majority budget that we are presenting here today.

I also want to thank all the members of the CBC and the Progressive Caucus and their staff for their help in completing this very worthwhile project. Particularly, I want to thank members of my staff, Kenya Reid and Jacqui Ellis, for the Herculean efforts they put forth to produce this budget.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Oregon, Congressman PETER DEFAZIO, and his staff for their valuable assistance.

The 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 produce a murder of Medicaid. It does not reduce EITC or wipe out the summer youth employment programs. The budget is again balanced by eliminating corporate welfare and closing corporate tax loopholes.

The Republican budget, on the other hand, continues in its extremism. The Republican budget is really not about money in the overall analysis. The Republican budget is about a destructive plan to destroy the New Deal programs and the great society programs. It wants to destroy safety net programs. Why else would it want to have a $13 billion increase for the defense budget at the same time it proposes to pare down government, streamline government, and to bring an end to Big Government?

By continuing to insist that the Medicaid entitlement be eliminated, the Republican budget poses a clear and present threat to the health and life of millions of Americans. By abandoning health care to the States, the Republican budget opens the door to decentralized genocide. Instead of going forward into universal health care, we will be leaving the children and the elderly to die for lack of vital health care.

As an alternative to this mean and extreme Republican budget, our caring majority budget of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus is a budget of compassion which would promote the general welfare while ensuring fairness and justice for all.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH].

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I am pleased to be here, and I want to congratulate the other side of the aisle for submitting a budget that really expresses concern for the care of the poor and the needy and for the less fortunate in this country. I applaud them for their compassion, their good will, and I would like to say that we share their concern and their compassion for the care of the poor and needy and also for those less fortunate.

We share their concern in wanting to provide more opportunity for more Americans in this country, but I want to point out a couple of things. One, referring to this chart right here, if this chair was America, which I believe it is, say this chair represents America, only a fool wants to sit in a chair like this, simply because Government is way too big. This is a result of the Great Society. The chair is ready to tip over.

The Government is the Great Society in the chair and it is way too large. At the same time, look at our religious institutions, look at our business institutions, look how we have decimated the family unit over the last 30 years. This is a result of the big government approach to solving problems in this country. This is the fruit of 30 to 40 years of the Great Society, where Government steps in, identifies a problem, tries to solve it with a Government solution.

Let me say, too, that we all care about how to take care and create more opportunity in this country. The question is how do we do it. No. 1, reducing the ranks of the poor and needy; No. 2, creating more opportunity for every American.

This is a tired old system. Today a child born into America has a very little chance of having a stable family, No. 1. No. 2, Government is overregulating and overtaxing so that he or she has no opportunity to go out and create. and No. 3, we have a system or a country today where religions have been devalued in this country.

And look what they have to deal with; a value-neutral Federal Government that hands out dollars and does not provide for any stability or security in this country. I am sorry, but this is the kind of budget that we are considering now that is being offered.

What the Republican budget seeks to do is this: It seeks to equalize the legs in the chair. Government is reduced. Everybody knows that the people on this side of the aisle are trying to reduce Government, but I will tell my friends why.

It is too free up the other institutions in this country. It is to free them up so that they have more influence on the individual lives of every American, so that a child born into America today is born into strong families; is also born into a business environment that provides opportunity, not only so that that person can either get a job but that they can go out and are trained to create a job; that they are born into a country that has more significance, where more value is placed on the religious institutions in this country; and that they are born into a country where there is less Government interference in their life.

Now, this is the Republican budget that we are considering, and I would request my colleagues to join the Republicans so that we can produce a budget that cares for the poor and needy, that meets the needs of the less fortunate, but also provides more opportunity for every American.

I would ask that we reject this amended budget that was brought in and support the Republican budget and the Republican efforts to make America a better country for everybody.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, did the chart of the gentleman from California include the leg that added $13 billion on to defense? That is the chart we are looking for. That is the leg that is out of order here.

Where is the gentleman from California? He is not here.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from New York, Mr. OWENS, and the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, and say that it has been a pleasure for the Progressive Caucus to work with the Black Caucus in developing the real alternative budget.

Mr. Chairman, yes, we should move this country toward a balanced budget, but we should not be balancing the budget on the backs of the weakest and most vulnerable people in this country. To my mind, it makes no sense to give huge tax breaks to the rich when we are living in a time where the rich are getting much richer and everybody else is getting poorer.

One of the reasons we have a major deficit crisis today is that during the 1970's and 1980's we already gave huge breaks to the rich. The wealthiest 1 percent of the population now owns more wealth than the bottom 90 percent. They do not need more tax breaks. Corporate profits are soaring while workers' wages are in decline. We do not have to give large corporations more tax breaks.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the vast majority of the people in this country do not believe, as the Republican leadership does, that we should force the elderly to pay double what they are paying today in Medicare premiums in 7 years and then spend $13 billion more on the military at a time when the cold war is over.

Why do we make elderly people earning $8,000 a year from Social Security double their Medicare premiums so we can build B–2 bombers and star wars programs that the Pentagon does not need?

Mr. Chairman, it is immoral and it is wrong to throw millions of young people off of Medicaid. These are the children of America. We should not be throwing them off of Medicaid because of disastrous cuts in Medicaid in order to give tax breaks to the rich, in order to increase military spending.

If we are sincere about moving toward a balanced budget in a fair way, there are ways to do it, and that is what the Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus budget does. We say no more corporate welfare for large corporations and wealthy people. Let us end the tax breaks and the subsidies that the large corporations are receiving. That is the way we can move forward a balanced budget.

We say that now that the cold war is over, let us increase funding for education, let us protect the environment. We do not need to be spending tens of billions of dollars more on military spending.

And, most importantly, what we are saying is that as America becomes more and more divided, with the rich owning a larger and larger percentage of the national wealth, we do not need to give tax breaks to the rich and then cut back on so many other programs that working people and the middle class need.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to just correct a few points that were made by my colleague.

First, we have no increase in copayment in our Medicare, no increase in the deductible, and we keep the premium at 25 percent. There is no increase in premiums. We only increase the premium for the wealthiest in our country who make over $100,000. They may pay more in Medicare part B.

Second, there are no tax cuts for the wealthy. What we have as a tax cut is a $500 tax credit for families making less than $100,000. Families making less than $100,000 in our bill will get $500 per child, regardless of wealth, under $100,000.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

□ 1130

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Let me refresh the memory of my colleagues. Who said the era of big government is over? I think we all know President Clinton said that. Who also said the rising tide lifts all boats? Many Democrat Presidents have said that.

Let me give information from the Labor Department, February 20, 1996: It released its employment cost index showing the smallest gain in wages and benefits since the Government began keeping statistics in 1982. Surely we need tax cuts. We have had since 1981, 19 tax increases in this country. Surely the Republican budget can have a tax cut. Bob Michel was on the floor, the former leader of our party, and he used to say son of a buck, we need some kind of tax cut for the American people. We can do better. Middle-class families work hard. They deserve tax relief. And frankly, my friends, and I credit the folks on the other side for their budget, but there are no tax reductions there.

After 19 tax increases it is time we had these tax cuts, and I am glad to say the Republican budget has that. We also want to see changes in welfare. Now we have a different approach with welfare, but we believe again that we need to improve it. You keep the status quo.

So the Republicans' budget is not extreme. It is reliable, reasonable and, most importantly, the Republican budget is honest. It uses honest numbers. And we have tax reductions for American families. We can do better. We can help Americans earn more, keep more so they can do more, and that is why when President Clinton said the era of big government is over and many Democrat Presidents also said rising tides lift all boats, these Democrats understood that you can do that best by tax reductions for the middle class.

I have to say to my colleagues on that side of the aisle, your budget does not have any tax relief for these American families. The Labor Department statistics shows the smallest gain in wages and benefits since the Government began keeping these statistics in 1982. So surely, as Bob Michel used to say, son of a buck, we have to give some tax relief for American families.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds 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 thank the floor manager for his generosity.

Can one of the Members on the Republican side, including the gentleman

from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], my good friend, ever get off the rhetoric and start talking about what is in this great bill? The tax breaks are for the wealthy. There is a $13 billion increase in the military. Let us not say that Medicare or health care premiums are not going up. Let us talk specific. We have only got an hour for debate.

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

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that hits the poor communities most in this country is lack of access to health care. I know how sensitive my Republican colleagues are in talking about cutting the health care budget, so let me put it this way in language that they like to hear. That is that 75 percent of the savings, 75 percent of reducing the rate of increase is coming from health care. Under this particular budget that you have, any old person that goes into a hospital or goes to a doctor, they will know what Medicare charges, but no longer will they know what the doctor is going to charge.

Under this, if you push it off to the States, there is no guarantee. So it is just like having a car with full insurance, and you go in and the insurance company says, we are going to pay everything we promised, and Medicare will under the Republican bill. But what they do not pay is what the doctor can charge.

Mr. Chairman, I think it ought to be a shame on all of those that have such confidence in the Governors that will turn our older folks loose to be subjected to whatever the hospitals and whatever doctors want to charge them beyond Medicare.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to talk real specifics and the truth about our budget.

Under Medicare, our budget goes from $196 to $284 billion. That is a 45-percent increase in spending in our program in Medicare. We have the same kind of increase in Medicaid. It goes from $95 to $140 billion. Only in this city when you spend so much more do people call it a cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD].

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, Rick Towne, who runs a small auto supply and parts store in Charleston, SC, came by my office yesterday. His belief was that this budget was about creating, not destroying. In fact, he talked about how is it that we get the economy growing again so that middle class, hard-working families are not hurt the way they are today?

His belief was a fairly simple two-part formula. He said first, you got to get government out of my pocket; and, second, you got to get government out of my way. I think that this budget reflects that. There is a saying back home farmers use, you can only squeeze so much blood out of a turnip that talks about taxes, and I think we all know the detrimental effect of taxes on economic growth.

So instead, I would like to focus on the second part of his formula, which was getting government out of his way. My mom used to say that too much of a good thing is actually a bad thing. Similarly, Ben Franklin urged moderation in all things. Well, there was a recent joint economic report that said if government spends too much money, it actually begins to hurt the economy, actually begins to be a drag on the economy. Above the point at about 17½ percent of the size of our economy, from that point forward, we are now spending about 22 percent.

From that point forward, it is a drag on the economy such that for every $100 of spending cut, we get about $138 of economic benefit for the Rick Townes of the world working in an auto parts store back in Charleston, SC.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Black Caucus-progressive caucus budget. Someone said earlier today this debate is about priorities, and that is absolutely true. Our budget is balanced over 6 years, but we have different priorities. I think we have the priorities of the American people.

The Republicans want to talk about your future, but they do not want to spend money on education. If you look at function 500 in our budget, what you will find is that we are trying to create an opportunity society. We spend money for education infrastructure. That means repairing and building new schools. We spend money on family learning centers, so that the average citizen can get on the information highway in his public library.

We spend $2 billion more on summer jobs so that young people will have opportunities to work for a living rather than engage in a life of crime. We spend money on Head Start so that every child, black, white, brown, or yellow, will have a chance to get a fair start in life.

We believe that this budget reflects the priorities of the American dream. It is a balanced budget. It solves the deficit problem, but it reflects true American values. I support this budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me time. I want to begin by commending the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], our colleague, and the Committee on the Budget for the magnificent job they have done in keeping us headed down the road toward balancing the budget over the period leading to 2002.

The budget of course is the place from which the appropriators start to allocate funds, to choose priorities. And let me emphasize that the process is a process that we have engaged in since we took control of the Congress last year of reviewing everything that every department, every agency, and every program in government does to evaluate it and to choose priorities and to choose what works well for people so that the money is properly spent.

The press, unfortunately, has focused, I believe, over the last year and a half, exclusively on what has been cut and eliminated, just the way our colleagues on the other side of the aisle do. But I think people should understand that Republicans have protected and enhanced good programs that work well for people.

In our own subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the one that funds the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, we raised Pell grants, that is, the money that needy students need to go to college and get a higher education, to the highest level in history with the largest increase in 1 year in history.

We protected the programs like TRIO and college work study and SEOG's that help needy students, as well. We provided an increase for Job Corps, which addressed the most at-risk youth in our society to give them an opportunity to get a job and to get ahead. We provided an increase for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the public health programs of this country, where needy Americans go to receive health care, some of them their only place to receive it, where we address the problems of children, the problems of infectious diseases, all the problems of public health.

We gave a very substantial increase of 5.7 percent to the National Institutes of Health, which engage in biomedical research all across our country.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the Speaker of the House gave his very, very strong support to that kind of increase for biomedical research funding that leads to cures for diseases and preventing of diseases throughout our society and indeed throughout the world. We protected funding for AIDS, both on the research side and the health care side, and we actually increased it in the final product.

We protected funding for the administration of the Social Security Administration so that they could do a better job of helping the American people. In a time of working to balance the budget, which is our job here, to take responsibility for the bottom line, we also have to choose priorities. I believe this Congress in the last year and a half has done that job very, very well. It has provided very strong support for

the programs that work for people, and it has only cut those that really do not do the job or waste the taxpayers money.

Mr. Chairman, I commend our budget chairman and my friend, JOHN KASICH, for his commitment to following the path we forged last year in bringing our budget into balance by the year 2002. Without question, the deficit problem has reached crisis stage, and I believe that overall, Mr. KASICH's number is a realistic one which will impose the painful but not unbearable fiscal restraint we need if we are ever to regain a measure of control over our economic destiny.

However, there are some aspects of this proposal that I don't agree with, although it is far preferable to the administration's budget.

For my part, I would prefer that we not cut taxes by $122 million until the budget is in balance. This tax cut will make it that much more difficult to balance the budget and simply comes at the wrong time. While I agree that some carefully targeted tax relief such as reductions in capital gains are warranted, I would prefer a smaller overall impact on our deficit.

I believe that biomedical research must be one of Congress' highest priorities in allocating scarce Federal funding and I am glad that the budget committee moved away from the unwise reductions proposed in this area last year. Federally supported biomedical research creates high-skill jobs, helps retain our country's worldwide leadership in biomedical research, and supports the biotechnology industry which generates economic growth and a positive balance of trade for our country.

Research provides great hope for effectively treating, curing, and eventually preventing disease and thereby saving our country billions of dollars in annual health care costs. The development of the polio vaccine alone—one of thousands of discoveries supported by National Institutes of Health [NIH] funding—in terms of health care savings, has more than paid for our country's five decades of investment in Federal biomedical research.

Defense spending, I would also note, could share a little more in the burden of reducing our Federal deficit. While clearly the President's defense budget proposal was dangerously low, and I am glad this budget restores troop readiness, the procurement budget increase of over $6 billion is difficult to justify.

In addition, America's ability to influence the world and provide necessary leadership is at its zenith, and further cutting foreign assistance at this stage is the wrong answer. We have already reduced foreign assistance by one-third over the last 5 years. Further reductions in this area, which is less than 1 percent of our total budget, will undermine our leadership for American values of democracy, human rights, and free market economies at the exact time when their advancement is most possible.

And I also want to note that the cuts assumed for energy efficiency initiatives are unwise and should not be adopted. These initiatives make our economy more productive and competitive overseas, while saving jobs and resources. This type of activity—which is proenvironment and proeconomic growth—is what we should be supporting, not discouraging.

Finally, I support the downsizing and eliminating of departments, agencies, and programs that will assist the Government in becoming more efficient and productive. However, we should not simply do this for the sake of symbolism. There must be real savings and efficiencies generated in this process.

While I have these differences and some others, with the resolution's details, I think that JOHN KASICH and the Budget Committee deserve credit for having the courage to keep us on track to getting our economic house in order. The President, frankly, has not put forward courageous proposals that recognize the primacy of balancing the budget. This House has, and I salute this effort.

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

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

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

You know, when I look at the Republican budget and then at the budget that the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus have done, I feel that this country is fortunate to have a really caring majority vision for America that is presented by this budget by these two groups. Under this Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus proposal the budget would be balanced in 6 years. There would be reductions in military spending and cuts in corporate welfare, Medicare and Medicaid recipients would be protected and, yes, the middle class will get a tax cut after deficit reduction was achieved.

Now, the majority of Americans believe that the power and bulk of our great country should be shared among all the people. That is one of the foundations of the principles on which our country was built. It has already been said that corporate CEO's earn 200 times what their workers make. The stock market continues to soar, profits are unbelievably high. Almost all of the new economic growth in our country is already going to the wealthy and the Republican budget wants to give them more.

You know, what I find as a hypocrisy is that the Republicans are always talking about family friendly, and yet when it comes to families, they want to cut education. They want to cut housing. They want to cut medical care for senior citizens. What kind of family friendly is that? I mean, this is beyond all kinds of belief. The radical budget prepared by the Gingrich-Armey Republicans demonstrates only one thing to America—that they don't care about the poor, about educating children, about providing medical care for homeless families.

Last year, that same troupe gave us the balance the budget on the backs of the neediest Americans and Working Families Act, that I said on this floor then was an absolutely wrongheaded and unconscionable approach and one that the overwhelming majority of American people, including my constituents, found fault with. That mean-spirited budget of the Republicans and their use of the bully pulpit left us with multiple shutdowns of the Federal Government and proved my words. They said play with my budget or I'll leave the playing field. They stopped the game. They didn't care.

This year, all over again, the Republicans are doing it again to the American people. They don't care about what the American people want, they just want their way. But I urge them to take a good look at this alternative proposal because it has great merit and to put aside partisan politics and to vote for it. In fact, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus budget proposal.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

This is an exciting time to be debating the budget. This is my fourth year on the Committee on the Budget. I remember back in 1993, where we first had the budget, where the President had the largest tax increase in history, we talked about budget deficits of $200 billion a year as far as we knew. Now the debate has changed. Even last year the President's budget, when he presented it last February, had $200 billion deficits as far as we could see. But today the debate is about balancing the budget. It is not whether we are going to balance it. It is how to balance it. So at least the debate has shifted.

Now the problem is we have two major differences with our colleagues from the other side. One is using real numbers, and the other is shifting power and money and influence out of Washington. Because we believe we need to have real numbers that we begin on a glide path to a balanced budget over 6 years and we also believe we need to shift power and influence out of Washington.

Now, I have to give credit to the Black Caucus budget because it has real numbers. It has a big tax increase and big cuts in defense spending. It is unrealistic in today's environment. So that is not a realistic option, and it does keep power and influence in Washington. That is what we need to get out of.

When I go home to my district in Florida, people are frustrated by all the power in Washington. Whether there it is the fact that health care, Medicare is a great program, we need Medicare, but there is one size fits all.

Why should not people have some choices? Welfare, what works in Sarasota, FL, is not the same that will work in New York City or in San Francisco. Let us have some choices. That is the fundamental difference between the two proposals on the Democratic side. Keep power and influence in Washington. We want to shift it back to the State and local counties and to individuals.

□ 1145

Another important thing is we have to remember why are we balancing the budget. We are balancing the budget for our children's future. It is obscene, it is obscene, these deficits we are running every year on this debt. To think that we have over a $19,000 debt for every man, woman and child in the United States is wrong, and what we are doing is helping for the jobs and the economy and growth in this country.

That is why we are fighting for this budget, to shift power and influence out of Washington and to protect our children's future.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

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

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget proposed by the Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus.

Over the past 14 months, our Nation has been involved in a significant debate over the role of government. What should government do? I go by the principle that government must do for people what people cannot do for themselves. Not only to the point of subsistence, but to the point of human dignity. They are the teachings of Pope John XXIII in mater majeste.

I support the Black Caucus budget because it does the best job of meeting the mandate of that principle. As the founding chairman of the Congressional Urban Caucus, I say to you that it also would do the best job of keeping our cities alive—while the majority budget would do so many things to hurt urban America.

First, and perhaps most importantly, the Black Caucus budget makes the proper investment to help people do the most for themselves. It increases spending on education and training, so that our Nation will be able to compete in the next century and so that people will be able to get good jobs at good wages.

It increases investments in job creation and urban empowerment through community development block grants and the Economic Development Administration. It would maintain our commitment to mass transit—while the majority budget would drive us toward gridlock in the year 2000. These are the kind of tools which we need to get to genuine welfare reform.

Second, it maintains the safety net. Health care for the poor and the elderly would be maintained and indeed strengthened by credible spending and sending savings back into the system—instead of sending this money on a big, fat tax cut for the wealthiest people in America.

Third, it would make a strong investment in one of the best examples of the role of government—protection against crime and providing for a common defense. It would spend $21 billion more to put more police on our streets and prevent crime.

Further, our caucus budget would pay for these important investments by supporting defense spending at safe and reliable levels—instead of taking us on the buying spree that the majority proposes—spending much more than the experts in the Pentagon have requested.

The Black Caucus budget proves that we can get to a balanced budget—as does the President's budget—without cutting the safety net to shreds and without sacrificing the principle our Government must do for people what they cannot do for themselves, alone.

I urge my colleagues to support the Black Caucus budget, as an effort toward rational, responsible, and compassionate budget cutting.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, May 8 was a high day. I do not know how many people recognized it. It was tax freedom day. It was the last day that Americans, the average American, worked to pay their taxes. Ever since January 1, all Americans worked through May 8 to pay their taxes. But one could not breathe a sigh of relief on May 9 thinking that they could then work for themself to buy a car or pay for their home or put their children through school because they still had about 9 weeks to go to pay for the cost of unfunded Federal mandates.

Government-free day last year was on July 9. We will see what it is this year.

Clearly, clearly, with Americans spending 52 percent of their time working to pay for the cost of government, we have got to reverse that trend and turn it around. The budget under discussion here moves us in the wrong direction. People will be working more than 52 percent of their time to pay for the cost of government. Americans are demanding that we turn that trend around and move back toward sanity where they work inconspicuously less than 52 percent of their time to support government.

Please reject this Black Caucus budget and vote for a budget that moves us in the right direction.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO], from the Progressive Caucus Task Force.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me. I thank those speakers earlier in the well who said that this was an honest alternative and they said it was about the difference in priorities. Indeed it is.

Let us talk about something that neither the Republicans on that side of the aisle, nor the sponsors of the other alternatives that will be offered today, want to discuss. Today in America, 73 percent of the foreign corporations doing business in our country pay no Federal income tax, none, zero; profitable, huge, multinational corporations. The U.S. Tax Code is full of credits and giveaways that actually encourage our firms to move overseas and move their jobs overseas. And guess what? The Republicans are saying that the middle-income taxpayers should carry the burden; they should subsidize the foreign mining corporations for removing billions of dollars of gold from our public lands in the West without paying 1 cent in royalties to the Federal Treasury. I am talking about the billions of dollars that the Federal Government gives to profitable corporations in the forms of subsidies, tax loopholes, outright gifts. And none of the other budgets on the floor today touch those giveaways.

Darn right, we increase taxes. We are going to ask these corporate freeloaders to pay their fair share. Why do the other budgets not address this issue? Because both political parties are addicted to the corporate cash that fuels their campaigns. It is like the emperor's new clothes. Nobody will admit that the king is stark naked, and nobody around here will tell the truth to the American people about how thoroughly our political system has been bought and sold.

There are two distinct paths to the balanced budget. On the one side we have the Republican budget and its pale shadows, the President's budget and its pale shadows, the President's budget and the Coalition budget. All of those budgets operate from the premise that military spending and corporate welfare are sacred cows that cannot be touched. The arithmetic is simple. If my colleagues will not cut the cold war military budget and they do not want to upset their corporate campaign contributors, they have no choice. So they have to cut Medicare, and they have to cut other vital social programs.

The Republicans actually want to make the matter far worse because they want to increase military spending and give their wealthy friends a hefty tax cut. As a result, they make deep cuts in Medicare, education, the environment, and other programs the American people strongly support.

We in the Progressive and Black Caucuses are offering the only genuine alternative to business as usual. We demand that foreign corporations doing business here get out of the wagon, as a famous gentleman on the other side of the aisle likes to say, and start pulling with the rest of us. We close loopholes and encourage job exports to the Far East and Mexico. We make foreign mining companies pay their fair share for valuable minerals they mine on our public lands.

We have the guts to take on the biggest pork barrel in the Federal budget, the bloated spending at the Pentagon across the river. We protect Medicare without forcing hospitals out of business or making seniors pay more for their care. We increase Federal investment in education.

Mr. Chairman, let's talk about something that none of the sponsors of any of the other

budgets on the floor of this House want to discuss.

Today in America 73 percent of the foreign corporations doing business on our shores pay no Federal income tax. None.

The U.S. Tax Code is full of credits and giveaways that actually encourage U.S. firms to move jobs overseas.

Middle-income taxpayers are being asked to subsidize foreign mining corporations who are removing billions of dollars worth of gold from our public lands without paying one cent in royalties to the U.S. Treasury.

I am talking about the billions and billions of dollars that the Federal Government gives to profitable corporations in the form of subsidies, tax loopholes and outright gifts and none of the other budgets on the floor today touch those giveaways.

Why? Because both political parties are addicted to the corporate cash that fuels their campaigns. It is like the emperor' new clothes: Nobody will admit the king is stark naked, and nobody around here will tell the truth to the American people about how thoroughly our political system has been bought and sold.

There are two distinct paths to a balanced budget.

On one side we have the Republican budget and its pale shadows, the President's budget, and the coalition budget.

All of those budgets operate from the premise that military spending and corporate welfare are sacred cows that cannot be touched.

The arithmetic is very simple. If they will not cut the cold war military budget and do not want to upset corporate campaign contributors, there is no choice but to make deep cuts in Medicare and other vital social programs.

The Republicans actually make the matter far worse because they want to increase military spending and give their wealthy friends a hefty tax cut. As a result, they make deep cuts in Medicare, education, the environment, and other programs that the American people strongly support.

We in the Progressive and Black Caucuses are offering the only genuine alternative to business-as-usual. We demand that foreign corporations doing business here get out of the wagon and start pulling with the rest of us. We close loopholes that encourage job exports to the Far East and Mexico. We made foreign mining companies pay their share for the valuable minerals they mine on our public lands. And we have the guts to take on the biggest pork barrel in the Federal budget, the Pentagon's bloated bank account.

We protect Medicare without forcing hospitals out of business or making seniors pay more for their care. We increase Federal investment in education and job training to make American workers more competitive. We take care of veterans and we fully fund the war on crime.

We can afford to do these things because we're willing to challenge the powers-that-be, the new class of corporate robber barons whose campaign contributions and private favors have so badly corrupted this nation's political system.

This budget is a collaboration between the Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus. Though I disagree with my colleagues in the Black Caucus who seek small increases in foreign aid, I believe we need to cut overseas assistance. This budget illustrates our priorities as well as any collaboration can.

Our budget is the only proposal on the floor today that challenges the conventional wisdom in Washington, DC, and puts the interests of American working people first. I urge the House to adopt it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to just point out to my colleague that on Medicare we increase it from 196 today, in billions, to $284 billion. That is Medicare. That is a 45-percent increase in the spending on Medicare. And on Medicaid we increase it from $95 billion to $140 billion. At the same time, we give seniors choice without increasing their copayment, their deductible or their premium.

Mr. Chairman, we also have a tax cut in our budget only for those who make less than $100,000; a $500 tax credit for children. That is the only tax cut we have in our budget.

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, in 1993 President Clinton took money and power away from the American people and our children and gave it to the Washington bureaucracy. President Clinton gave us our highest tax increase in our Nation's history, raising taxes on the American family to its highest level in history.

Mr. Chairman, the Clinton tax bill included increased taxes on gasoline, increased taxes on family incomes, increased taxes on married couples, increased taxes on Social Security benefits, increased taxes on small business owners and increased taxes on property that parents leave their children. Today the average family pays more in taxes than it pays on food, clothing, and housing combined.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget, on the other hand, lowers taxes by a net $121 billion and cuts Government in Washington so that the citizens of this great Nation can earn more and can keep more of what they earn and, therefore, be able to take better care of their families.

Mr. Chairman, America needs the Republican budget before us today, a budget that shifts money and power and influence out of Washington and gives it back to the people. This is a historic debate about the role and the scope of Government in our lives, a debate of whether Washington will continue to tax more, spend more and regulate more or whether we will finally begin to reduce the size and scope and power of Washington.

Support the Republican budget.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget presented by the Congressional Black and Progressive Caucuses.

Unlike the Republican budget, which steals from the needy in order to pad the pockets of the wealthy, this budget is fair. It achieves a balance in 6 years through shared sacrifices. And it does so without bankrupting the poor and the working people of this country.

This budget also retains two of the most important aspects of the Federal Government. They are Medicare and Housing, perhaps the most essential services our Government can offer its citizens.

By protecting our Medicare and Medicaid recipients we can do our best to assure health care for the poor, the old, the veterans and children of this country.

In my State alone there are more than 3 million senior citizens. They make up more than 20 percent of the population. The least we can do for these people is guarantee them a bed in a nursing home, and medical attention when they need it.

Another area that the caucuses' budget protects is housing. Public housing is often the last safety net that poor people have before becoming homeless.

Mr. Chairman, this is a responsible budget that champions the values of this country.

''To whom God has given much, much is expected.''

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] who risked his life in Vietnam for our defense through 300 missions and was shot down on the 300th mission.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the Black Caucus for at least producing a balanced budget unlike the President's budget. But I think that Colin Powell would enlighten the Congressional Black Caucus on what the needs for national security are within this country. Our committee, Republicans and Democrats, by a vote 49 to 2, 49 to 2 Republicans and Democrats, came together and said that after the cold war these are the needs of our Nation, and it was supported by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Shalikashvili in a memo to the Presidents. When the Democrats' task is studied, the Bottom-Up Review of what we would need after the military drawdown to fight two conflicts at the same time, a level was stationed. A $50 billion cut according to Colin Powell, Dick Cheney, and then-candidate Clinton would put us into a hollow force. The President cut defense $177 billion, and then with what was left put in nondefense spending. We spend billions of dollars in Haiti, which is military operations. There is another $2 billion just in administrative costs, as the one in Haiti. Take a look at Somalia and all the other expansions. Operation Tempo has increased 150 percent over Vietnam. The Air Force has not bought a single airplane in 3 years, gentleman. The AV–8's; we are losing

them, almost a third of them, the new ones with the upgrades.

We safety our pilots by over 50 percent. We pay for those safety fixes; the F–14's, the fixes because we are crashing F–14's.

The COLA. The President said that he was going to have a middle-class tax cut in 1993 and increase middle-class tax, and then he cut COLA of the military, some of these kids on food stamps. We recognized an increase for the families, the COLA.

We provide for national security in this country, well trained, well equipped, and allow our families in the military to have a fairly good life above at least a food stamp level. So I would challenge my colleagues in the Black Caucus to listen to what the real national security needs are of this country.

□ 1200

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise today in support of the CBC/Progressive Caucus budget. Finally, Mr. Chairman, we have a budget on the floor that is courageous enough to say: It is time for America's corporate welfare kings and bloated military to share in the burdens of balancing the budget. Going after such sacred cows makes sense not only because it is fair, but because it was President Reagan's corporate tax giveaways and military spending that put us in this deficit hole in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, our budget is the only budget that tackles the issue of corporate tax entitlement spending. Our budget is the only budget that says, it's time for the Pentagon and military contractors to go on a diet, too.

Just like everyone else.

The CBC/Progressive Caucus budget reaches balance by the year 2002 without cutting Medicare, Medicaid, education and the environment in order to pay for tax breaks. Our tax breaks come after the budget is balanced. That is the responsible thing to do.

As this chart here demonstrates, the share of the national tax burden paid by corporations has declined steadily since the 1950's, while average Americans have continued to carry about the same share of the national tax burden. if Wall Street paid in taxes what corporations used to pay the budget would be balanced in 1 year, not 6.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when corporate profits are going through the roof, the stock Market is breaking new records and CEO salaries are making sports heroes blush, it is time that corporate America paid its fair share to balance the budget—just like everyone else.

Moreover, instead of giving the Pentagon $270 billion a year, let's ask them to make due with $220 billion a year. And why not, especially when we spend more than all of our potential enemies combined.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to demonstrate this fact with this chart. Here are all our potential enemies and what they spend on the military. And this is what we spend and then some.

Mr. Chairman, Ronald Reagan and George Bush gave us this deficit with their tax cuts for the wealthy and pork for the Pentagon. It is time to say: No longer are we going to pay McDonald's and M&M's to advertise overseas. No longer should we pay to build golf courses at military bases.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this budget which protects middle class families in this changing economy. Our seniors, students, and poor should not be asked to carry the entire burden of balancing the budget. Everyone must pull the wagon, including Wall Street and defense contractors.

Support the American middle class and support the CBC/Progressive Caucus budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, our objective in our budget is to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget to save our trust funds for future generations, and to transform our caretaking social and corporate welfare state into what I would call a caring opportunity society.

That really gets at the thrust of why I am here today. As a moderate Republican, I have seen what we have done for the last 30 years. We have been caretakers instead of being caring. We are able to go back to our districts and say I did this for you and I did that for you, but the bottom line is we have been a caretaker instead of caring.

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH].

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of a budget for the United States of America, for it is not the Congressional Black Caucus' budget, it is a budget offered by the Congressional Black Caucus on behalf of those constituents that we represent, who know all too well that the biggest deficit that we have in this country is not the trade deficit or the budget deficit, but the human capital deficit; the fact that we want to see future Colin Powells have an opportunity to get an education, to be able to grow up in decent neighborhoods and have affordable housing.

This is a budget that we would recommend to our colleagues to truly consider in light of the need to not only have a budget that is fiscally balanced, but that is morally correct and that is focused on this Nation's needs to develop future generations.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus for offering this alternative here on the floor. I would hope that my colleagues would be able to see past their partisan and perhaps parochial concerns and see the needs of an entire Nation, striving to create a more perfect union.

Mr. Chairman, this is an opportunity for us to put behind us generations of neglect for many families in our country. I hope that we support this bill.

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the gentleman from New York allowing me to participate.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget and in support of the strong point that we need a balanced budget. Any of the three substitutes offered by the Democrats indeed is better, including the bipartisan coalition budget. But the Black Caucus budget is, indeed, about our priorities of human beings. I am pleased to be an advocate for a balanced budget that balances our priorities as a nation, and we respect people and respect the honor of having an opportunity to serve people.

As we balance the budget, we should not prefer one group over another. I ask the Republicans, do they really want to be known as the party whose policies support he wealthy at the expense of working Americans or those who are less fortunate? All three of the substitute budgets make clear that these programs and policies are more important to the average American citizen than the Republican budget. All three substitutes do a better job of protecting education, protecting the environment, protecting Medicare and Medicaid, and making sure those priorities that make America strong indeed are provided for.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], to talk positively about our budget.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, again today we have a graphic example of two differing philosophies: one philosophy which places its trust in an ever-expanding, ever more powerful Federal bureaucracy, a philosophy that somehow confuses the notion of compassion and commitment.

On the other hand, our new majority offers a budget that offers true compassion, for it faces up to the fact that if we do nothing to change our ways, and if by some miracle, the legislative equivalent of chewing gum and baling wire, this Republic endures and somehow averts the fiscal crisis that awaits it, children born today will pay in excess of $185,000 in interest on the national debt. Nothing could be more immoral. Nothing could be more egregious.

So as we move to solve the problems, let us have the courage to acknowledge that in contrast to the budget offered here, all answers do not emanate from Washington, DC. All answers do not confuse compassion and commitment.

The most compassionate thing we can do for this generation of seniors, for generations yet unborn, is to adopt a sensible, rational budget that at long last has Washington live within its limits and the American people truly compassionately live within their means.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, with all respect to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], I think he is still giving his campaign speech from 2 years ago. Every budget that is coming to this floor will balance the Federal budget, so this is not about whether we balance the Federal budget or not. We have already passed that point.

The question is what kind of priorities we set while we balance the Federal budget. Do we continue to build up a military that is already spending 100 times, 100 times more than any other country in the world? And do we do that at the expense of ordinary, average working people who need health care, who need education, who need the environment protected, who need the services that we provide to the elderly?

Mr. Chairman, anybody ought to understand that this is not about whether we balance the budget or not. It is about the priorities we set while we engage in that process. Mr. Chairman, I hope my friend will understand that that debate is over.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and against the amendment. Basically the amendment or the substitute calls for very steep cuts in defense.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of the GOP freshmen that voted against the defense authorization. I have voted against our defense bills, because I thought that some of the funding was misdirected and could be a little lower. However, I think that the substitute here goes way too far in cutting defense. I am very concerned about what I think could happen in Russia in the elections that are coming up.

I would refer my colleagues to an article that is in a journal that some may or may not read: The American Spectator. It is called, ''Zyuganov, the Terrible.'' It is about the Russian who is leading in the polls now. He is the head of the Communist Party. Statements from his writings are very, very worrisome in terms of a very anti-West program, and very anti-Zionist remarks by this person who is leading the Russian polls now for their elections which are coming up.

I am very fearful that we may end up facing some significant increased defense expenditures. For that reason, I think that the priorities are misdirected in the substitute, and I would urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I need to say to this country that the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus' budget is the best budget for all the people of America. If we watch that budget, we will see that they are going to have the older people of this country sustaining and keeping the Medicare Program where it is now, without cutting it and making it a regressive kind of cut. They are also protecting the Medicaid recipients in this country.

They also look to help the lower working class people of all this country. It does not mean only black people or minorities, it means everybody. When we work to help the lower people who are at the lower-paying jobs, then we are helping this country.

So what the Republicans have done, on one side they want to help the rich, but they want to keep the poor down. The Black Caucus' budget and the Progressive Caucus' budget combined help that segment of America. I ask Members to please vote yes on this resolution by the Black Caucus.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday in my remarks on the floor, I talked about the budget proposals that were before us. I said that I thought there was a difference in the direction of these proposals. I said the budget debate ought to be about the direction of this country, it ought to be about our different philosophies. In the various proposals we see here today we can see those differences clearly delineated.

The President, in his State of the Union Address, told us three times that the era of big government was over. Yet, the budget proposal that he has made and the other alternatives that we have before us from the Democratic side of the aisle do not reflect that the era of big government is over.

□ 1215

I want to focus on the issue of entitlement changes, because this is where we know we have to make changes if we are ever really going to balance the budget, if we are ever really going to change the direction of government. Many of our entitlement programs are not working the way they should. They are not delivering health care, they are not delivering services to people in poverty the way they should. We need to make changes to that and we think we can make those changes by giving their management back to the States, back to local governments.

Yet the alternative budget provisions and the Clinton budget make none of these changes. No fundamental changes are being made to entitlement programs. That is why we need to adopt the Republican budget proposal.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, do I have the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has the right to close.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, we come to the last moments of this debate. I have stated on numerous occasions that the most significant thing that any of us do is to adopt a national budget for this country, because our budget speaks to our values, our principles, and our priorities.

Are there specific individual items in this budget or any other budget that some of us may disagree with? If we applied that test, we would vote against all the budgets, because there is no perfect budget out here.

But what is important, Mr. Chairman, is that we rise above the minutia, because those matters can be worked out. This is a starting point. What each of us in these Chambers must do is embrace that budget that in a general way speaks to our vision about the hopes and the dreams, the aspirations and the needs of the American people and vote for whichever budget we believe best does that.

Which budget in its military budget speaks to the realities of the post-cold-war world and attempts to reverse the extraordinary expenditures that characterized the cold war? I believe the budget before us does that and reverses that trend.

Which budget embraces a vision that reverses the trend toward big tax breaks and corporate giveaways? I believe this budget does that.

Which budget, Mr. Chairman, speaks to the realities of the pain and human misery and tragedy that is the reality of urban and suburban and rural America throughout this country, with young children dying in the streets of America, impoverished people, frightened senior citizens, unemployed human beings, undereducated people, and an environment that often is being raped and plundered rather than preserved in a fragile way for our children and our children's children?

Each of us must look at each one of these budgets to ascertain which one of them, not some specific item, ''I can't vote for your budget because it has this.'' Those matters can be worked out.

We must lift ourselves to a larger vision, a larger vision about where this country ought to go as we travel to the 21st century. I believe the budget before us does that. It reverses the wrong trends and with compassion and dignity and vision and forthright thought speaks to the reality of the pain and the human misery and the needs of our

people, whether they are senior citizens, whether they are middle-class human beings, whether they are farmers in rural America or whether they are young children trapped in the mire of the violence of urban America. This budget, it seems to me, does that.

I ask all of my colleagues, who can find many specific details that would allow them to bail out of any one of these budgets, to move beyond minutia, to grab hold of a much larger vision and a larger idea. I am proud to stand in support of the budget that is before us. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As a moderate Republican who has voted for a number of budgets that have taken care of people, I have seen the result of our work. The result of our work in some cases is 12-year-olds having babies, it is 14-year-olds selling drugs, it is 15-year-olds who cannot read their own diplomas, it is 24-year-olds who have never had a job, it is 30-year-old grandparents. We have a caretaking society, and it has become a caretaking society because of what we have done in the Federal Government.

When I was elected from the State government to the Federal government, I thought the Federal Government could do it better. It cannot do it better because what it does is, it adds up all the people in a room, adds up their entire shoe size, divides the number of people by the shoe size, and say, ''Here is 8½, wear it. If your shoe size is 10, I'm sorry. Here is 8½, wear it.'' We have a society that is going in the wrong direction.

Our budget changes that. We increase the student loans, we increase Medicare, we increase Medicaid, we increase welfare payments. But ultimately what we are trying to do, as a columnist said, in the final analysis, it is not what we do for our children but what we have taught them to do for themselves that will make them successful human beings.

We are looking to transform our caretaking social and corporate welfare state into a caring opportunity society, a carying opportunity society where we teach people how to grow the seeds so they can do it for themselves. So I compliment my colleagues on the other side. There is compassion in that budget, but it is headed in the wrong direction.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Sabo substitute to the budget resolution. Although it is much more appealing than the Republican proposal, it certainly isn't the best substitute we had the opportunity to consider today.

The Congressional Black Caucus-Progressive Caucus budget offered a 6-year balanced budget that proposed to increase investments in education, job training, infrastructure and at the same time protected Medicare and Medicaid. To pay for these investments the substitute proposed to modestly reduce the defense budget and closed tax loopholes that create corporate welfare. It made investing in the working class, the middle class, the poor, our children a priority. The CBC-Progressive Caucus budget proved that we can invest in education, job training, infrastructure, while protecting health security and still achieve a balanced budget.

The CBC-Progressive Caucus budget also provided sufficient military funding to keep national defense strong while eliminating large amounts of waste through a thorough analysis and projection for future world security and peacekeeping needs. But the Sabo substitute still spends $251 billion more than CBC-Progressive budget over 6 years. In fact, the Sabo military provision is virtually indistinguishable from the Republican defense budget. The $251 billion the CBC saves allows us to invest more in education, job training, transportation, and health care. Without the savings, we will not have the resources to make the necessary human investments, even as we move toward a balanced budget.

In the CBC-Progressive budget substitute, we proposed to invest more than $80 billion over 6 years in education and job training—to assure that we have the most advanced and competitive work force in the 21st century. We protected large job-creating programs like transportation and public works—investments that not only create work but also improve our Nation's standard of living by improving our infrastructure. We protected Medicare and Medicaid, assuring its effectiveness for our Nation's elderly population. Until we get real health care reform, spending on Medicare and Medicaid cannot be compromised. We just can't afford the cuts that the Republican budget leaders are prescribing.

Mr. Chairman, this budget debate is about priorities. I believe the CBC-Progressive Caucus defense budget fairly reflects our Nation's security needs, while offering this country the peace dividend it has earned. Without the savings realized by a more efficient Defense Department, we are not able to make the kinds of investments that will truly help working people in America.

Americans have rejected the extreme ideas of the Republican majority. Democrats have the responsibility to represent the middle class, the working class, the poor, the elderly, and our children. The CBC-Progressive Caucus budget emphasized a commitment to these priorities and deserves our support.

But yet how do we account for the fact that the CBC-Progressive budget garnered only 63 votes and the Blue-Dog Democrats were able to manage twice as many votes? I urged my Democratic colleagues to vote for the CBC-Progressive budget so we could in turn vote for the President's budget—but they refused. What kind of message does this send to 40 million people who are represented by members of the Black and Hispanic caucuses, that endorsed the CBC-Progressive budget? I ask our esteemed leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, to share with me the serious dichotomy that honestly reveals at bottom that most of the Democrats have very little vision of how we would discharge the most important responsibility as legislators, if we were in power. We're run over now, and unless things change, we will be run over when we win on November 5, 1996. I have asked Mr. GEPHARDT to meet with me on this subject at his earliest convenience.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus alternative budget.

When President Reagan, in 1981, challenged anyone who did not accept his program to come up with an alternative that offered a greater chance of balancing the budget, the Congressional Black Causus sent him their answer in a month.

With that first budget they set the tone for fiscally sound, economically fair, and realistically feasible budgetary options for this country in its attempts to recover from serious economic deficits and high inflation.

The Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus have joined to offer an alternative budget for fiscal year 1997 that does not engage in the economic cannibalism of our Nation's poor, elderly, or children.

This budget opposes all attempts by the ''elite conservative minority'' of the Republican Party to reduce the value of Social Security. This budget would ensure that current coverage for Medicaid and Medicare is not cut or further compromised.

This budget would maintain current services, where the Republican budget would have $240 billion in Medicaid cuts.

To encourage commerce through the creation of small and women and minority owned businesses this budget would add another $300 million for each fiscal year. They would freeze Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation moneys at fiscal year 1996 levels rather than allow it to decrease in funding.

This budget would oppose any attempts to erode the value of Social Security, including any extension of the age for eligibility.

They would balance the budget with a fair application of revenue increases through the elimination of loopholes for multinational and foreign controlled corporations, reform taxation of income of multinational corporations and capital gains reform just to mention a few. Their recommended changes would result in a total of additional revenue of $486.7 billion.

The American people need and want a reasoned and balanced plan for addressing this country's serious deficit problems, and this budget is that plan.

The CHAIRMAN. 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 ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 63, noes 362, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 176]

AYES—63

Becerra	Engel	Jackson-Lee (TX)
Bishop	Evans	Jefferson
Bonior	Fattah	Johnson, E.B.
Brown (FL)	Fields (LA)	Johnston
Clay	Filner	Lewis (GA)
Clayton	Flake	Markey
Clyburn	Foglietta	Martinez
Collins (IL)	Ford	McDermott
Collins (MI)	Frank (MA)	McKinney
Conyers	Gibbons	Meek
Coyne	Gutierrez	Millender-McDonald
Cummings	Hastings (FL)	Moakley
DeFazio	Hilliard	Nadler
Dellums	Hinchey	
Dixon	Jackson (IL)	

Oberstar
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Rangel
Rush
Sanders
Schroeder
Scott
Serrano
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Thompson
Torres
Velazquez
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wynn
Yates

NOES—362

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
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
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
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
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
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
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
Stump
Stupak
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—8

Bevill
Burton
Chenoweth
Hayes
Molinari
Paxon
Talent
Towns

□ 1241

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Towns for, with Mr. Paxon against.

Messrs. EWING, CHRYSLER, and RADANOVICH, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii changed their 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.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute designated in paragraph 2 of section 2 of House Resolution 435.

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

Mr. ORTON. 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. ORTON.

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997.

The Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

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

Fiscal year 1997: $1,107,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,165,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,214,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,269,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,330,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,392,543,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $7,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $17,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $16,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $17,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $19,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $18,645,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $1,316,223,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,364,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,405,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,448,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,480,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,529,237,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $1,313,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,352,476,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,388,058,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,428,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,453,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,501,530,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $205,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $186,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $173,397,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $158,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $122,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $108,987,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $5,417,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $5,651,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,864,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,058,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,212,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,344,300,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $41,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $39,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $42,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $43,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $45,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $46,718,000,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $267,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $266,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $266,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $267,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $267,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $269,051,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $259,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $262,484,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $263,733,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $259,351,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $267,996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,560,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $273,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,858,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $272,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,703,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $272,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,364,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $200,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $14,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,008,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,342,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $18,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $12,682,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,566,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,417,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $18,628,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,552,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,518,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $19,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,749,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,461,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,618,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $19,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,879,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,669,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,739,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $19,858,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,727,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,891,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $20,431,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $16,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,894,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,852,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,776,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $16,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,822,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,845,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,844,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,845,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $3,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,080,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,033,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,695,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,180,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,035,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,179,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,816,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,174,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $21,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,969,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $37,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $21,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,846,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $41,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $21,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,921,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $41,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $21,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,630,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $41,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $21,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,253,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $44,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $21,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,089,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $44,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $12,617,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,778,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,810,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $5,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $12,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,677,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,387,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,529,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,808,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,026,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,825,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,889,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,081,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,708,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,646,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,816,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,706,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $7,060,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $7,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $826,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,910,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $198,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $9,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,381,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $198,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $10,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,713,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,954,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $198,427,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,686,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,015,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $198,723,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,984,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,198,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,072,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $198,876,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,325,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,837,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,134,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $199,111,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $43,944,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,307,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $44,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,616,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $16,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $43,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,014,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $16,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $44,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,526,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $17,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $44,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,788,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $17,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $45,582,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,440,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $18,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $8,733,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,409,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,231,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,024,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,257,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,464,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,287,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,163,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,365,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,671,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,404,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,149,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,430,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,496,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $53,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,302,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $16,219,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $15,469,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $54,914,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,764,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $19,040,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $14,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $56,631,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,520,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $21,781,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $57,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,675,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $22,884,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $14,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $59,496,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,975,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $23,978,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $15,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $61,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,302,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $25,127,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $16,085,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $130,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $129,859,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $187,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $137,102,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $136,870,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $94,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $146,449,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,486,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $155,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $155,232,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $163,952,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,535,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $174,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,167,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $191,735,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,051,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $205,671,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $203,946,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $219,739,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $217,467,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $233,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $231,334,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $249,351,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,617,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $266,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $263,690,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $231,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $238,848,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $243,312,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,097,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $252,613,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $256,017,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $266,923,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,708,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $273,393,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $273,190,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $288,716,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,757,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $7,813,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,001,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,664,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $9,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,369,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $9,980,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,129,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,925,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,757,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $39,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,570,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $935,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $38,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,387,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $962,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $39,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,603,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $987,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $39,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,235,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $39,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,655,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,189,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $40,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,268,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,194,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $23,668,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $22,127,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,930,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $22,302,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,162,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $23,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,241,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $23,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,944,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,119,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,461,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,085,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $13,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,362,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,522,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $13,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,299,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,149,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,346,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,046,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,147,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,104,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $282,011,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $281,971,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $287,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,933,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $289,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $289,032,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $289,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $289,162,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $292,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $292,190,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $297,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,252,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.
(B) Outlays, −$0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$6,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(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.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$8,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$9,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$9,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$9,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$43,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$43,258,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,878,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,350,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,685,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$35,974,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$35,974,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,759,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,435,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) Not later than June 21, 1996, the House committees named in subsection (b) 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.

(b)(1) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $2,082,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $15,117,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997

through 2001, and $18,852,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(2) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $367,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $2,428,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $3,026,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(3) The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $10,717,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $158,844,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $226,598,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(4) The House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $220,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $2,454,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $3,198,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(5) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $2,600,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $40,278,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $50,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(6) The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $0 in outlays for fiscal year 1997,
$357,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $476,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(7) The House Committee on National Security shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $84,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $493,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $649,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(8) The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $74,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $308,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $332,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(9) The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $19,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $810,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $885,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(10) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $117,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $2,378,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $3,232,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(11) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit, as follows: by $14,766,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, by $172,990,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and by $231,595,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(c) DEFINITION.—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. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) domestic violence is the leading cause of physical injury to women; the Department of Justice estimates that over one million violent crimes against women are committed by intimate partners annually;

(2) domestic violence dramatically affects the victim's ability to participate in the workforce; a University of Minnesota survey reported that one-quarter of battered women surveyed had lost a job partly because of being abused and that over half of these women had been harassed by their abuser at work;

(3) domestic violence is often intensified as women seek to gain economic independence through attending school or training programs; batterers have been reported to prevent women from attending these programs or sabotage their efforts at self-improvement;

(4) nationwide surveys of service providers prepared by the Taylor Institute of Chicago, document, for the first time, the interrelationship between domestic violence and welfare by showing that between 50 percent and 80 percent of AFDC recipients are current or past victims of domestic violence;

(5) over half of the women surveyed stayed with their batterers because they lacked the resources to support themselves and their children; the surveys also found that the availability of economic support is a critical factor in poor women's ability to leave abusive situations that threaten them and their children; and

(6) proposals to restructure the welfare programs may impact the availability of the economic support and the safety net necessary to enable poor women to flee abuse without risking homelessness and starvation for their families.

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

(1) no welfare reform provision shall be enacted by Congress unless and until Congress considers whether such welfare reform provisions will exacerbate violence against women and their children, further endanger women's lives, make it more difficult for women to escape domestic violence, or further punish women victimized by violence; and

(2) any welfare reform measure enacted by Congress shall require that any welfare-to-work, education, or job placement programs implemented by the States will address the impact of domestic violence on welfare recipients.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPACT OF LEGISLATION ON CHILDREN.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress should not adopt or enact any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry, homeless, poor, or medically uninsured.

(b) LEGISLATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPACT ON CHILDREN.—In the event legislation enacted to comply with this resolution results in an increase in the number of hungry, homeless, poor, or medically uninsured by the end of fiscal year 1997, Congress shall revisit the provisions of such legislation which caused such increase and shall, as soon as practicable thereafter, adopt legislation which would halt any continuation of such increase.

SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TAX CUTS.

It is the sense of Congress that changes in tax laws which promote job creation, economic growth, and increased savings and investment should be enacted and be offset by changes which close tax loopholes and eliminate corporate welfare.

SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE DEBT.

It is the sense of 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. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TRUST FUND SURPLUSES.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(2) all recent-year Federal budgets, as well as both fiscal year 1996 budget resolutions reported out by the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, have masked the magnitude of annual deficits by counting various trust fund surpluses; and

(2) upon reaching a balance in the Federal budget, the Government should move toward balance without consideration of trust fund surpluses.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BALANCED BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that, in order to ensure that a balanced budget is achieved by fiscal year 2002 and that the budget remains in balance thereafter, title XIV of H.R. 2530 establishing strict budget enforcement mechanisms should be enacted. Such language would—

(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, using accurate assumptions;

(4) require the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the 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) require Congress and the President to take action if the deficit targets in this resolution are not met.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MEDICARE REFORM.

It is the sense of Congress that any legislation reforming medicare should reflect the policies and distribution of savings contained in H.R. 2530. Specifically, that legislation should—

(1) reform policies for medicare risk contracting to expand the choice of private options available to all medicare beneficiaries, including individuals in rural areas;

(2) contain regulatory reforms to facilitate the creation of provider-sponsored networks;

(3) contain reasonable reductions in the growth of payments to providers that do not threaten the availability or quality of care;

(4) require higher income medicare beneficiaries to pay a greater portion of medicare premiums without establishing a new bureaucracy for the collection of premiums;

(5) expand coverage of preventive benefits under medicare;

(6) provide a demonstration project for Medical Savings Accounts for medicare beneficiaries; and

(7) prohibit managed care plans from charging medicare beneficiaries additional premiums beyond the part B premium.

SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MEDICAID REFORM.

It is the sense of Congress that any legislation changing the medicaid program pursuant to this resolution should—

(1) continue guaranteed coverage for low-income children, pregnant women, the elderly, and the disabled;

(2) continue the guarantee of an adequate benefits package for all medicaid beneficiaries;

(3) provide States with greater flexibility in the delivery of services and administration of the program;

(4) contain a financing mechanism in which the Federal Government fully shares in changes in program costs resulting from changes in caseload;

(5) require States to maintain current levels of financial effort to preserve the current joint Federal-State partnership in meeting the costs of this program;

(6) continue current restrictions on the use of provider taxes and donations and other illusory State financing schemes;

(7) continue Federal minimum standards for nursing homes;

(8) continue Federal rules that prevent wives or husbands from being required to impoverish themselves in order to obtain and keep medicaid benefits for their spouse requiring nursing home care; and

(9) continue coverage of medicaid premiums and cost sharing for low-income seniors.

SEC. 13. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING WELFARE REFORM.

It is the sense of Congress that any legislation reforming welfare programs pursuant to this resolution should—

(1) impose tough work requirements on able-bodied recipients;

(2) provide sufficient resources for job training, child care, and other programs necessary to help welfare recipients make the transition from welfare to work;

(3) require States to maintain levels of financial support sufficient to operate an effective program;

(4) contain effective counter-cyclical mechanisms to assist States facing economic downturns or increases in population;

(5) include provisions holding States accountable for the use of Federal funds and the effectiveness of State programs;

(6) contain strong child support provisions; and

(7) maintain the integrity of the food stamp program as a national safety net.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be coming shortly, and he will be opposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, last night after general debate on the budget, I was talking with one of my constituents who after watching several hours of debate was totally confused over what the argument was all about. While the budget and alternatives may be clear to those of us here in this Chamber, the people have a hard time following us.

Therefore, as simply as I can, I will now outline the principal differences between the various budgets we are considering.

All of the budgets offered would achieved balance in 2002. The differences are in the details of how much is cut each year, how much is spent or cut from each program, and how the programs are changed to achieve these savings.

Last year, at the beginning of the budget debate, the President's budget and the Republican's budget were $600 billion different between now and 2002. The coalition budget was a centrist budget, with numbers between the President's and Republican's, designed to bridge the gap between the two and facilitate an agreement which the President could sign into law.

Since that time, in an effort to resolve their differences, both the President and the Republicans have changed their proposals significantly toward one another. In fact, their numbers on spending have collapsed to virtually mirror the coalition budget. Today, the difference between the President and the coalition is only 0.6 percent and between the Republicans and the coalition is only 0.9 percent in an $11 trillion budget over the next six years.

Being so close, then why isn't there agreement? The answer is found in the policy decisions—how you change each program to achieve the savings. Here again, the coalition budget has set forth proposed policy changes designed to bridge the gap with real commonsense solutions. In a moment, my colleagues will outline those solutions in welfare, Medicaid, Medicare, and other areas.

There is another major difference between the coalition budget and the others under consideration. That is how quickly the deficit is reduced and how much additional Government borrowing is necessary.

The coalition budget borrows $137 billion less than the Republicans and $200 billion less than the President over the next six years.

How is that done? The coalition budget cuts spending first. Both the Republicans and the President backload their spending cuts. What is backloading? That means that most of the spending cuts come in the last years of the budget. In fact 80 percent in the last 3 years. And they don't bring the deficit down below $100 billion until the next century—when some future Congress and President will have to make the tough choices of spending cuts. According to CBO the Republican deficits will go up $4 billion next year and then drop to only $1 billion below today's level in 2 years. That is a net increase in the deficit of $3 billion 2 years from now, leaving almost all of the tough decisions to the next Congress.

We have also heard a lot about tax cuts. The coalition budget does not include tax cuts, not because we oppose tax cuts, but rather we believe we should cut spending and achieve a balanced budget first. Next we should reform our tax system for fairness and simplicity. To try to combine both balancing the budget and tax cuts will guarantee neither and probably prevent either. In an effort to guarantee both, last year the budget contained the provision ''Tax Reduction Contingent on Balanced Budget'', but this year they refuse to include even those guarantees. Why? Because they promise tax cuts which the Joint Tax Committee says will cost $216 billion, but only provide numbers in the budget for $122 billion. That is not ''truth in budgeting''. The Republican plan is apparently to being a tax cut package first, an obvious benefit in an election year, and then separately try to change entitlements. This is the same approach used in the 1980's when deficits quadrupled the debt to over $4 trillion.

I urge my colleagues to support the coalition budget.

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

□ 1245

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Connecticut, and I listened with interest to my colleague from Utah. I share the lament of one of his constituents, who, if I understand my friend correctly, said the argument seemed to be escaping the American people, by and large. We get caught up in too many arcane terms with reference to the budget.

So we will attempt to both respond to my colleague from Utah and to his constituent; and, indeed, Mr. Chairman, to the American people. I think there is simply this fundamental difference. It may be a matter of degrees on the liberal side of the aisle, but essentially what our friends in the coalition are saying is this: ''We can change the way we spend money, but let us maintain control here in Washington, and let us maintain control,'' they say, ''with the vast Federal bureaucracy.''

Indeed, they use the same mechanisms of the past. Even in trying to have numbers meet in the middle, they have a philosophy which is more of the same: more taxing, more spending.

The budget offered by my friends who call themselves Blue Dog would raise taxes $211 billion. The budget offered by the coalition would raise spending $74 billion. And of great concern to the seniors in the Sixth District of Arizona and nationwide, the coalition budget would give seniors $51 billion less over 6 years.

The remedy is the same. It is regretable. Our colleagues who call themselves the Blue Dogs seek more of the green stuff from home. They want more of our money in taxes; they want more spending; and they want control here in Washington.

Our budget saves our children's future, empowers people to be self-reliant, and shifts the money, power, and influence out of the hands of the Washington bureaucrats and back home to Main Street, to local government, to solve problems.

With that in mind, I urge my colleagues to reject the budget of the Blue Dogs and stay with the new vision for the future.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Utah for yielding me the time.

I want to quickly respond to my colleague from Arizona and say there are no tax increases in the coalition budget, and that we save or we have $140 billion more in deficit reduction than the Republican budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to that Republican budget and in strong support of the coalition substitute. The coalition substitute balances the budget in 6 years in an honest, straightforward manner, no detours, no gimmicks, and without any unnecessary tax cuts.

The coalition's budget balances our fiscal responsibility with our social responsibility, and the balance is perhaps best illustrated by our Medicare policy. The coalition budget ensures Medicare solvency for the same number of years as the Republican plan, yet without harsh Republican policies. Our Medicare plan is fair to seniors, does not allow managed care companies or doctors to extra bill them, and it only increases premiums for those with the highest incomes. It provides over $2 billion for preventive benefits for cancer screening and diabetes testing, an investment that will make sense and will save both lives and money.

Our Medicare plan is also fair to providers. It is supported by numerous health care providers as the most equitable and reasonable way to save the trust fund. Let me read from a letter I received this morning from the American Hospital Association:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PAYNE: The American Hospital Association, representing 5,000 hospitals, health systems and other providers, believes the Coalition's budget alternative is the best choice available to Congress for balancing the Federal budget. We applaud your efforts and urge the Congress to adopt your fiscal year 1997 budget plan.

The Coalition alternative is compatible with the Medicare and Medicaid budget principles that the American Hospital Association has consistently supported.

We appreciate the thoughtful approach the Coalition has taken to deficit reduction, particularly as it pertains to Medicare and Medicaid.

Signed, Rick Pollack, executive vice president.

Mr. Chairman, seniors and providers of health care support our budget as the most equitable and most responsible, and I urge my colleagues to support the coalition Medicare plan and the coalition substitute budget.

Mr. Chairman, I include the letter from the American Hospital Association for the RECORD:

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 15, 1996.

Hon. L.F. PAYNE,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PAYNE: The American Hospital Association (AHA), representing 5,000 hospitals, health systems, and other providers of care, believes the Coalition's budget alternative is the best choice available to the Congress for balancing the federal budget. We applaud your efforts and urge the Congress to adopt your fiscal year 1997 budget plan.

The Coalition alternative is compatible with the Medicare and Medicaid budget principles that the American Hospital Association has consistently supported, including:

Assuring access to care for vulnerable populations—the Coalition preserves the Medicaid program as an entitlement and guarantees reasonable payment to providers for the care they deliver to Medicaid patients.

Giving hospitals the tools they need to compete in the future health care system—the Coalition alternative contains provider-sponsored organization (PSO) language that creates real options for Medicare patients.

Providing for shared responsibility among all stakeholders in the Medicare program.

Creating an independent citizens' commission to help Congress make the tough choices for Medicare's next 30 years.

Not cutting Medicare and Medicaid too fast or too deep—the Coalition's reductions to these two critical programs, while still deeper than we might prefer, are more balanced than those in the Republican or Administration plans.

We appreciate the thoughtful approach the Coalition has taken to deficit reduction, particularly as it applies to Medicare and Medicaid.

Sincerely,

RICK POLLACK,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

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

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, this issue of whether or not we should pass the blue dog budget is really a very, very simple matter. When put into perspective, under the blue dog budget the American people would pay $211 billion more in taxes as compared to the Republican plan that we are going to be voting on later on today.

Second, the people in Washington, DC, will spend $74 billion more over the next 6 years than under the Republican plan that we will be voting on later on today.

So it both taxes the American people more and it spends more, and our people in Wisconsin do not want to pay more taxes and they do not think the people in Washington, DC, need to spend more.

But that is not the biggest problem with the blue dog budget. The biggest problem is its impact on the Social Security benefits paid to our senior citizens. And to all of the senior citizens listening here today, I would like to caution them about some Washington jargon that should be a red flag. It is called the CPI adjustment.

Whenever anyone hears this Washington language, they need to know that what they are really talking about is reducing the amount of money that is available to be paid to our senior citizens in the future.

Let me make this very, very simple. If the blue dog budget passes today, and the CPI, that is the cost of living adjustment, would be 3 percent, under the blue dog plan it would be reduced to 2.5 percent. So instead of going up by 3 percent, an individual's Social Security payments would only go up by 2.5 percent instead.

Folks, this needs to be very, very clear; that under the blue dog budget Social Security benefits are impacted. To me, this is a very simple matter. The blue dog budget taxes more, it spends more, and it reduces the amount of money compared to current law that would be paid to our senior citizens from where we are today.

Clearly, this is a budget we should be voting against for those three reasons: It taxes more, spends more, and reduces the benefits to our senior citizens.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. BLANCH LAMBERT LINCOLN].

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

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, today, I come and rise in strong support of the blue dog coalition budget, and I oppose the other budgets being offered. I do that as a mother expecting two youngsters soon, and I am especially proud of the coalition's work on a fair balanced budget proposal.

One of the biggest selling points, and it is very clear to everyone, is that the coalition budget has less debt burden placed on our children, my children, everyone's children, in the future. The Republican budget will run up $137 billion more in debt, which our children will have to pay; or the $200 billion in the President's budget.

Regardless of what this extra debt is used for, tax cuts, spending, whatever, it will mean higher interest payments and, therefore, less money for our children. Anyone knows that less money down on a house means a larger payment; more interest that is not even deductible.

The coalition alternative balances the budget while being more responsible. The prime example is Medicaid. We maintain guaranteed coverage for those who need it, including disabled children. We allow Medicaid dollars to follow demand, keeping costs down by focusing our dollars on individuals and their needs. We guarantee adequate benefit packages to recipients.

Our guarantees of coverage and benefits will be enforceable through the Federal Government. The Republican proposal contains enforcement loopholes. We still give the States the flexibility that they need to create the savings. We retain Federal nursing home standards to protect our elderly citizens, which the Republican plan does not. We do all of this while still slowing the rate of growth in Medicaid, creating a total savings of $70 billion over 6 years in Medicaid.

That is what the coalition budget is all about, balancing budget using common sense and fair approaches while doing all that we can to ease the burden on future Americans by taking responsibility for spending now.

If we are concerned about the future for our children, which my colleagues over here claim they are, no one can argue that ours is the only budget that leaves the least amount of debt to our children, all of our children.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], the chairman of the committee that is reforming housing.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment but also to congratulate my colleagues who have put forward this amendment in an effort to try to find a constructive solution.

Let me say, ladies and gentleman, that we do not go the whole route with this alternative. In 1950, ladies and gentlemen, a family of four making an inflation-adjusted $50,000 in current dollars paid about 4 percent of their income in Federal taxes. Guess what it is now: 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18? If Members guessed any of those, they would be wrong. Twenty-six percent in the last 40 years; a 6-fold increase in the Federal tax burden.

Is there any wonder why moms cannot spend more time with their children after school to go over homework or dads have to work overtime just to meet that Federal burden?

The Republican budget meets this challenge. It begins to say that Americans who earn more will be able to keep more so they can do more. They can make their own decisions. They can help their families. They can have more time to spend going over homework and going to clubs and organizations with their children.

In 1993 this body passed the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation. Now we are going down another path, a path where Americans can keep more of what they earn and help their families.

Alan Greenspan, the chairman of the Federal Reserve board, said in testimony before us that families can look forward to their children doing better than they, and that is the American dream.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the ranking member and former chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I congratulate the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], and other Members of the coalition for the budget that they present. If our goal is to balance the budget by 2002, this is the alternative that might actually do it.

Mr. Chairman, we need a little humility when we project 6 years into the future. Many things can change. But if there is any plan that can actually work, it is the Orton proposal. It is tough, it is realistic, but it is also fair to people.

It means less interest costs for the Federal Government. It is the one plan that might actually result in happening what we talk about; that a young family buying a new home might actually have lower mortgage payments because of lower interest rate costs.

It is a good proposal, it is fair, it is workable, it is the one that can achieve our goals. I, in the strongest way I can, urge people to vote for this good alternative, and I congratulate the gentleman from Utah.

□ 1300

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN].

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my friends, the blue dogs on this side of the aisle, for bringing forth this budget today. I think it is a great improvement over the budget we are going to see next, which is the President's budget. I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] is going to bring it to the floor.

I say that because the President's budget does not even balance over the 6-year period based on CBO numbers, unless you add some late year gimmicks the last 2 years on some contingencies. So I commend them for having a product that does get to balance. I have a few problems with it as I look at it.

No. 1, in the entitlement area, which is where most of our spending increases are now, they do not get at the real problems, in my view, in Medicaid. I think there could be an unfunded mandate in Medicaid because there is a lack of flexibility, as compared with the Republican approach.

With regard to Medicare, you cannot tell how long the part A trust fund remains solvent based on this approach. It looks like we have a shift from the part A trust fund to the taxpayer-paid part B trust fund.

Finally, and this is the fundamental point, it has higher taxes and higher spending than the Republican plan which gets to balance in the same time period. So why vote for something that does not have the attributes of the Republican plan in terms of entitlement reform, fundamental reforms and has higher taxes and higher spending and gets there at the same time?

I guess my view is, why not the best? We have a plan that has lower taxes and less spending that gets us to balance. That is what we need to do.

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

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues in the House to vote for the coalition budget. Let me suggest three reasons why they should.

First, there is no question that the coalition budget reduces the Federal deficit greater than any of the other proposals before us. Just compare the facts. After 3 years under the Republican budget, the deficit will be reduced by just $35 billion, from $150 billion to $115 billion. Then they would have us believe that Congress is going to jump off a cliff in the next 3 years and eliminate that $115 billion deficit.

Compare that to the coalition budget which reduces the deficit during the first 3 years by almost one half, down from $150 billion to $80 billion.

The true measure as to whether we are serious about deficit reduction is what we do up front. The coalition budget does the best job of keeping us on a glide path to really get the budget deficit over with. Over the next 6 years the Republican committee budget will increase the national debt by $140 billion more than the coalition budget. The American people want us to end the flood of red ink. The coalition budget is the serious proposal to get that done.

The CBO, OMB, and outside interest groups all agree that this is the best approach, if reducing the deficit is our top domestic priority.

The second reason I urge my colleagues to support this approach is that this approach protects the priorities that are important to the American people. It protects priorities in education, environment, and health care. It protects student loans and provides $45 billion more for education and training programs to help prepare American children and workers for the economic challenges of the future.

The third reason is that the coalition budget can pass. Democrats and Republicans can come together on the coalition budget and we can really get the job done. If we want to accomplish a balanced budget by the year 2002, this is the way to go. We can come together as Democrats and Republicans, and I urge my colleagues to support the coalition budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. Very briefly, if the Democrats or the coalition or the blue dogs had presented this budget 2 years ago, I suspect most everybody on this side of the aisle would have voted for it.

The reason I suggest we should not vote for this blue dog budget is because it would replace an even better budget passed by the Budget Committee. Here is why I think the Republican budget is better. The Democrat proposal has higher taxes. It has increased spending and that means returning to a tax and spending philosophy.

We had a tax increase in 1993. All of this side of the aisle voted for the tax increase. That tax increase, according to the Heritage Foundation, cost Americans 1.2 million additional private sector jobs and $208 billion in economic output. The Democrat coalition budget continues all of the 1993 tax increases.

We have such huge budget problems. I compliment the coalition Members for looking at Social Security. That could be the next catastrophe to hit

this country. We need to start dealing with it. I say we have got to have a tax change policy that encourages job expansion for more and better jobs to assist our effort to solve these budget problems.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me. I thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] for his leadership on the coalition on putting this budget together.

We in the coalition have struggled for this entire Congress and we had the luxury, quite frankly, of being called sometimes a minority within a minority, to put forth a public policy document free of as much partisan politics as is possible in this city of Washington, DC.

You will hear a lot of rhetoric. I will not get into it. The Republicans say this raises taxes, this does not, welfare is better or worse in our plan or yours. But my colleagues, there is one good reason why about 40 major newspapers and the Concord Coalition, which is a bipartisan group dedicated to the balancing of this Nation's budget, has endorsed the coalition plan. They have no ax to grind. They take it seriously. I really know of nobody who has credibility on this issue more in our country than the Concord Coalition. They say the blue dog budget is the way to go.

Why? No. 1, we stop borrowing money quicker. We do not keep going into debt as both the Republican and the White House budgets do. That is uncontroverted.

No. 2, we have in our plan an enforcement mechanism, the only one on the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, I was here for part of Gramm-Rudman 2. We had Gramm-Rudman 1. We had the budget summit of 1990, all well-intentioned by good-meaning people to try to get something done, and what happened? We had a big announcement that things were going to get better and because of lack of enforcement, it did not happen.

We put an enforcement mechanism in our budget. We are not interested in going out here and having a press conference and making an announcement that the budget is going to be balanced in 6 years unless it actually happens. We try to do it.

Please support our plan.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], my colleague on the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to restore a comment that was made earlier by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. I think if this were the budget that were proposed 2 years ago, we would all be up here enthusiastically endorsing it. But that was 2 years ago today, we think there is a better alternative that is available.

The chief difference between this alternative budget proposed by the conservative Democrat coalition and the Republican budget comes in the area of tax relief for American citizens. The coalition talks about how we are going to achieve greater deficit reduction. They say their deficit reduction numbers are bigger. The Concord Coalition endorses it. That is true. It does make a faster reduction in the deficit at least initially.

Mr. Chairman, what the coalition budget does not do is give necessary relief to American taxpayers. American taxpayers are paying too much in taxes today. Whereas a few years ago, a generation ago, Americans were sending 4, 5 percent of their income to Washington, today they are sending over 20 percent. When you add in local and State taxes, for a one-income family, 36 percent of their income goes to taxes, 39 percent for a two-income family. It is too much.

We need to stimulate the economy. We need to stimulate growth by putting some money back in people's pockets. That is the difference between these two budget proposals.

We believe we can achieve a balanced budget. We get to a balanced budget at the same time as the coalition budget. We believe we can achieve a balanced budget. We can do it while giving at the same time some tax relief to American citizens.

Mr. Chairman, there is another difference. If you look at this proposal over the very long run, even longer than our budget horizon goes, you do not get the fundamental changes that you must make to entitlement programs in order to have longstanding, long lasting, budget deficit reduction.

That is one of the big differences here. We have got to change programs. We have got to make changes to entitlements if we are ever going to really see a balanced budget. For those two reasons, tax relief for American citizens and fundamental changes to entitlement programs, the Republican budget proposal should be supported.

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

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

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ 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, a number of Members have used this chart. Our plan will help Americans earn more, keep more, so they can do more. That has been the rhetoric. Let me suggest to my friends that this rhetoric was copyrighted in 1981. It was called supply-side economics. It was copyrighted at a time when we had $945 billion in debt that confronted the American public. Twelve years later, when not a nickel was spent in America that Ronald Reagan and George Bush did not approve, not a nickel, we had an additional $4 trillion in debt.

I suggest that the Republican budget is an easy budget to vote for. You get the candy without a promise of medicine later on. Politicians and people like to do that. Do it easy. It is tough to say we are going to constrain entitlements. I understand that. There has been some demagoguery, very frankly, on this side of the aisle where Social Security is being cut, although Medicare, we are slowing the growth, give me a break. How dumb do we think the American public is?

Mr. Chairman, we need to have courage. We need to be honest. We need to trust the people. I am not going to vote for the President's budget because I think, like the Republican budget, it makes early promises and early ease for long-term greater pain. That is what we did in 1981. And we did it together. Let us together be honest with the American public. The coalition budget is not perfect. No budget will be perfect because it is a consensus. We work together.

But the coalition budget is honest in that it says we have a problem. We have a deficit that is too high, that is slowing growth, undermining America's ability to grow and to earn more. Let us confront the tough questions first and then reap the benefits later. Vote for the coalition budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to correct my colleague.

On Medicaid, we are increasing spending from $95 billion to $140 billion. My colleague may call that a cut but it is not. It is an increase in spending. We increased Medicare from $196 billion to $284 billion. We are increasing Medicare.

My colleague took a chart and then proceeded to mislead, in my judgment, the facts. Medicare is growing from $196 to $284 billion. That is not a cut. It is a 45-percent increase in spending. Medicaid is going from $95 billion to $104 billion. The student loan program is going from $24 billion to $36 billion. We do have a cut, $500 tax cut for children for families making under $100,000. We pay for that tax cut. It is not like 1981, like my colleague would try to imply. We pay for it. We set aside the money by making further reductions in the budget.

Mr. Chairman, this coalition budget spends more, It raises more money in revenue. It goes after senior citizens by going and paying them less in their Social Security benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER].

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

□ 1315

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], for yielding this time to me, and I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], in saying that if 2 years ago the Blue Dog Coalition budget had been offered, it would have passed in a tremendous vote of confidence with the Democrats in charge, and I will tell my colleagues the Democrats could very well still be in charge of this House if they had followed the advice of the Blue Dog Coalition.

But I will also tell my colleagues that there is a lot of rhetoric on both sides. People are made up of 99-percent water, so I think it is kind of a natural phenomenon that people, they act like water, they follow the course of least resistance, and that is what we are doing in a lot of ways around this place.

I am really struck though by the fact that everybody says we have got a choice between the President's budget, the Blue Dog budget, the Black Coalition budget and the Republican budget as though one of those plans is going to be all and end all.

Now, my personal belief is the Republican plan takes the first big step, but anyone in this Chamber, anyone in this country, who believes that the Republican plan, as draconian as all the Democrats are saying that it is, if my colleagues think that that is going to be the panacea, they are wrong. The Republican plan is just the first step.

If we are going to get this budget in balance, if we are going to control the spending of our Government and create an economy where our children and grandchildren can prosper, the only way it can be done is to take very severe steps. The Republican plan is not a severe measure in any way, shape or form. Everybody in this Chamber had better start looking at this from an adult perspective and quit playing politics. We are talking about the future of our Nation.

The Republican plan takes just the first steps. There are more drastic steps that are going to have to be taken, and I am more than willing to take those steps because I think that the payoff that we will have as a Nation, it will be more than worth it.

We need to quit playing politics. We need to vote for the Republican plan.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the conservative coalition budget alternative. Of all the budget alternatives the House will consider this year, this is by far the most favorable in its treatment of research and development.

I make this point not just because I happen to be an advocate of science and technology. The more important issue is that this budget alternative directly and clearly recognizes that investing in R&D will stimulate economic growth. That is, it treats R&D as an integral part of their overall plan to eliminate the deficit, create jobs, and increase productivity.

I will take a moment to contrast this with the Republican view and the Republican treatment of R&D in House Concurrent Resolution 178. That view is pervasive throughout the report accompanying that resolution. R&D, they say, is just another form of corporate welfare, it is just another expenditure that needs to be cut, the Federal Government no longer needs to spend as much money on R&D, they say. For that reason, the Republican budget resolution cuts civilian R&D by 25 percent over the next 6 years.

The coalition budget restores this funding and targets it on some very critical needs:

It maintains a healthy and stable space program and provides NASA the funding it will need to carry out its critical programs.

It increases funding for basic research in agencies such as NSF, real increases, not some distorted arithmetic such as in the Republican resolution.

It provides funding for critical energy programs in solar and renewable research, fossil energy research, and energy conservation. The coalition budget recognizes that these are critical to our energy security and a sustainable future and are not just product improvements, as the Republican budget calls them.

Finally, it provides much needed funding for various environmental research programs that will be critical in basing any future regulations on actual risk data.

Mr. Chairman, the conservative coalition budget makes many good decisions. It holds defense spending to what is actually needed, it avoids a misguided tax cut, and it puts us on the road to a healthier and more productive economic future. Investments in research and development are a major part of this equation.

I do have concerns with the CPI cuts. I will work to see that a final budget package finds another way to reach balance and to promote a healthy, growing economy without the kind of CPI cuts contained in the coalition budget.

But, overall, the coalition budget does make many wise choices. I will vote for it today and ask my colleagues to join me.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to apologize to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. He was right on one and wrong on another. We are paying for our taxes; I disagreed with him there. But he did make the point that we were allowing Medicare and Medicaid to grow, and I misunderstood his comments, and I apologize to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the coalition budget in one decent respect in which we must all agree at one point or another, and that is the increased funding for the health component of Government spending.

As a stalwart supporter of the National Institutes of Health, I consider the work that they do in trying to prevent disease and to cure disease alone merits the full attention of the Congress of the United States because everything that they do is for the individual betterment of the American citizen, and so I commend the coalition on that score, and I hope to be able to convince the Republican Members when we get farther down the budget process that the balancing act that we eventually have to do will take some cognizance of the coalition health funding than is now the case in the budget resolution preferred by the Republicans.

On the other hand, I want to say, in summary, of the gentleman from Maryland, I promise now that I will never say that the Democrats are interested in cutting Social Security if they will consider promising from this floor that they will never say the Republicans are interested in cutting Medicare. If we can make that kind of deal, we have gone a long way in trying to be commonsensical to the American people who, as the gentleman from Maryland says, are not stupid.

We are not cutting Medicare, they are not cutting Social Security. I wish from the President down that the Democratic side of the government will acknowledge that the Republicans at long last are not cutting Medicare.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, in Indiana we are known for our hard work and our common sense. This coalition budget represents hard work because it is not a pie-in-the-sky budget, it cuts spending in Washington first, and it also is known for its common sense because we do not cut a dime from student loans, we do not cut a nickel from hot lunches for poor children in Indiana or Tennessee, and we do not cut a penny from Head Start programs, one of the best investments we make.

Now, if the Republican budget stays with a $13 billion increase in defense, as that bill passed yesterday, we are going to see B–2 bombers and a host of other things that are going to require cuts in education that are not going to reflect common sense.

People in Indiana and across the country want and deserve a balanced budget. This coalition budget does it fairly and with common sense, not a

pie-in-the-sky budget, but reflects the grass roots, hard work of the Midwest and other States in the Union.

I strongly support a vote for this budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Kolbe].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] said about the Republican budget cutting school lunches and student loans. That just simply is not true.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman for a few seconds here. Go ahead.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman, first of all we have just been working for the last 1½ years, and the gentleman from Arizona will not deny that Head Start was cut under their first budget, student loans were cut under their first budget——

Mr. KOLBE. No, Mr. Chairman, that is simply not true.

Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, student loans are not being cut. First of all, Pell grant will go up, the total dollar volume of student loans will go up under the Republican budget. The only thing that we are talking about cutting is cutting the very wasteful, bureaucratic direct student loan program. We are going to reduce some of the money that goes in subsidies to bankers. But we are not cutting the number of student loans or the amount of student loans. Let us make that very clear.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from the State of New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS].

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity to open this discussion yesterday, and I reflected on the fact that budget proposals are indeed a reflection of our values and our priorities, and in one important respect there is something fundamentally dangerous about the budget resolution that is before us today. It seeks to impose legislatively an arbitrary so-called correction of the Consumer Price Index.

Now there is a body of economists who believe that the CPI currently overstates the impact of inflation, and I think most of us would agree that something should be done about it.

But what the blue dog budget seeks to do would not only, if adopted, reduce Social Security checks next year, but it would set the movement to try to responsibly reform the CPI back for years. We should only be tinkering with this measure of inflation after a technically competent group can arrive at some scientific measures of the most popular recognition of how we can more accurately assess the impact of inflation. To rely on a budget fix, not of a hundred million or a billion or $10 billion, but in excess of $50 billion with the CPI plug when we do not have the final analysis having been completed by either BLS or by the Senate Finance Committee's commission.

We can wait and know that we have got the scientific efficacy, the legitimacy, to make this change. To arbitrarily make it in the form of legislation will, in my judgment, set back the cause of responsibly reforming the CPI.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to respond with regard to the CPI.

Senate Majority Leader BOB DOLE last September, in talking about the CPI, endorsing the reduction in the CPI, said, quote, ''It can only happen if we join hands. I think we ought to do it in a bipartisan way without taking political shots.'' Now that is a quote from the Washington Times, September 27.

Also I would remind my colleagues that 11 Republican Senators have also proposed a CPI increase twice as high as that proposed in the blue dog budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] for yielding this time to me.

I am pleased once again to join in supporting the bipartisan coalition balanced budget proposal. In contrast to both the Gingrich and the President's budget proposals, cuts in this budget are balanced in each year and achieve a zero deficit without resorting to unsustainable program cuts in the outyears and an ill-timed tax cut paid for with borrowed money.

The coalition proposal is a honest compromise between the other two major proposals, and it contains policy recommendations that strengthen and preserve Medicare and Medicaid as well as critical investments in education, technology, and the environment.

I support tax cuts including a capital gains tax cut, but they should be enacted and paid for in the context of overall tax reform when we can also simplify the tax system.

If we are serious about deficit reduction, let us put spending cuts first. Let us put a plan on the table that asks the 104th Congress to make the same kind of hard decisions that we will ask of the 105th and 106th Congresses.

Vote for the coalition budget.

□ 1330

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Louisiana [Mr. MCCRERY], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to commend the authors of the coalition budget. It is an excellent budget. It is not the best budget on the floor today, but it is an excellent budget. If anyone doubts the positive impact on the budget process that the new Republican majority has had, they need only look at the offerings on the floor of the House of Representatives today and compare them with the offerings of just 3 years ago. There is a marked distinction, a marked distinction in favor of future generations of Americans; in favor of dealing honestly with our Nation's fiscal problems.

I want to commend those who have brought honest budgets to the floor today. I also know, however, that some of these same authors of the coalition budget just 3 years ago voted against a tax increase. They voted against President Clinton's tax increase. Yet, they stand on the floor today, just 3 years later, and say, ''Oh, well, we were against them then, but today we think they are okay.'' That is essentially what they are saying when they refuse to give back to the American people any portion of President Clinton's tax increase of 1993.

The Republican budget gets back for the people less than half of the tax increase that was passed by one vote in this House 3 years ago. I do not think that is too much. I would like to do more. I would like to give more of that money that we took from the American people in 1993 back to them, but at least we get a good start in the Republican budget.

The coalition budget, as good as it is, taxes more and spends more. That is the key difference between their budget and the Republican budget. Please vote no on this coalition budget. Support the Republican budget.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute 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 strong support of the coalition budget, the fairest, most realistic, most achievable, and most responsible of the balanced budget plans before us.

This plan meets the goals of both the President and the Republican leadership by balancing the budget within 6 years using the conservative economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office. But most importantly, this is a plan that is good for our economy and good for the American people because it preserves vital investments such as health care, medical and scientific research, education, and environmental protection.

The coalition budget is superior to the other plans before us in many ways.

First, it includes $137 billion more in deficit reduction than the Republican plan, leaving less debt to burden our economy and future generations. And it achieves more deficit reduction faster than the backloaded Republican plan, making it more likely that future

Congresses will stick to this plan and actually balance the budget.

Second, the coalition budget extends the solvency of the Medicare trust fund without taking away senior citizens' choice of doctors, as the Republican plan would do. The coalition budget ensures adequate funding for medical education by providing dedicated funding from managed health care plans for this important purpose.

Third, the coalition budget continues the guarantee of health care coverage for all current Medicaid beneficiaries and protects families from the devastating cost of long-term care.

The coalition budget also sets the right investment priorities. It provides $45 billion more for education programs such as student loans, elementary and secondary education, Head Start, and job training. It provides $8.7 billion more for medical research at the National Institutes of Health and other agencies. Finally, Mr. Chairman, the coalition budget is the only budget proposal which achieves a balanced budget without shifting the tax burden. The Republican budget would increase taxes for families earning $28,000 or less and double flood insurance premiums for homeowners.

Mr. Chairman, the coalition budget offers the best opportunity to put aside partisan politics and pass a commonsense balanced budget that is fair to the American people and good for our economy. I urge my colleagues to pass this budget, and I urge the President and the Republican leadership to come to agreement on a plan such as this.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, the reason we are fighting for a balanced budget is that it will allow young working families to save more of the money that they earn. It will boost the economy. It will increase their wages. The problem with the Clinton budget is that it taxes more and it spends more. And the problem with the Clinton budget is that it simply does not balance. It increases the deficit next year, and even more the year after that. That means more money out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Our GOP budget ends three decades of reckless deficit spending and stops forcing our children to pay our bills. Currently, the Federal Government taxes and spends on programs that in many cases simply are not effective, and that is why we provide tax relief. That is why we reform welfare. That is why we are shifting power and money and influence out of Washington and giving it back to the people whose taxes it was paid with.

For example, in this budget we terminate the Department of Energy and the Department of Commerce, chronically mismanaged agencies. We eliminate or privatize 130 wasteful or unnecessary Federal programs, saving more than $34 billion over 6 years. The Republican budget cuts corporate welfare, it implements the FAIR Act, taking us away from a command-control Federal farm program, and leading us back toward a more purely based market-based farm system.

Last, Mr. Chairman, President Clinton's budget plan avoids making the hard choices. Of all the spending cuts he recommends, 64 percent take place in the last 2 years, after he is out of office. As has been pointed out, that is like trying to lose 50 pounds over 50 weeks and waiting until the last week to lose 49 pounds. It simply will not happen.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, we are in the strange position of all agreeing that we wish to balance the budget in 7 years, but then quibbling over some of the details, and also over the design. I think it is important to put in bold relief the difference between the coalition plan and the Republican plan and the President's plan.

I think that perhaps nothing speaks more eloquently to this than the comments of the last speaker. That is, how much are we actually making in terms of sacrifices and cuts in these early years, when we are serving in Congress and we are answerable for our actions?

I submit that both under the President's plan and under the Republican plan, we are being asked to postpone the tough decisions until later, when we are perhaps not even in office. It is not responsible, I submit, to take this attitude, but instead, we should ask that realistic cuts and sacrifices be made now, in 1996, 1997, 1998. Under the Republican plan, approximately $90 billion of deficit reduction has to occur in the last 2 years.

It is unrealistic to think this will happen. We all agree that we ought to be cutting taxes, but tragically, when we attempt to cut taxes, we borrow money to finance that cut. The Republican plan has $137 billion less deficit reduction than the coalition plan, as a result. I urge support for the coalition plan.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute and 30 seconds, just to point out to the gentleman that, of course, the administration and most of the Members of the majority were supporting a President's budget that would have spent $7 billion in 1996 more than what the Democrats spent in 1995.

So in other words, the Democrats in the House essentially supported, not all but the greatest number of them, supported the President's proposal to increase Washington spending by $7 billion, discretionary spending by $7 billion over 1995 and 1996. We advocated making a reduction of somewhere over $23 billion, from 1995 and 1996. We ended up with $23 billion worth of savings in Washington spending, the single greatest amount of savings in at least the last 50 years.

So to argue that our budget is backloaded is kind or absurd, because we have been able to force the greatest amount of savings in over 50 years. We accomplished that just the opposite of what the administration wanted to do. We did not backload. We got in there in the very first year, I would say to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY], and we made the most significant downsizing of Washington spending and Washington bureaucracy since World War II.

So let us not argue about who is doing the backloading. We are not doing any backloading. We are doing a lot of heavy lifting, and I want to compliment the House. There were only 32 votes against it, so we are in the midst of a real change in this city.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me thank my colleague, the gentleman from Utah, for yielding time to me, and for the good work he has done on the coalition budget.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to point out that the Republican budget that we are dealing with today is the same one that was tried as blackmail to force this President to sign priorities he disagreed with, and the American people disagreed with. It took two shutdowns of this Government to bring the Republican Members of Congress to their senses, so we could proceed with last year's budget.

This budget, again, is a repeat. The poor, the sick, the elderly, our students, the environment, all, once again, face drastic cuts. The elderly and the disabled will no longer be guaranteed a minimum of medical care should they be unable to afford it because Medicaid would be block granted. Rural hospitals and rural medicine would suffer because of the Office of Rural Health is eliminated, on top of many new reductions in the Department of Agriculture's programs, that go well beyond the most recently passed farm bill.

There is no question that the coalition budget is a much better way of balancing the budget. There are no cuts in education or student loans. Medicare and Medicaid growth is controlled, as it must be, but not ruthlessly slashed. The coalition budget not only balances by the year 2002, it creates a surplus. It starts doling out whatever medicine we must take now, gradually reducing the deficit over the 7-year period, rather than plusing up spending, as the Republican budget does, in a way that makes it questionable as to whether we will ever get to the other end of this road we must travel.

There is no question that the honest and up front approach has been taken by the coalition. It should serve as a basis for agreement, no only in this Congress, before we end our deliberations, but I would hope in the next Congress, when a new majority takes control. Again, I want to thank those

who have worked so hard and showed courage in breaking new ground, particularly on the issue of cost-of-living adjustments.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding time to me, and I also want to commend him on his work. I rise not as a member of the Blue Dogs, but I rise as a Member who thinks that the proposal that is authorized by the coalition indeed is a strong proposal, and in fact is the strongest one we have.

I also rise as one who thinks all three alternatives really are better than the Republican party's, because they, indeed, balance the priorities of this Nation. So I am pleased to say I am an advocate and supporter of a balanced budget, but I am even more pleased to say I am supporting a balanced budget that makes tough choices and shared sacrifices across the board, and it does it not at the expense of the poor or the expense of the working American.

Again, all three substitute budgets make clear the programs and policies do support the average American citizen. The coalition budget protects and preserves these fundamental values that make America strong. At the same time, it does not increase the tax burden, as, indeed, the Republican party does, and it does it at the expense of the poor, and the working Americans, when they say cuts, which, indeed, has been the motto for the Republican Party.

I think the coalition budget also has taken a strong position in saying all of us must make sacrifices, those who are senior citizens as well as the rest of America, but it does it in the most appropriate way. There are those who would like to demagog those taking this courageous step. I think they need to be complimented.

Yes; I would emphasize, all three substitutes are better than the Republican party's. I urge my colleague to reject the Republican party's alternative and vote strongly for the resolution that the coalition has put before us.

□ 1345

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN].

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk about welfare spending. Welfare spending is so huge it is tough to comprehend. One way to put it, though, is this.

On average the cost of the welfare system amounted to $3,300 for each household that paid Federal income tax in the year 1993. That means the first $3,300 of taxes from that household went into the welfare system black hole. I am sorry, but that is a lot of money for a Federal bureaucracy that has simply failed every American.

Mr. Chairman, some studies show that for every dollar that is spent in the current welfare system, 70 cents of that dollar is wasted on the Federal Government bureaucracy. That is not compassion, I would argue. The money in our Federal welfare system needs to go to those folks who really need it, not a bureaucrat inside the beltway.

Let us talk a moment about compassion, because many of the liberal Members seem to have a distorted sense of what that term means when it comes to our Nation's failed welfare policies. More taxes do not equal more compassion.

Is it compassionate to continue with the status quo that for the last three generations has only served to strip women and children of their dignity? I do not think so. Is it compassionate to prolong a system that encourages destructive behavior and greater illegitimacy plus little incentive to go to work? I do not think so. Is it compassionate to maintain a system that traps so many children in such a poor environment that it exposes them to higher rates of domestic abuse, higher rates of violent crime, and inadequate educational opportunities, so that some children never during the course of their lifetime have within their family a role model who holds a job? I do not think so.

Republicans say no. In fact, our current welfare system is anything but compassionate in reality. It is destructive. Most Americans on welfare want to go to work, but as long as the Government offers them a better deal to stay dependent and makes it tougher to move off welfare, many of them will stay on welfare. That is not compassionate.

Our proposal will bypass this outdated bureaucracy at the Federal level and it will funnel money more directly to the people who so desperately need it. Our proposal will shift the Government's current destructive incentives to incentives that promote marriage and work. And our proposal will remove the Federal Government as a surrogate parent and enable people to take personal responsibility for their lives.

Republicans want to help people break the cycle of poverty that holds down families and children of America. That is compassion. I encourage my colleagues to vote down the blue dog budget and to vote for the Republican budget that funds $6 million in child care, that goes after deadbeat parents, and that sends our welfare tax dollars back to the States and to the people who need it.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the coalition budget, I ask all my colleagues to vote for it, and I commend the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] for the work they have done.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, let me just thank my friend from Utah for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, could the gentlewoman from Washington tell us what she means about the liberals, the so-called liberals having a distorted sense of compassion? Maybe being from Georgia, I do not quite really understand what ''distortion'' means.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1¼ minutes to simply say that to try to combine both balancing the budget and tax cuts will guarantee neither and probably prevent either. In an effort to guarantee both, last year the budget contained the provision called ''Tax Reduction Contingent on Balanced Budget,'' but this year they even refuse to include those guarantees. Why? Because they promise tax cuts which the Joint Committee says will cost almost $216 billion but only provide numbers in the budget for $122 billion. That is not truth-in-budgeting. The Republican plan is apparently to bring a tax cut package first, an obvious benefit in an election year, and then separately try to change entitlements. This is the same approach used in the 1980's when deficits quadrupled the debt to over $4 trillion.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the coalition plan which is the only plan which does not borrow money. I would just point out that the $122 billion of tax cuts is borrowed money. We are going to borrow money from future generations to pay it back to today's generation in a tax cut that people say they would rather use the money to balance the budget.

I urge my colleagues to support the coalition budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the coalition budget, and think it would be helpful if all of us lowered the tones of our voices and stuck a little bit more to the facts before us.

The coalition budget differs from the majority budget in that we do not borrow $137 billion in order to grant all of us who need it a tax cut. The chart to my right shows the difference. The orange and the yellow lines are the difference between the majority's views of what the deficit ought to look like in 2002, the White House opinion of what it ought to be, and what the coalition believes that it ought to be.

I for one accept, and I believe I speak for every single Member that supports the coalition budget on both sides of

the aisle, with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] that said we should stop talking about cutting, in this case the accusation from a few of the extremists on this side of the aisle that said we are cutting Social Security. We ought not to be saying that because that is not true, and we know it, and the two freshman Members that made that statement know better.

Now the end of that. I commend my colleagues on this side for saying that and helping set the record straight. No one is proposing cutting Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security. But what we are talking about doing, and there are differences of opinion, and members of the coalition, myself in particular, have major differences with the majority and how they choose to adjust Medicare and Medicaid. But we are getting very close on welfare reform, and the beautiful speech we heard a moment ago, we are there, folks, we are there. Why we keep talking about that, I do not know.

But I have to say, and I will be happy to yield at any time to anyone on this side that challenges anything that I am saying in the few seconds I have got remaining, because representing a rural area, I object strenuously to cutting 56 percent of the remaining discretionary spending for agriculture in rural America. That is not the farm program. We took care of that. Fifty-six percent.

The gentleman and the party now that suggest that we ought to eliminate 100 percent of the research on fossil fuels, at a time we are complaining about the price of gasoline, I say makes no sense whatsoever. So I differ with your policies in that regard, and let us debate those policies on the floor. But let us quit making accusations. There is bipartisan support for education, there is bipartisan support for meaningful health care.

What we suggest in the coalition budget is that we ought to be honest going into it and say if we are going to be for it, speak for it, we ought to budget for it, not come on the floor of the House and make some of the speeches that we have heard here today. That is not helpful.

But I want to say, in fairness and in closing, I appreciate the tenor of most of the debate that has come from this side today. It is helpful. And I appreciate my colleagues on our side for supporting this budget, and I urge its passage. It could be the most positive step forward for this Congress in dealing with the very real problems that both sides say that we need to address.

Ms. FURSE. I rise today during consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 178 to support of the coalition balanced budget plan. As someone who strongly supports balancing the budget, there are aspects to each proposal with which I disagree. After evaluating each approach, I support the coalition budget because it is fiscally conservative and socially responsible. It is a common sense approach that both Democrats and Republicans can support.

We need a balanced budget plan that emphasizes security in our communities and families. I believe the Republican balanced budget plan of last year was rightly rejected by the public and deserved the President's veto. Simply put, it is wrong to ask seniors and students to pay more while giving the Pentagon a $70 billion boost.

I believe the Black Caucus budget has the best priorities, because it cuts wasteful Pentagon spending by over $250 billion. Moreover, the Black Caucus budget makes education and our communities a priority. Unfortunately, it goes beyond simply cutting corporate welfare and dramatically increases taxes.

The coalition balanced budget is a common sense budget. It balances the budget through tough spending cuts, without raising taxes, but maintains our priorities. There are no education cuts in the coalition plan. It reforms Medicaid, but does not eliminate health care guarantees for children and pregnant women. It makes important changes in the welfare system, but does not punish children for the actions of their parents. It also emphasizes community health and other protections.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is plain wrong to make seniors and students pay more to hand out tax cuts for the rich. We should make balancing the budget our number one priority—that is what the coalition budget does. This is the second year in a row that I have supported the coalition balanced budget plan, and hope we can pass it before the end of the year.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, no matter how you address the issue, the coalition budget is far and away, more beneficial and less extreme than the bombastic Republican budget. This Republican budget continues the policies of wanton destruction of this Nation's environment, human capital, and technological infrastructure.

May I remind my colleagues that absolutely none of the deficit reduction attempts being attempted would have been possible without the previous efforts of both Presidents Bush and Clinton. Regardless of what my Republican colleagues will tell you, getting toward a balanced budget is neither a new or distinctly Republican idea—it is an American idea. However, it is an idea which must be achieved through thoughtful and careful policies designed to make the taxpayers' money work harder without destroying the social and technological progress that this Nation has built, and the coalition budget does this.

As an example, the members of the Science Committee soundly rejected last year, the privatization of the Department of Energy's National Laboratories. We did so because Republicans and Democrats alike understood how important these precious national resources are. Mr. KASICH and his Republican colleagues obviously do not, since they would carelessly sell off these irreplaceable technological jewels to the highest bidder. It is clear that they were thinking no farther ahead than November 2, and their desire for a political trophy.

Mr. Chairman, I would venture to say that those proposing the coalition budget are even more serious about deficit reduction than the Republican proposal. The coalition budget cuts the deficit without tax cuts. The coalition budget cuts the deficit while spending more on education, economic development, and scientific research. They can do this because this budget postpones tax cuts until after the budget has been balanced.

The world is not the simplistic place that Republicans in this House would have us believe. It is a pool of economic sharks. In the globally competitive environment that American businesses and their employees are in today, the only way to survive and prosper is through investing in the things which drive the engine of economic growth: education, research and development, training and economic development. In our collective haste toward a zero deficit, let us not eat our children's seed-corn. Let us not leave them with a deficiency of educated workers, a paucity of new technology and an abundance of sick elderly and low-income citizens.

Cutting the deficit is not painless, but the coalition budget is far more reasonable and far more careful about how it applies this pain. The coalition budget is far more concerned about changing, but keeping viable, this country's safety net of Medicare, Medicaid and welfare.

Those supporting the Republican budget speak frequently of saving the future for our children and our children's children, but what future will they have living in a polluted environment? Throughout their tenure as the majority, the Republicans have fought an unyielding war against the environment. A leopard cannot change its spots and regardless of how many zoos the Speaker visits and how many nature walks Republican freshmen take, their record and their budget speak for themselves. It is only due to the cries and raised voices of anger against the Republican antienvironment agenda that they seemed to have changed their colors, but we know that the special interests are giving heavily in this campaign season and eventually we will see those environment-destroying policies surface yet again.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this coalition budget and keep intact our children's true future, the one of continued technological advancement, economic leadership, environmental stewardship and a balanced Federal budget.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget resolution introduced by the coalition to balance the budget by the year 2002, and salute my coalition colleagues for presenting a responsible, viable plan that meets the needs of our Nation today and our collective future.

I oppose provisions of the Republican budget that assume dramatic and detrimental changes in Medicare, Medicaid, welfare, and the earned income tax credit—all in the name of increased defense spending and tax breaks which we cannot afford. Block grants, medical savings accounts, higher Medicare premiums, increasing taxes on the working poor, eliminating guaranteed healthcare for children, women, and seniors, and denying benefits to legal immigrants are not solutions to our country's financial crisis.

This proposal maintains basic human services at adequate levels. The coalition budget does not eliminate bilingual education programs or the direct lending program for student loans. Nor does it privatize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I believe the Republican cuts to these programs would harm children, our future, and I oppose them.

Further, the Republican budget does not adequately protect our natural resources and

the environment, reducing funding for these programs by 10 percent. The Department of Energy and its key research programs on alternative fuels, clean coal technology, and renewable energy would be eliminated. The coalition proposal freezes funding for natural resources and the environment at levels that are adequate to maintain the progress we have made in cleaning up our air, water, and land.

Under the Republican budget, the important work of the National Institutes of Health would be endangered. Just recently, scientists have found the gene that causes breast cancer, and they are hopeful that this information will help them develop a cure for the disease. Now is not the time to decrease funds for this type of research. The coalition budget includes an additional $8.7 billion for this and other health research functions.

Budgets always lack something. Neither includes a targeted capital gains tax cut, which I believe is critical to sustaining and increasing the level of economic growth we have enjoyed in this country. The Republican budget pays lipservice to capital gains by indicating that such a tax cut may be possible, but only if offsets can be found in the Tax Code. However, their budget resolution does not assume a capital gains tax cut. And it is clear that under the Republican proposal, there is not enough left over from savings over the 6 years to pay for such a tax cut.

There is a need to permanently extend the research and development tax credit. Our country's leadership in high technology will wither if we do not reward our companies for investment in research and development of new products. These provisions, coupled with the Republicans proposal to eliminate the Department of Commerce, will sound a death-knell for our country's preeminence in the high technology arena.

The coalition's budget is the most viable approach to deficit reduction, toward a balanced budget by 2002, with some tough medicine, and a recognition that we can retain investments in our people, and not abandon our principles to do so.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the coalition budget.

The coalition budget is a fair and steady approach toward a balanced budget in 2002.

It adds $137 billion less than the Republican plan to the debt because it does not delay the majority of the spending cuts to the last 2 years.

The resolutions before us today are just numbers, but attached to these numbers are fundamental policy assumptions.

While it is encouraging to see the Republicans abandon some of the extreme cuts in last year's budget and bring their numbers closer to the coalition's budget, they retain many of the same dangerous and radical policy assumptions.

The Republicans offer $168 billion in Medicare savings, while the coalition plan offers $146 billion in savings.

The differences, however, are more than the $21 billion would suggest.

The coalition budget achieves greater savings from means-testing the Medicare part B premium for upper income beneficiaries by using existing methods to collect the premiums. The Republican proposal assumes essentially the same provider cuts that were contained in the reconciliation bill that was vetoed last year.

Both proposals provide Medicare beneficiaries with increased choice of private options. The coalition budget, however, protects seniors in rural and other under-served areas and protects seniors from managed care plans charging beneficiaries additional amounts beyond the part B premium.

It also appropriately limits the radical medical savings account proposal to a demonstration program.

The $2 billion difference between the Republican $72 billion cut and the coalition's $70 billion cut from Medicaid masks the fact that the Republican plan permits States to cut their Medicaid funding by an additional $178 billion, seriously undermining our commitment to the poor, the disabled, and the elderly.

We can cut Medicaid growth without eliminating the guaranteed coverage to the poor, the disabled, and the elderly, and the coalition budget does.

We can balance the budget without eliminating the Departments of Commerce and Energy; and the coalition budget does so.

We can save $42 billion from welfare programs while at the same time meet the Governors' request for providing adequate funding child care so that the parents can return to work.

We can reduce fraud in the earned income tax credit without imposing a tax increase of $20 billion on the working poor.

Mr. Speaker for the those and a host of other reasons I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget and support the coalition budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A record vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 295, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

AYES—130

Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bishop
Blute
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Campbell
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins (MI)
Condit
Cramer
Davis
de la Garza
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Furse
Geren
Gibbons
Gordon
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kennelly
Klug
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Leach
Lincoln
Lofgren
Luther
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Minge
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roukema
Sabo
Sawyer
Schroeder
Scott
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Spratt
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Towns
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Wamp
Ward
Watt (NC)
Wilson
Wise
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOES—295

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dixon
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Pelosi
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)	Thornton	Weldon (FL)
Smith (WA)	Thurman	Weldon (PA)
Solomon	Tiahrt	Weller
Souder	Torkildsen	White
Spence	Torres	Whitfield
Stark	Torricelli	Wicker
Stearns	Traficant	Williams
Stockman	Upton	Wolf
Stump	Velazquez	Woolsey
Stupak	Vucanovich	Yates
Tate	Walker	Young (FL)
Taylor (NC)	Walsh	Zeliff
Tejeda	Waters	Zimmer
Thomas	Watts (OK)	
Thornberry	Waxman	

NOT VOTING—8

Ehlers	Miller (CA)	Paxon
Ford	Miller (FL)	Talent
Hayes	Molinari	

☐ 1415

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Paxon against.

Messrs. EVERETT, MOAKLEY, HORN, and SERRANO, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. MATSUI changed his 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.

☐ 1415

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment designated in paragraph 3 of section 2 of House Resolution 435.

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

Mr. SABO. 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. SABO:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997.

The Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

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

Fiscal year 1997: $1,092,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,146,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,195,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,244,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,309,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,389,900,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: −$7,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: −$2,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: −$2,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$7,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$1,721,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $16,024,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $1,325,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,374,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,413,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,454,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,496,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,528,300,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $1,321,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,375,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,408,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,447,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,466,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,498,400,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $228,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $229,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $212,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $202,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $156,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $108,500,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $5,441,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $5,713,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,964,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,204,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,395,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,542,900,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $45,451,000,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $172,005,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $254,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $229,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $258,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $256,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $263,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $270,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $263,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $279,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $266,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $287,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,200,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $15,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,067,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $18,624,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $13,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,300,000,00.
(B) Outlays, $13,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $15,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,600,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $3,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,620,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $2,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,100,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $21,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $36,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $21,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $21,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $20,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $21,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $23,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,600,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,605,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,900,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $8,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,536,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $97,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $10,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $42,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $415,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $571,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $36,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $33,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $30,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $34,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $37,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,300,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $9,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,952,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,885,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $9,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,300,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $53,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $21,770,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $19,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $54,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $56,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $58,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $60,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $63,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,400,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $136,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $136,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $140,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $144,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $151,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $151,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $158,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $159,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $164,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $176,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,600,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $193,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $191,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $209,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $207,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $222,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $236,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $234,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $252,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $272,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,900,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $231,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $244,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $255,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $256,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $271,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $280,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $296,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $292,900,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $7,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $9,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,800,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $39,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,344,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,548,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $37,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $36,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $35,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $37,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $39,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,800,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $23,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $24,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $25,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $25,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,000,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $15,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $15,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $15,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $16,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $282,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $282,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $289,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $289,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $293,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $293,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $296,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $296,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $301,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $301,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $307,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $307,500,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1997:

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

(B) Outlays, −$500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $106,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, −$0.

(B) Outlays, −$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, −$0.

(B) Outlays, −$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$0.

(B) Outlays, −$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$12,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$16,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$36,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$36,800,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, −$43,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$43,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, −$35,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$35,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, −$35,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$35,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$38,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$38,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$41,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$41,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$62,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$62,200,000,000.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) Not later than June 21, 1996, the House committees named in subsection (b) 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.

(b)(1) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $2,062,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $14,816,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $18,457,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(2) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $3,346,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $2,755,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $3,143,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(3) The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $5,717,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $128,862,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $207,698,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(4) The House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $633,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $4,923,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $6,040,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(5) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $840,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $7,236,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $9,086,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(6) The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays, as follows: $51,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, and reduce outlays by $84,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $147,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(7) The House Committee on National Security shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $79,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $472,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $1,753,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(8) The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $112,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $372,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $391,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(9) The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $42,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $255,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $363,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(10) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $148,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, $3,870,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and $5,284,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(11) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the deficit, as follows: by $1,024,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and decrease the deficit by $64,619,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and by $117,820,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(c) DEFINITION.—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.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

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

Mr. Chairman, one is always faced with choice, and alternatives are never as perfect as one would like them. I was a strong supporter of the coalition budget, which was just, I think unfortunately, defeated on the House floor. That was my preference as the best way to achieve a balanced budget. Now I offer another alternative, the budget as presented by the President of the United States.

As an alternative to the Republican proposal, it is clearly far superior for a number of reasons. It does balance in 6 years, as scored by CBO; but, more important, it makes very fundamental reforms in how we run numerous governmental programs but is still fair to beneficiaries.

It does make fundamental changes in Medicare but does it in a fashion that does not do long-term damage to the program like those proposed by the Republican majority. It makes fundamental change in reform of Medicaid in a way to save money for both the Federal and State and local governments, but it still continues to assure adequate health care for the vulnerable, elderly, disabled, and children in our society.

It has fiscal restraints as it relates to discretionary spending, but still provides the opportunity to invest in education and training, research and development, and investing in the basic infrastructure of this country.

It reforms welfare in a fashion that is tough on work, not tough on kids.

So, Mr. Chairman, at this point, I strongly urge a ''yes'' vote for the President's budget as an alternative that is clearly superior for the American public and for the future of our economy to the proposal of the Republican majority.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I would hope that Members would look very carefully at what they have in the budget that is before them now; that is the President's budget. Because the fact is that this is, indeed, a UFO budget.

Our friend, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, has said on a number of occasions that when they took a poll some time back they found that among young people more of them believed in UFO's than believed they would ever collect Social Security and Medicare because they thought the whole process was breaking down.

Obviously, the administration took that poll to heart and designed a budget around the UFO philosophy, because

what they have here is a budget that has unidentified spending cuts in it, that has a family tax increase in it, and it has ominously higher deficits in 1997 and 1998.

Now, think about this for a moment. They come to us today with a budget that, first of all, suggests that it is in balance while at the end of the process, in the year 2002, they have huge, tens of billions of dollars of money they do not identify in terms of spending cuts.

The gentleman from Minnesota just told us that they will protect education and research and training. How do we know? There are massive spending cuts that are not identified in this budget. It is not real.

There is a tax increase in here. If we take the CBO estimates and we take them out to the year 2002, what we find is it takes $16 billion of unspecified taxes in order to balance the budget. That is $16 billion of a middle class tax increase.

So the American families are now being treated to the specter of people saying they are going to cut spending but, in the meantime, what are they doing? They are raising taxes.

And, finally, Mr. Chairman, if we believe they are going to balance the budget, how do we get along with this idea that in the President's budget the deficits go up in 1997 and 1998? That is true. Now, he claims what he is doing is having us on a downward slope toward a balanced budget. But, instead, in 1997 and 1998, where do the deficits go? The deficits go up, not down.

If we were the American people sitting out there, would we believe that the deficits can go up and still balance the budget? I do not think so.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the President says he wants a balanced budget, but in reality he has not produced one. He says he wants to lower the deficit year after year, and as we just heard, he does not do that either. And the President has said that he wants to save Medicare, at least on occasion, and end welfare as we know it, and that does not happen.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the President's budget is a budget of assumptions, it is a budget of hunches, it is a budget of nonspecifics, it is a budget based on if's; what if this happens, what if that happens.

The Republican budget is a concrete budget that returns power, influence and money back to the people of this country. It is a budget that gives a reasonable tax cut to working Americans, and this is in contrast to the President's budget that does none of this.

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

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, there is a stark contrast between the Republican budget and the President's budget on one issue. On the issue of tax cuts there is a clear and flagrant difference.

The Republicans give real, meaningful tax cuts. The President gives essentially no tax cuts and, indeed, in the last year of his budget he raises taxes by $14 billion just to bring, by smoke and mirrors, his budget into balance at the last minute.

Mr. Chairman, I make no apology for arguing for tax cuts. We Republicans trust Americans to spend their money more wisely than we do. But let us talk about that issue. We are here concerned about the deficit and the debt.

The truth is we have an anemic economy growing at 2 percent a year. Historically our economy has grown over the last 30 years at 3.6 percent. Now it is growing at only 2 percent. If we could enact the tax cuts that President Clinton vetoed, we could unleash this economy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting a budget that stops the situation where Americans pay more in food and clothing than they do in taxes.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not vote for the President's budget, but I will tell my colleagues one thing: This President has brought the budget deficit down. This President, contrary to Mr. Bush, contrary to Mr. Reagan, who in 1981 said, ''If you will only adopt my tax cut, things are going to be rosy.'' They were rosy, all right, all red. All red. All deficits.

I voted for the coalition budget because I thought it was real. The Republican budget is not real. The President, this President, has already brought the budget deficit down 3 years in the running, the first time that has been done since Harry Truman. It will be a 4th year by my Republican colleagues' figures and our figures, which will be the first time in this century that the budget deficit has come down 4 years running.

President Clinton did it because he had the courage to put forth an economic program in 1993 that was real. It was not easy, but it was real, and none on the Republican side voted for it, so they cannot take credit for bringing the deficit down. All they can take credit for is putting it up $4 trillion.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, in 1981 we had similar supply-side economics as the majority is projecting today. In 1981 we were told that by 1984 the budget would be in balance. Instead, we had a deficit of $175 billion.

When we were told we should cut taxes and something good would happen to the deficit, instead it exploded. Spending exploded under the Reagan program and the deficit went to $175 billion, under the same theory that the majority leadership has today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I have heard many times here today and on television in the last few days that the President raised taxes, the biggest taxes raised in history. That is not true, but we will not debate that at this time.

Every Member in this body had more people getting a tax cut under the President's 1993 package than had an increase. In the 8th District of North Carolina, 1,100 people had a tax increase and 54,000 people had a tax cut because of the EITC, the Earned Income Tax Credit, which the majority is going to do away with in this budget. They are going to practically do away with that. If a taxpayer makes $20,000 a year and does not have any children, they will not get any tax relief. So much for the middle income folks.

Let me tell Members this. Here is what we have done, and I am speaking about ''we'' because we are all Americans. Since President Clinton has been President, we have created 8 million new jobs. People say the President created those jobs, but they were created in the United States of America. We have lowered interest rates and produced the lowest combined rate of unemployment since 1968.

I was at a reception last night for a group of people that are not Democratic supporters, and one of the gentlemen was in the furniture business. I said, ''How has business been in the past 3½ years?'' He said, ''It has been the best it has ever been since I have been in business.'' And this is a family business. ''I have made more money in the last 3½ years than I have ever made in business.''

Now, the same people that are coming here today to tell us how great this Republican package is and how bad the 1993 package was, let me just read some of the statements that were being made when we were considering the President's package back in 1993.

□ 1430

In 1993, the Speaker of the House said: The tax increase will kill jobs and lead to a recession, and the recession will force people off of work and on to unemployment and will actually increase the deficit.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. What, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HEFNER. That was the Speaker of the House, distinguished Representative NEWT GINGRICH. The President, the chairman of the Budget Committee in the other body, said April fool, America. This Clinton budget plan will not create jobs, will not grow the economy, and will not reduce the deficit. These are not my words. It was said in the Dallas Morning News.

Our distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, who is a

very dear friend of mine, made these statements: We are going to find out whether we have higher deficits. We are going to find out whether we have a slower economy. We are going to find out what is going to happen to interest rates, and it is our opinion that this budget is a killer.

He goes on to say the Democrats have a job-killer program. It is like a snake bite. The venom is going to be injected into the body of this economy in our judgment, and it is going to spread throughout the body and is going to begin to kill the jobs that Americans now have.

And it goes on and on. I could give other names: DICK ARMEY, CONNIE MACK, Congressman DORNAN, WALLY HERGER, JOEL HEFLEY, CHARLES GRASSLEY, JIM BUNNING, JOHN CHAFEE, JOSEPH KNOLLENBERG, JIM RAMSTAD, and it goes on and on and on.

Mr. SABO. If the gentleman would continue to yield, has the deficit not gone down?

Mr. HEFNER. Yes.

We have created 8 million new jobs. The deficit is down. They have continued to go down for 3 years, on the 4th year of a downward trend on the deficit. It will go down even more this year than it would if we pass this Republican so-called family friendly budget that is going to help the middle class.

This budget was a sham when it was projected a few months ago. It is a sham today and I do not blame BOB DOLE from disengaging from this process that the Republicans are putting forward.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds only to say that the reason the deficit went down is that the President of the United States and the Democrats in Congress enacted the largest tax increase in American history.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to two of the points made by the previous speaker. First of all, he said that not only was the earned income tax credit being cut. We have heard that one before. He said it was practically being dismantled.

Now, I know the gentleman from North Carolina has been around Washington a lot longer than I have. Maybe that is part of the problem here. This is how much has been spent in the last 6 years on the earned income tax credit. This is how much, $109 billion; $155 billion would be spent in the next 6 years.

Mr. Chairman, that is dismantling the EITC? I do not think so. But only in Washington-speak, only those people that have been around here all the time and only think of everything when it doubles every year think that we are actually cutting or dismantling the earned income tax credit.

On the second point, as far as the deficit is concerned, I would point out that President Bush, the Congressional Budget Office under a Democratic Congress, a Democratic administration, proposed in a Republican administration, said that the deficit was going to go down each of the succeeding years after 1992. The President's budget starting in 1993 showed deficits that stretched into infinity.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK].

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, our budget shows our trust in the American people to make their own decisions. We want to let them control their money and design programs that will solve the problems at home. I know firsthand that the local people can be trusted to do this. You know, when I was Mayor, we did not hold our hand out to the Federal Government. We simply went ahead, worked together to move people off of the Federal dependency and into self-sufficiency.

We got a lot of ideas for others to follow, like a public housing venture that literally moves people out of public housing and into home ownership. We have a housing partnership that last year built 119 homes, sold those homes, and 65 of those homes were sold to people who had previously been in public housing.

We started a homeless shelter with private community support that in the last 2 years has put over 500 men back into the workplace. We have coordinated job training program that actually does help young people, not only with training but puts them into their first job. We are turning lives around one at a time and it works. It works because we work together to help people achieve self-sufficiency and because we can tailor the program to fit the need.

Our budget allows communities all over America to use their ingenuity and help to do their own programs to solve their own problems, and it works so much better than a bureaucrat in Washington, DC, trying to tell them how to do it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I have been here for 20 years, and I have seen a lot of budgets. Each year that I vote on budgets, I have not found one yet that I can agree with 100 percent. But this time, and basically that is why I voted for the coalition budget, because there was only one item in there that I disagreed with. Now I am faced, like every Member of this House is faced, with a prospect that if we do not pass the President's budget, which I do not agree with on certain things, all I have got left is this monstrosity that the majority has presented to us that will ruin rural America.

I have no choice. I do not think anybody in this House has any choice. The only alternative I have is the President's budget, and it is a whole lot better than what I see coming from them. What does it do? Well, it protects and provides funds for education, which is big for my district and the United States of America. It provides for medicare. It does not make those reductions that they make in medicare and medicaid, which will devastate my rural hospitals.

I am from a rural district. yes, this is going to mean closings. My hospital association says it means closing within 5 years of some of my rural hospitals. What does that do? I guess they can go out and find the money and provide for the hospitals. Sorry, folks, it is not going to work that way. The President's budget provides for environment, rural development, and it is balanced. yes, in the same period of time, it is a balanced budget.

Although I do not believe we should do tax cuts until we have a balanced budget, and I firmly believe that, that is one of the areas I disagree with the President's budget, but I can vote on that as a later issue.

So I am asking the Members of this House, if they do not want to take the radical approach, you know, I heard two Members of that opposite party last month when I was talking federalism with them, said the Federal Government should do two things: Defend our shores and deliver the mail. They were not so sure about delivering the mail. Think about that. That is radical, just defend our shores and do nothing else.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM].

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

If there is a young person who, for whatever reason, missed school today and is sitting, listening to this debate, let me tell them why I think their country is in such debt and why I think the President's budget does not help a whole lot. The deficit is about $150 billion. There is a thing called the national debt that, as I speak, is $5,098,866,418,898. It is worth $19,250 for every man, woman, child in America.

The reason that we got a $5 trillion debt is because entitlement spending in this country has gone through the roof, and both parties are sitting here yelling at each other about who caused the problem. In my opinion, both parties have let the entitlements grow to the point that they are 50 percent of the budget. When we add the interest element to the equation, 67 percent of the Federal budget is on auto pilot. If you want us to balance the budget, please make us change the reason Medicare has grown 2,200 percent since 1980. If you want to free America up, balance the budget and help people, please change welfare so the average person does not stay on it 10 years. If you want us to do something about education in your State, please make us

change Medicaid so it does not grow at 19 percent a year and takes money away from the State to run its education program just to get health care dollars.

President Clinton's budget has no entitlement reforms. It does not address why we are in debt. It does not change any of the reasons that led to every man, woman, and child owing $19,000 today. If you want us to change America, let us give choices and get government back home.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We are still talking here today about the need to balance the budget, to reduce the burden on future generations. That is important, and I certainly concur with that belief. But I think it is very important too that we protect future generations and ensure that a good quality of life is going to be available to our grandchildren as was available to us.

The Republican budget resolution does not adhere to this principle. The amendment before us now, which incorporates President Clinton's 6-year balanced budget plan, will continue to invest in our children. It will provide quality, affordable health care to our senior citizens and the disabled, provide tax incentives targeted to the middle class and stimulate further economic growth and development.

The choice before us is simple: We either invest now in critical programs aimed at improving the quality and standard of living in the United States, programs like education, community development, biomedical research, national assistance, public safety, small business development, trade promotion, clean air and clean water, and so forth. Or we can refuse to meet the basic responsibilities of the Federal Government and turn our backs on the most vulnerable, the senior citizen, the children, the disabled, and the poor.

I support investing in the future, and I will support the Sabo amendment. I urge my colleagues too, as well. I hope you would carefully review this proposal because many of the policy assumptions that were included in the budget have always enjoyed bipartisan support. The budget, as I stated before, it balanced. It includes real middle-class tax cuts without adding to the deficit or without using Medicare cuts to pay for tax cuts for the rich.

It includes a proposal to give premium subsidies to individuals who lose their health insurance when they lose their jobs. It also assumes real increases in biomedical research, maintains a strong commitment to civilian research and development, increases our investment again in our children in education. It also calls for the restoration of tax fairness by targeting tax relief to the real middle class, and the amendment assumes the deduction for qualifying. This is most important. The deduction of $5,000 a year to educate and training expenses in 1996, 1997, and 1998 and in 1999 raises it to $10,000.

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

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

At times I am asked, "What's the hardest part of being a Congressman?" I could easily talk about the grueling schedule or the complexity of legislation or the fact that we live in glass houses—or maybe the answer for many of us has to do with how hard it is to be missing in action from our families so much of the time.

But one of the toughest things I grapple with on days like today is determining when something is good enough to support as "moving the mark forward" and when it just doesn't quite pass muster.

I refuse to be part of the mentality so prevalent these days that claims compromise is a dirty word. Working things out, finding a middle ground—that's part of the life blood of a Democratic legislative body.

But I also know the danger of wink-and-nod acquiescence to inferior agreements crafted too much for political expediency and not enough in honest confrontation of difficult problems—problems like the deficit.

I sincerely praise both the President and the Republicans for promoting specific and legitimate balanced budgets this year. I am proud as a Democrat to note that, with one exception, this is the first time since the last Democratic President that, the House has voted on a Presidential budget scored as being in balance by the Congressional Budget Office.

Just as the majority has moved toward the coalition budget by moderating many of their savings, the President has moved toward the coalition budget by tackling some of the tough choices necessary to reach balance. While more movement from both sides is necessary, the fact that each has come toward the coalition's numbers in the center gives me some hope we still can seal a balanced budget agreement.

But in the final analysis today, I think both the President's and the majority's budgets have done too much winking and nodding when it comes to deficit reduction. Republicans want too much to raid my grandson's pockets to pay for today's tax cuts. Having lived through the failed promises of the 1980's tax cuts, I won't walk down that path again.

Likewise, the President wants to dip into my grandson's pockets to pay for grandpa's Social Security and Medicare. Having watched the uncontrolled ballooning of those programs in the early 1990's, I won't follow that path either.

President Clinton, and Chairman KASICH both deserve recognition for heightening the debate on balancing the budget. But both proposals fall short when measured on the deficit reduction yardstick. I will oppose both, having just supported the only obvious compromise and the plan most dedicated to deficit reduction, the coalition budget. Our substitute postponed tax cuts until the budget is balanced, provided a steady deficit reduction glide path, and has less total debt than any of the other options before us. It also avoided unlikely off-triggers on taxes and other questionable budget devises found in both of the other budgets.

Americans are asking for bipartisanship, for honesty, integrity, and responsibility, and for constructive solutions. It's time to respond to those demands.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Stearns.]

Mr. STEARNS. I thank my colleague. Let me give an analogy on this debate. Let us say you are overweight by 100 pounds. You are trying to lose weight over a 7-year period. Would you take a plan where in the first 2 years you gain 100 pounds and then in the next 2 years you try to lose it, then in the final year you really make an effort to reduce that 100 pounds? Of course not, it will not work.

This same principle is applying to the Clinton budget. The President's budget is such that the largest spending reductions are in the 7th year. Also under the President's budget, deficits go up in the early years. We certainly do not need that, either.

How many of this floor remember what the President said in 1993 about his tax increase? He said, "You might think I raised your taxes too much. Well, it might surprise you to know that I think I raised your taxes too much too." And in fact his tax increase was the largest of the 19 increases we have had on this floor since 1981.

□ 1445

Mr. Chairman, I ask, "Isn't it time that after 15 years we should have one single tax cut?" We should not have to wait another 17 years.

Also, my colleagues, Prof. Thomas Hopkins of the University of Rochester indicated that the annual cost of Federal regulation has risen since 1981 over the equivalent of $6,000 for every single American while the party of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has been in control for the last 40 years.

Come on, Mr. President. It is time for a new direction. Even the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. HOYER, came on this House floor and said he is not going to vote for the Clinton budget, so why should Mr. SABO?

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], because it is so much better than the Republican alternative.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, why does not the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and many of the gentleman's other colleagues come on the House floor and say they do not support the Clinton budget?

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I cannot respond for other people. I can only say

the President's record on deficit reduction, on rational discipline of the Government is so much superior to previous Republican administrations. His proposal today is so far superior to the majority proposal that it is a simple and easy vote for me to vote ''yes'' despite the fact I would have preferred some other alternative.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North California [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I might have an answer.

Might be the reason the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is not going to vote for it might be the reason that 20-some of the Republicans voted for the coalition budget because they think it is so much better than the Republican budget.

I say about the Republican budget it is like the one we had many years ago. This budget is like an ugly child. We have to tie a pork chop around its neck to get the dogs to play with it.

So this is a terrible budget.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds only to say that the members of their party will flee from their budget like scalded dogs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Clinton budget and in support of the House Republican budget proposal.

I also want to express my appreciation to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee.

He and his staff worked closely with the committee on Veterans' Affairs on the Republican budget, and it shows in the favorable provisions for veterans.

The President's plan would balance the budget on the backs of our Nation's veterans, drastically cutting VA medical care spending.

The House Republican budget plan provides $100 million more next year and $5 billion more over the next 6 years than the Clinton plan for veterans' medical care spending.

The President's plan takes more cuts out of veterans programs for deficit reduction but still falls short of balancing the budget, denying all veterans the economic advantages of a balanced Federal budget.

Our plan balances the budget while providing nearly $230 million for increases to veterans' earned benefit programs, which are not in the President's budget.

In the words of President Clinton's Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Jesse Brown, and I quote, ''The President's budget would devastate VA.''

In a letter dated May 14, 1996, to Secretary Brown, the national commanders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, and the Paralyzed Veterans of America stated and I quote:

> Our Nation's sick and disabled veterans deserve a viable health care system devoted to them and their special health care needs. . . . President Clinton's seven year balanced budget proposal does not provide the funding necessary to meet these needs.

I urge my colleagues to join the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs and the major veterans service organizations in denouncing the Clinton budget proposals for veterans by voting ''no'' and defeating the Presidents' plan.

For over a year, Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Jesse Brown has bashed Republicans in Congress with a barrage of fraudulent and deceptive attacks about the Republican budget's impact on veterans' programs.

Secretary Brown has misled veterans to believe that the Republican budget would impose a means test on service-connected benefits, tax veterans' benefits, remove disabled veterans from compensation rolls, and cut compensation for other disabled veterans. The Balanced Budget Act contained none of those proposals, and Secretary Brown knows it did not. He has also widely claimed that he would be forced to close numerous VA hospitals because of the budget.

With the apparent approval of the President and clear knowledge of the facts, Secretary Brown continues spreading misinformation. He goes so far as to suggest in battlefield metaphor that ''veterans are under attack by hostile forces within this nation. Those forces are Members of Congress. * * * We must stay alert because we have hypocrites in the land.''

Yes, there are hypocrites in Washington. They are creating a pattern of deception, purposely telling half-truths to scare veterans for political advantage. But, they are not the Republican Members of Congress.

Let's take a look at the pattern of deception. In the 1994 budget, President Clinton's Office of Management and Budget planned to cut 27,000 VA employees as part of the Clinton administration's heralded reinventing Government effort to reduce the Federal work force by 252,000 positions by the year 2000. Congress, at that time controlled by the Democrats, blocked the proposal and worked out a compromise limiting the VA cuts to 10,051 employees. In the 1995 budget, President Clinton proposed the first installment of these VA personnel reductions. Secretary Brown presented it to Congress and defended the President's budget, which included cutting VA medical care staffing by 3,400. Congress refused to accept the budget, allocating $100 million more than Secretary Brown had requested for VA medical care. Despite this increase, VA eliminated 3,436 medical care positions and closed 2,300 hospital beds. Clearly, these medical staff reductions and bed closures were not budget driven. They were part of an overall plan to move VA's health care system in line with private sector models, emphasizing outpatient and primary care.

For 1996, after prolonged budget debates, Congress increased VA medical care spending by $400 million above the prior year. Secretary Brown shrieked for months that veterans would suffer due to lost hospital beds and medical staff cuts. He forecast catastrophe and called Congress mean spirited wherever he traveled. Throughout the year, Republican leaders assured veterans that medical care funding would remain sufficient to provide well managed, quality care.

In recent testimony before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Secretary Brown stated that his dire predictions did not happen because of increased efficiencies and consolidations of service. He did not explain why his predictions failed to reflect VA's already planned efficiencies and consolidations. This raises the question of whether he was out of the loop or just scaring veterans for political purposes.

Testimony of the Under Secretary of Health, Dr. Kenneth Kizer, confirmed the previous reductions of work force and hospital beds did not result from budget cuts but were part of VA's initial efforts to reform the way it provides care. Dr. Kizer said, ''We are fundamentally reengineering and reinventing the health care system so that it goes from a hospital based system to an ambulatory care-based system that is rooted in primary care.'' He added, that VA would ''continue to emphasize improved and increased accessibility and quality of VA health care.''

Having admitted that his dire predictions did not come true, one might expect Secretary Brown to cool his rhetoric, correct the record, and reassure veterans that quality health care delivery is being maintained.

But on a recent trip to Colorado, Secretary Brown blamed Congress again for cuts, implying that staffing reductions are purely budget driven and are having a negative impact on the delivery of care.

The Secretary has a responsibility to tell veterans the truth about what is really going on within VA health care and the President's budget.

Secretary Brown should tell veterans that the President's budget requests a further medical care work force reduction of 5,000 in 1997. He should also tell veterans that he has sought and received authority from the President to reduce VA's medical work force by 10,000 persons over the next 2 years. And, he should tell veterans that these additional proposed reductions are a continuation of VA's reorganization efforts, can be achieved without negatively impacting health care delivery, and are not simply budget driven reductions.

When on the road, at taxpayer expense, the Secretary says nothing about President Clinton's budget for VA health care in future years. He should be honest with veterans and tell them that the President's budget takes VA medical care from a high of $17 billion in fiscal year 1997 down to a low of $13 billion in fiscal year 2000 without one word of explanation about how this would be accomplished. When asked about this at a hearing, Secretary Brown told the obvious truth saying, ''The President's outyear numbers would devastate VA.''

As a self-proclaimed advocate for veterans, Secretary Brown should have the courage to tell the truth—to tell veterans and their families that the House Republican budget is better for veterans than the President's budget. The House budget proposes to spend nearly $100 million more on VA health care in 1997 than President Clinton, and $5.1 billion more on VA health care than the President over the next 6 years. Additionally, the House budget requires less in savings from veterans' programs to balance the budget and provides for nearly

$230 million in benefit improvements that are not contained in the Clinton budget plan. Those are the facts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to the President's budget. I agree with the Secretary of the VA that the President's budget will, in fact, be devastating to the VA. The President slashes VA medical care spending by $4 billion while at the same time raiding $18 million from the National Cemetery Service at the same time as more veterans, in fact, are dying. It bothers me tremendously.

One point I would like to make is, I have to ask where is the President's commitment? I ask that because the President, first he said he would balance the budget in 5 years, then he said we can do it in 7 years, then he said I think we can do it in 9 years, then he said I think we will balance the budget in 10 years, then he said I think we can reach it in 8 years, then he said somewhere between 7 and 9, and today he sent to the floor a budget for 6 years.

Where is the commitment? This is a President that opposed the balanced budget amendment. Bill Clinton has the commitment of a Kamikaze pilot on his 37th mission.

Where is your commitment, Mr. President?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would caution Members their remarks should be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to only say it is the President's program that reduced the Federal deficit by more than 50 percent over all the ''no'' votes of the Republican, now majority, when they were in the minority. It is the President's program that has brought record growth of over 8½ million new jobs since 1993. The President does not have to listen to lectures from people who voted ''no'' on real deficit reduction in 1993. He has not just talked about it, he has done it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER]

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the President's budget is not perfect, but the President's budget does prove that we can balance the budget in 6 years without extreme cuts in health care and education and housing and law enforcement and environmental protection. But while those extreme proposals get most of the attention, I would like to point out to other areas of the extremist Republican budget that have at least as many bad implications for our future, and those areas are scientific research and development and our public transportation.

The Committee on the Budget plan cuts civilian science by $15 billion over 6 years. It phases research and solar and renewable energy way down and wipes out energy conservation and research in fossil energy efficiencies. It eliminates technology partnerships with businesses, including advanced technology development and manufacturing extension.

Now, these are the very investments that create high-paying jobs to grow our economy while protecting our environment and quality of life.

Now, public transportation gets people to jobs and to their medical appointments while conserving energy and protecting the environment. Completely missing the interconnection between public transportation and our energy and environmental security needs, the Republican budget slashes support for transportation systems that are used in every urban community, large and small, all over America.

What kind of future will those policies leave us? Well, a bleak future at best.

So we should reject the Committee on the Budget's renewal of extremist proposals and adopt instead the President's budget as a far better investment in our future, and I urge all my colleagues to support the President's sensible priorities.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I find the use of the term ''extremist'' in reference to the Republican budget rather ironic when looking at the section dealing with veterans' health care spending. The veterans in this country want a balanced budget. They know what it is to sacrifice for our country, and they want a balanced budget, but they want a balanced budget that is fair, in which we do not attempt to balance the budget of this country on the backs of our Nation's veterans. The President's budget seeks to balance the budget on their backs at their expense.

That is why the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs rightly said that the President's budget would be devastating to the veterans' health care spending in this country, and that is why the national commanders of four of our major veteran service organizations wrote the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs this week saying that in fact there was not adequate funding for a viable health care system in the President's budget and urging that it not be supported and saying that they would oppose it and all other budgets that fail to provide for our veterans.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] earlier called the President's budget the UFO budget. I rather like that and think that is rather accurate. But if we look at the veteran section, we can call it the big dipper budget because in the next 4 years in the area of VA medical spending there is a 20-percent cut in veteran spending for health care in the President's budget. That is devastating. It would reduce from $17 to $13 billion over the next 4 years. It is over a 20-percent cut in medical care. We cannot tolerate that.

The President's budget would spend $5 billion less on veterans' medical care over the next 6 years than the Republican House budget. The House budget even next year spends $100 million more on VA health care than does the President.

There is nothing extreme about that, but there is fairness to our Nation's veterans.

Again I say, Mr. Chairman the veterans of this country want a balanced budget, but they want a balanced budget that is fair. They do not want, as this chart indicates, a 20-percent cut in medical care spending with no explanation of how those cuts will be achieved, simply putting them at the expense of our Nation's veterans. That is not right, it is not fair. The President's budget fails the fairness test for our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Chairman, that is why we need to oppose this Clinton budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Veterans funding is the gentleman's top priority. He should have voted for the coalition budget because that budget had less cuts in veterans' care than the majority proposal. But, in reality, what will govern the funds available for VA funding in the next several years is a total level of discretionary funding. That is what is going to give appropriations the flexibility for funding VA. Cuts in discretionary funding are much deeper, much more severe, than those projected in the President's budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE) 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 Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1997

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the President's 6-year balanced budget.

This debate is about much more than dollars and cents—it is about our Nation's fundamental priorities and values. The differences between the Gingrich budget and the President's budget are very clear. These plans offer competing visions for America's future,