HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, April 17, 1991*

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

As we pray each day for justice in the affairs of people, we remember particularly the hostages who are denied the freedoms that are their rightful heritage. Our earnest petition, O gracious and loving God, is that people will be moved by Your spirit of reconciliation and peace so that the hostages will again know the security and warmth of their own lands and their own families. May Your presence and Your abiding spirit be with them and be their hope and strength this day and every day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BARRETT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 740. An act to provide a new civil cause of action in Federal law for international terrorism that provides extraterritorial jurisdiction over terrorist acts abroad against United States nationals.

The message also announced that, pursuant to section 1024, title 15, of the United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. SMITH to the Joint Economic Committee.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM NATCHER: A NATIONAL TREASURE

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it is very rare when we uncover one national treasure within a week, but here we have uncovered two national treasures within 1 week. The first, an early copy of the U.S. Constitution, was found affixed to the rear of a picture bought at a flea market sale, and the second national treasure, uncovered just yesterday in the Washington Post, is the dean of the Kentucky congressional delegation, Congressman WILLIAM NATCHER. BILL NATCHER, my friend for these past 20-plus years, has served this Congress well. He is notable for the fact that since 1953 when he first walked into this Chamber, he has never missed a vote or a quorum call; but we who know him better know that his record goes beyond not missing votes. It is a positive record of civility, of decency, of competency, of courtliness, in the way he handles his responsibilities.

The only thing that I would say negative about the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] is that he always comes to the floor so elegantly clothed and so perfectly suited, so elegantly shod, that he makes all of us by contrast look disheveled, really quite messy and in disrepair.

But, with that sole exception, everything about the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] is wonderful and positive, and we in the Kentucky delegation are very proud to share our national treasure with the United States and the world.

I am including the Washington Post article which profiles BILL NATCHER at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 17, 1991]

CONGRESSMAN NATCHER, PRESENT ON ALL COUNTS—THE KENTUCKY OCTOGENARIAN'S VOTING VIGOR

(By Lois Romano)

In a world of excesses, he is a man of unheralded self-restraint. In a congressional atmosphere of frenetic fund-raising, surplus staff and haphazard attention to substance, he is a paradigm of order and control.

There is no one left on the Hill like him: "When I first got here 37 years ago, I was number 435 out of 435," says Congressman William Natcher. "I looked around the House floor and thought, 'None of you are ever going to die and none of you are ever going to retire.' Now, here I sit."

Where the gentleman from Kentucky sits is fourth from the top in the House of Representatives—in terms of both age and seniority. At 81, he is one of the most powerful members of Congress as evidenced by the $200 billion purse he controls as chairman of the labor, health and human services and education subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

He is a throwback to a time when seniority meant something, when a campaign could be paid for with a Texaco credit card, and roll calls weren't parliamentary weapons used to keep members in Washington.

That this Democratic representative has, for nearly four decades, made a total of 16,883 votes and quorum calls, paid for every campaign out of his own pocket and rarely uses more than a third of the congressional allowance provided to hire staff, is no small feat. He is the lone member of Congress who can boast as much.

"When I talk to new members I say to them maybe it's better in the beginning to miss one vote that isn't so important," says the member who has missed not a one. "I say to them I don't advise you to do this. When you've been here as long as I have and never missed a day or a vote, it's right around your neck."

He is a sweet and courtly man, who although revered by his congressional colleagues commands little attention off the Hill. "He fits the part of the congressman from the tip of his polished black shoes to the top of his white hair," says Vic Fazio (D-Calif.), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

"The ultimate Southern politician," adds Dennis Eckart (D-Ohio). "I assure you he knows every member's name."

"He's so identified with the institution and all that's good about it," says Mary Rose Oakar (D-Ohio), who became the first woman to sit on the gym committee that Natcher chairs.

The worst that is said about the man amounts to this: He is stubbornly practical about getting his massive appropriations bill—a prime target for wild-card funding amendments—through the Congress and past the White House. No horse trader, he. This singlemindedness, it is said, makes him rather inflexible when it comes to earmarking new or controversial monies, such as abortion funding. And predictably, he manifests his time-earned eccentricities.

Hearings start at 10 a.m. sharp, adjourn at noon and restart at 2 p.m. No exceptions. "And when you're interested in a particular project," advises one staffer, "you better not leave to go to the bathroom—he stops for no one. That old man will sit there during a mark-up in 100-degree weather in his three-piece navy suit till 8 o'clock at night without moving. And you better stay real close to him or you'll lose whatever it is you want."

He has saved about 16,000 pieces of mail sent to him over the years, and refuses to relinquish them to House storage rooms. They are packaged in brown paper and piled in a closet in his office, which he proudly shows off. "I have 200 letters from presidents," he says, as well as letters from "Tony Randall, Lynda Carter and Bob Hope. . . . I keep the originals." He also collects gavels, porcelain bells and replicas of White House china. His office looks like the Mount Vernon gift shop.

He has never cared to deal with the media, not during his campaigns, or his years as the

49-059 O—95 Vol. 137 (Pt. 6) 32

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

controversial chairman of the District of Columbia appropriations subcommittee when he intermittently held up Metro funding, or through recent time when he has been sought out for friendly stories. He agreed to chat for this piece, but when the interview was abruptly interrupted by—what else—a roll call, Natcher refused to speak to the reporter again. "I believe we're finished," he said crisply when approached after a hearing.

Nonetheless, for an enlightening 15 minutes he shared his philosophy and thoughts about the job he loves. There is something so poignant, even sad, about how this man defines his life, his loves, his losses, his universe, through his perfect voting record.

He says he had not realized he was voting at 100 percent until 1958, five years into his tenure, when a clerk phoned him to inform him. "Ever since then, I made up my mind I'd see where I could take it," he says.

He takes no chances with his vote. He enters the electronic voting card he carries in his wallet not once, as required, but five or six times at different stations on the House floor. "Then I ask the floor clerk to check to make sure it took," he says. "I sat there one day and watched one of my colleagues vote—and we sat and waited for the light to go on [next to his name on the board] and it never did."

He says he has had "a thousand narrow escapes" but will only speak of one.

When his wife of 53 years passed away in January, he says, he simply accepted the fact that he would miss his first roll call vote. "I just said to myself, 'Well, this is it,'" he says with resignation. "I just made up my mind to the fact. . . ."

There was the Monday he needed to fly his "beloved Virginia" to her final resting place in Kentucky. There was the day of viewing at the funeral parlor. And finally, there was the burial itself, scheduled for a Thursday that the House was in session. "I would have missed five votes that day," he recalls with precision.

But, he says, the days seemed to break his way and the services were delayed because the six grandchildren could not make it to Kentucky in time. "But I had some help," he says, pointing skyward. "I guess it was just meant for me not to miss a vote."

"People just don't realize how extraordinarily easy it is to miss a vote," says Rep. Tom McMillen (D-Md.), who has himself made the effort to maintain a perfect voting record since his 1986 election. "You can't undervalue his accomplishment. . . . It will never be duplicated. I've already told myself I am not going to go crazy when I miss my first vote."

There are other disciplines too. Natcher still swims aggressively in the House gym several times a week. Every day the House is in session, he keeps a journal, which he has locked away somewhere. Once a year he pulls the bound books out of their sanctuary and invites a photographer to memorialize the occasion. There are 52 volumes now. "I dictate and then have it typed on the finest bond I can find," he explains. "I put it down just like it happens every day. It takes some doing. You have to be right well organized."

And he writes religiously to each of his grandchildren weekly. While all receive identical letters, he is quick to note that no one receives a copy. "I started it when they were born—wrote to welcome them," he says. "And kept on going. Every week."

A staff of "five ladies"—his words—helps him with his obsessions. "I dont' have any need for an administrative assistant, a press secretary or a legislative aide," he says flatly. "We get it all done. I don't need to pay any 18 people."

What he does get done with such a low overhead is impressive. As financial puppeteer for some of the most popular and sensitive social programs around—Job Corps, student aid, Social Security administration, biomedical research—he is on the minds of many special interests. Labor groups and universities parade before him, abortion advocates wince at his name, members beg him for pennies.

He listens to all, changes his mind for virtually none.

The job has enormous potential for power brokering. That he doesn't take a dime of campaign money, of course, greatly diminishes the input of lobbying groups who would so like to sway him. "They all come to see me and I hear them out nice," he says. "But this is the best system. My wife—she didn't like the way they did things up here, but she believed you could be in politics and do it right."

To a certain extent, Natcher has tried to preserve the purity of 1953, the year he came to Washington by virtue of a special election. To the amazement—and at times frustration—of his peers, he has never been influenced by the times. He believes he is reelected not because he is so powerful or so smart, but because he effectively does his "duty." He still runs his own reelection campaign, driving himself from event to event. He says his last campaign cost him a little more than $6,000.

The Washington Post files on him overflow with stories about his tightfisted control of the D.C. appropriations subcommittee in the '60s and early '70s. He is legendary for his refusal to release millions in Metro funding—despite public pleas by President Nixon. To Natcher, it was cut and dried: If the local government was not upholding its end of the bargain to improve the highways, it didn't get the money. "It took the combined effort of the White House and the House leadership to get that money finally released," recalls Rep. Dave Obey (D-Wis.), then a junior member of the subcommittee. "If you decide to fight him, you'd better be prepared to pull out all the stops. He believes you can only have one quarterback at a time—and he's it on his committee."

In recent years, liberal House Democrats have been stymied by Natcher's refusal to loosen restrictions for federally funded abortions. (The bill's language for the past decade permits federal funding of abortions only if the mother's life is in jeopardy.) Over his reservations, the House slapped an amendment onto his bill two years ago that would have allowed abortion funding in times of rape or incest. President Bush vetoed the bill, and the House failed to override the veto.

Sources say Natcher remains adamant against introducing such funding into his bill again. But the abortion-rights Democrats still hope to persuade Natcher to give his blessing to an extended floor debate on the matter. "We want an up-or-down vote on this issue," says one such Democrat who did not want to be identified. "But to his practical mind, it's counterproductive to getting his bill passed. Those of his generation simply fail to acknowledge there might be some value in simply making a point."

On other issues of a contemporary nature, however, members say Natcher tries. "I've been badgering him on [funding for] breast cancer research," says Oakar, "and he's really evidenced a desire to learn about the issue."

Says one member of the Appropriations Committee: "You're not going to see him poring over the newest studies on this or that, but he does listen. I mean, he wasn't the last member of the Congress to realize the importance of AIDS research funding."

During the brief interview, Natcher alludes to the time when he might quit the good fight. He says the bells and china in his office would then go to his lone granddaughter. And the gavels and other masculine mementos would be given to the grandsons. He says that upon his retirement, he would also release his prized journals.

And the question is posed: Is he planning to cast his last vote any time soon?

"Oh, no, no," he says, quite astonished by the question. "No plans. No plans at all."

And then, the bell tolls once again for Bill Natcher.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION CALLING FOR WAR CRIMES TRIAL AGAINST SADDAM HUSSEIN AND IRAQI OFFICIALS

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the distinguished ranking Republican on the Foreign Affairs Committee, my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] and myself, today I am introducing a concurrent resolution calling upon the President of the United States to take action through the United Nations to bring Iraqi officials, beginning with Saddam Hussein, before an appropriate international tribunal to be judged for war crimes and crimes against humanity.

We have seen during the course of recent years, beginning with the gassing of Kurdish citizens of Iraq years ago, Saddam Hussein engaging in a pattern of crimes against humanity, genocide, the mass killing of innocents. Our television screens are filled with children and old people dying of hunger, disease, and cold and persecution and helicopter gunfire.

The 12 nations of the European Economic Community are calling for the same action. It is high time that Saddam Hussein and his henchmen pay for their crimes before an international tribunal properly constituted.1

A CLEAR CHOICE ON BUDGET PRIORITIES

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, later today the House of Representatives is going to get a very clear choice on the budget priorities of this Nation. We are going to get an opportunity to vote not only on the resolution presented by the Budget Committee, but also on the resolution that was

sent to this Congress by the President of the United States.

It has been suggested by our Republican counterparts that there is no difference between these budgets, but I think when the Members have a chance to examine these alternatives they will understand that there is a very real fundamental difference between these budgets and the future of this country's children and the future of this country's working men and women in their efforts to support their families, to provide for an education, to achieve health care, and to provide for the safety of their children.

There are dramatic and very substantial differences in the health care of very young children and our ability to fight off infant mortality, to improve the health statistics of young children who have problems in their ability to thrive from the very onset of life in this country.

We have an opportunity in the Democratic budget to reverse those figures, to reverse those declines, to make major commitments for full participation in the Head Start Program, the most successful pre-education program that we have in this Nation, yet only a third of the children who are already eligible without expanding eligibility are able to participate. The other two-thirds fall between the cracks, become far more expensive, and end up dropping out of school. That is the difference in the two budgets.

THE BUDGET AND FAIRNESS

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

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Speaker, for months now, the pundits have been writing that President Bush really has no domestic agenda.

The pundits are wrong.

The President has a domestic agenda. It is just not one that includes many of America's working families.

Today, this body will consider the President's budget, which is the essence of his agenda. It would cut Medicare; put such rigid restrictions on college student aid that most middle income working families would be excluded entirely, and underfund the war against drugs and crime.

Oh yes. There is one more thing. It also asks—again—that we approve a capital gains tax break for the rich.

Fortunately, the House Budget Committee has drafted an alternative. It protects Medicare. It invests more in education for all Americans; and it provides the funds necessary to obtain the personnel, equipment, and training required to back up all the tough talk against drugs and crime.

And—quite reasonably, in this Member's view—it also asks that the rich pay their fair share.

I congratulate the chairman of the House Budget Committee, Mr. PANETTA, and urge my colleagues to support the committee's budget.

For those who care about fairness and America's working men and women, Mr. Speaker, the choice is clear.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the railway workers are on strike, and I do not blame them. How would you like to go three years without a pay raise? How would you like to have your seniority stripped away? How would you like to report to work and be told that you are reassigned 1,500 miles away next weekend?

And listen, if you raise your voice, listen to what you are told. You are told, "Look here, Buster, be thankful that you have a job."

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, the American worker is sick and tired of getting the shaft. Their wages have been cut, their benefits have been stripped, their pensions are underfunded, and in some cases they are even taken away, stolen.

□ 1010

Their jobs are shipped overseas, their families are fractured.

But, "Look here, Buster, don't complain, be thankful you have a job."

Ladies and gentlemen, the American workers have but one weapon, and that is to strike, and it is a shame they have to strike, but it is up to labor. Since the air traffic controllers, if organized labor lets the railway workers go down the chute, then there is no one left to help these workers but labor unions.

I am hoping Congress addresses the issues and gives some fairness to the American workers. They sure deserve it.

INTRODUCTION OF BUDGET SIMPLIFICATION AND REFORM ACT

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

Mrs. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, once again we in Congress find ourselves standing at the entrance of the budget maze. We have tough battles to fight and difficult decisions to make as we work our way through the twists and turns, toward the goal of achieving a fair and adequate budget solution.

Today, I am introducing the Budget Simplification and Reform Act. This bill attempts to bring some sanity to the Federal budget process. It is my hope that this bipartisan approach will help make our budget process simpler, stronger, and more honest.

Among the ideas included in the bill are limitations on continuing resolutions, an expedited rescission process, and the elimination of the current services baseline. It would also amend congressional budget procedures to provide for a biennial budget and a binding budget resolution.

Under BSRA, all provisions of appropriations bills that benefit 10 or fewer beneficiaries would have to be disclosed. In addition, it would require that both the President and the Congress identify funding sources for any additional Federal spending.

I ask that my colleagues consider this legislation as we work toward reaching an equitable budget solution.

CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATIONS OF KNIGHT COMMISSION ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of us were enthralled with the NCAA basketball championships. We had the opportunity to watch some very talented men and women play some superb basketball. Now that March madness is over we should do more than cheer for the young men and women athletes at our colleges and universities. May is fast approaching and that brings reality and graduation.

Recently, we have received a copy of "Keeping Faith With the Student-Athlete/a New Model for Intercollegiate Athletics." This report was published by the Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. The report focused on the abuses in the college athletic system and the commission devised principles that could correct the situation.

My district is the home of basketball. Just about a year ago, Dr. Edward Steitz passed away and he was commonly referred to as Mr. Basketball. Dr. Steitz was concerned and outspoken about the need for reform in college athletics. If he was here today, I know he would be in support of the Knight commission. Dr. Steitz was the athletic director of Springfield College and Springfield College is an excellent example of college with a strong athletic program that does not sacrifice the integrity of its academic program.

The report by the Knight commission sets forth principles that colleges and universities should follow. I have introduced a concurrent resolution that expresses the sense that Congress supports the recommendations of the Knight commission.

This will send a message to our athletes that we are concerned about them

as individuals. In addition, it will tell universities and colleges that it is time to make a change. I urge you to support House Concurrent Resolution 119. Let us take action before the academic integrity of our universities is sacrificed.

UNITED STATES MUST NOT STAND BY WHILE INTERNATIONAL OUTLAWS COMMIT GENOCIDE

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the world continues to witness Saddam Hussein's annihilation of the Kurdish people. What he has failed to achieve by gassing and bombing, he now tries to accomplish by mass starvation and freezing. No less than 1,000 innocent refugees are dying in the mountains each day. Many, maybe most, of these victims are children under 5 years old.

If the new world order means anything, it is that the United States will not stand by while international outlaws commit genocide.

After urging the Iraqi people to rise up, our President has finally stood up for them. He is to be congratulated for his decision yesterday to provide greater relief and safety to Kurds in northern Iraq.

But our efforts to bring peace to Iraq will not end in a month. Nor will they stop at the 36th parallel. Peace will only come once the Kurds and Shiites can return home without the threat of massacre. And peace will only come once these persecuted peoples have a say in how their country is run.

Mr. Speaker, as the moral leader of the free world, the United States should immediately place before the United Nations a resolution demanding that sanctions against Iraq will not be lifted until the Iraqi people have food, safety, and free elections. That is what our soldiers fought for, that is what the people of Iraq deserve, and that is what it takes to bring real peace and stability to this region.

IN SUPPORT OF THE BRADY BILL

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the second amendment rights, my right, our right to bear arms. I do this with a great deal of thought and concern and have looked at two differing bills. One is the Brady bill, the other is the Staggers bill.

I will support the Brady bill because it does not infringe on my ability to bear arms and to hunt. I did hunt in northern Indiana, growing up, and I want to protect those rights.

But as we debate the budget today, as we debate the budget impact of a bill that might require us to have automatic and immediate control on computers overlooking into people's background, I am not sure we can afford it, timewise or budgetwise.

Also, my constituents sent me here not just to look over the budget and spend our money wisely and prudently, but also for public purposes, not special interests.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, my State, Indiana, has adopted the 7-day waiting period that the Brady bill has recommended. This is a commonsense approach that would provide a consistent State law from one State to the other, which Indiana has already had the consistency and commonsense approach to adopt.

INVESTIGATION INTO THE ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF U.S. EXPORT CONTROL PROGRAMS

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, my oversight subcommittee is conducting an investigation into the administration and enforcement of U.S. export control programs. As part of this review, the subcommittee is examining the enforcement activities of the U.S. Customs Service and the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control [OFAC], which administers trade and financial sanctions against selected foreign countries. The subcommittee will begin hearings on this issue on April 18, 1991.

Last week, OFAC revealed the names of 89 businesses and individuals determined to be agents and front companies in Iraq's arms procurement and financial network. The action taken by OFAC puts the world on notice that when they deal with those designated nationals, they deal with Saddam. The OFAC list will also assist the allied nations in discovering hidden wealth that could be used to pay part of Iraq's war reparations.

The subcommittee's investigation hopes to shed light on who is acquiring sophisticated technology, machinery, weapons, and other dangerous materials, how potential adversaries are able to circumvent U.S. export control laws, and whether improvements can be made to strengthen U.S. export control systems.

We, the United States, sell voluminously. We screen very carelessly.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to change our priorities.

EXTENDING THE APPRECIATION OF CONGRESS TO ALL AMERICAN INDIAN VETERANS FOR THEIR SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 22, extending the appreciatiion of Congress to all American Indian veterans for their service in the armed forces of the United States, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] so that he may explain the purpose of the Senate concurrent resolution.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring before the House today this resolution extending the appreciation of Congress to all American Indian veterans for their service in the armed forces of the United States.

American Indians have contributed to all phases of American life, but among their more striking contributions are in the defense of this country. Native Americans have fought in unusually high numbers in every major war in this country's history. Ironically, they were not even made citizens of the United States until 1924.

From the early days of the Revolution to raising the flag at Iwo Jima, American Indians have performed their duties with valor and commitment.

In Operation Desert Storm, American Indians again answered the call. Again they came out in great numbers and some gave their lives to the struggle.

We must remember their courage, sacrifice, and contributions. They are the pride of the Indian nations and great defenders of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution extends the appreciation of the Congress to all American Indian veterans. Their contributions and sacrifices have helped preserve democracy and the integrity of this country.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, and I wish to join all my colleagues today in commending all American Indian veterans who served in Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

Mr. Speaker, one of the very first casualties of the war was a member of the San Carlos Apache Tribe from my congressional district in Arizona. Pfc. Michael Noline died on January

26 in a collision of two armored vehicles after a combat raid near the Kuwait border. He made the ultimate sacrifice for freedom on that day, a sacrifice this Nation will never forget.

That Private Noline and hundreds of other Indian Americans including Navajo, Hopi, Apache and Pima, served with honor and distinction in the gulf comes as no surprise, for Indian Americans have a long history of serving so ably in defense of this Nation. One of the most notable contributions came during World War II when, using their native Navajo language, the Navajo Code Talkers helped secure communications during war effort. The Navajo language code was never broken, no doubt helping lead the United States to a successful conclusion of that war.

Let us never forget the contributions and sacrifices of our Indian veterans—and all veterans—who served so ably in this most recent conflict, and other conflicts, abroad.

With the passage of this resolution, we say thank you to those who served, to their families, and to the communities that raised them. We are proud of every one of you.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the minority concurs in the Senate concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 22

Whereas, American Indians, of various Indian tribes across the nation, have a long, proud and distinguished tradition of service in the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas, American Indians have historically served in the Armed Forces of the United States in numbers which far exceed their representation in the population of the United States;

Whereas, American Indians have lost their lives in the service of their nation, and in the cause of peace, including Operations Desert Storm and Desert Shield; and

Whereas, American Indians currently deployed in the Persian Gulf have continued this proud and courageous tradition of service in the Armed Forces of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

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

SECTION 1. APPRECIATION.

The Congress expresses its appreciation to:

(1) all American Indian veterans for their long, proud, and distinguished tradition of service in the Armed Forces of the United States;

(2) all American Indian service men and women currently or heretofore deployed in the Persian Gulf region as part of Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm; and

(3) the families of American Indian service men and women and members of Indian tribes nationwide who have supported their loved ones through traditional ceremonies and have prayed for the safety and continued strength of all American forces and Allied partners.

SEC. 2. CONDOLENCES.

The Congress expresses its condolences to the families whose loved ones have made the ultimate sacrifice in the service of their nation and in the cause of peace.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1020

REASONS TO OPPOSE H.R. 5

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the American economy, like the American railroad system, seems to be sputtering and almost grinding to a halt, and, when we look at the Federal deficit this year, $350 billion in deficit, we know we have got some serious economic challenges ahead of us.

Mr. Speaker, one thing we cannot do is to ensure that we have a sputtering economy and that our economy begins to grind to a halt like our railroads and other sectors of the economy, and, if we change the work rules so that employees have an incentive to strike, we are going to see strikes like we now see in the railroads spread throughout our economy.

The United States of America cannot, cannot, afford to see our economy go down like this. I am asking my colleagues to join me in opposing the H.R. 5 which would change the work rules and give an incentive to American workers throughout the United States to strike and bring down the American economy.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1992

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to House Resolution 123 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 121.

□ 1022

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. 121) revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1991 and setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996, with Mr. GRAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, April 16, 1991, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered as having been read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 121 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 121

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the budget for fiscal year 1991 is revised and replaced, the budget for fiscal year 1992 is established, and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996 are hereby set forth.

RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 2. (a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1990, October 1, 1991, October 1, 1992, October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, and October 1, 1995:

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

Fiscal year 1991: $793,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1992: $850,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $909,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $966,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,025,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,079,800,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1991: $0.
Fiscal year 1992: $0.
Fiscal year 1993: $0.
Fiscal year 1994: $0.
Fiscal year 1995: $0.
Fiscal year 1996: $0.

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

Fiscal year 1991: $74,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1992: $82,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $88,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $94,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $100,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $107,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1991: $1,187,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1992: $1,269,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $1,272,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $1,300,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,341,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,407,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1991: $1,155,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1992: $1,212,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $1,212,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $1,234,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1.209,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,276,900,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1991: $362,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1992: $362,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $302,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $268,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $183,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $197,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1991: $3,567,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1992: $3,993,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $4,364,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $4,707,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $4,966,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $5,237,700,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1990, October 1, 1991, October 1, 1992, October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, and October 1, 1995, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $18,100,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $109,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $15,400,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $114,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $15,600,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $118,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $15,500,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $121,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $15,600,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $125,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $14,900,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $127,300,000,000.

(b) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1991 through 1996 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, $289,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $297,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, $290,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $295,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, $290,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $292,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, $327,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $320,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, $341,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $333,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, $356,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $346,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, $20,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,600,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, $21,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $18,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, $20,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $18,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, $21,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $19,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, $22,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, $16,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, $17,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, $18,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, $18,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $18,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, $19,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $18,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, $20,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $19,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, $5,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $4,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, $7,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $5,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, $6,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $5,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $4,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, $6,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $4,900,000,000.

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

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

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, $18,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $18,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, $19,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $19,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, $20,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $20,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, $22,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $21,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, $23,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, $24,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $23,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, $20,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $15,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,600,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, $22,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, $19,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $15,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $17,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $18,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,600,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1991:
(A) New budget authority, $97,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $112,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $64,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $105,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $66,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $57,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $69,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $39,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $71,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $21,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $74,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $18,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $77,300,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1991:
(A) New budget authority, $31,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $34,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $37,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $40,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $43,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $46,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1991:
(A) New budget authority, $7,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $6,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $6,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $6,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $7,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $7,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1991:
(A) New budget authority, $44,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $50,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $51,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $50,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $51,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $53,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,300,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1991:
(A) New budget authority, $73,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $83,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $93,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $102,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $113,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $112,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $126,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1991:
(A) New budget authority, $105,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $120,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $116,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $131,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $128,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $145,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $162,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $157,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $181,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $176,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1991:
(A) New budget authority, $210,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $169,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $221,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $180,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $230,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $188,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $240,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $199,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $253,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $209,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $266,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $219,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1991:
(A) New budget authority, $2,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $5,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $6,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $7,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $7,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1991:
(A) New budget authority, $32,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $34,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $35,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $36,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $38,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $39,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $21,300,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1991:
(A) New budget authority, $12,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $14,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $15,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $16,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1991:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $11,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $11,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $16,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1991:
(A) New budget authority, $219,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $219,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $235,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $235,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $253,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $253,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $268,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $280,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $280,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $292,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $292,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1991:
(A) New budget authority, −$300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$2,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$1,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$1,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$1,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1991:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, −$32,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, −$35,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, −$80,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$76,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$100,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$94,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$111,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$100,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendments are in order except the amendments printed in House Report 102-33, which shall be considered in the order and manner specified in the report, shall be considered as having been read, shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question, and shall be in order even if amending portions of the concurrent resolution already changed by amendment. If more than one amendment in the nature of a substitute is adopted, only the last amendment adopted shall be considered as having been finally adopted in the Committee of the Whole and reported back to the House.

It is also in order to consider any amendment provided for in section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 necessary to achieve mathematical consistency.

PERFECTING AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORD OF MICHIGAN

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD of Michigan:

Section 2(b) is amended by reducing in fiscal year 1992 the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays as set forth below:
(1) Functional category (300):
(A) New budget authority, $100,000,000.
(b) Outlays, $100,000,000.
(2) Functional category (400):
(A) New budget authority, $100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, no change.
(3) Functional category (750):
(A) New budget authority, $100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, no change.
(4) Functional category (800);
(A) New budget authority, $100,000,000.
(b) Outlays, $100,000,000.

Section 2(b) is amended by increasing in fiscal year 1992 the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays as set forth below;
(1) Functional category (500)
(A) New budget authority, $400,000,000.
(b) Outlays, $200,000,000.

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

Is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] opposed to the amendment?

Mr. GRADISON. I am, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] will be recognized for 30 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to increase budget authority and outlays for function 500 of the budget by $400 million and $200 million respectively and to reduce certain other budget functions by a corresponding amendment; in other words, to add nearly half a billion dollars to the money available to the Committee on Appropriations for education and to pay for that in the budget so that it is budget neutral by reducing other programs, none of which is reduced more than 1 percent.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in furtherance of what I have called sincerely this year the home front budget initiative, and we have been working on it since the early part of the year.

The amendment would target additional funding for education and related programs without jeopardizing any of the initiatives agreed to by the Committee on the Budget. Decisions made by the committee in nutrition, health, energy, security, transportation and infrastructure, the elderly, veterans, anticrime, antidrugs, rural poverty, the working poor, and the homeless and competitiveness would not be affected by the offsetting reductions in this amendment.

In a recent column in the Wall Street Journal written after our victory in the gulf, John Akers, the chief executive officer of IBM, Inc., wrote:

> As our focus shifts back to the home front, now is the time for an equal commitment to rescue our educational system.

Because of the constraints of the Budget Act, my amendment cannot reduce the defense budget. I want to repeat that. I have already had people say, "You're not taking money from defense for education; are you?" My answer to it is: I wish that I could, but under the rules I cannot do that, so the defense budget is in no way affected by this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot raise taxes to pay for the budget, although I am required to give my colleagues a budget neutral amendment, and that is why it is necessary to selectively reduce other programs to pay for it.

A truly equal commitment would mean that this administration would ask the Congress to declare a national education emergency and provide off-budget funding for our programs. That is what we did in the Middle East. We declared an emergency, and took it off budget, and we did not have to go through this exercise. A majority of us are not ready to scrap the Budget Act, so my amendment is the best we can do.

I want to reassure the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], that I think that, given the constraints that they have operated under as a result of last year's budget agreement, they have done as well as anybody could expect. What this amendment seeks to do is not to criticize the actions of the Committee on the Budget; in fact we try to stay consistent with the Committee on the Budget. I should make it clear on the record that this amendment employs the same methodology as the Committee on the Budget in reducing noninitiative discretionary domestic funding by 1 percent in order to provide the $400 million.

Mr. Chairman, the protected initiatives that were set out by the Committee on the Budget are still protected in this amendment. In other words, in fuction 300, the 1 percent reduction does not apply to EPA operations, superfund, land acquisition through the land and water conservation fund. In function 400, the 1 percent reduction

does not apply to aviation, Federal aid to highways, mass transit and Amtrak. In function 750, the 1 percent reduction does not apply to antidrug abuse programs, anticrime programs or the Legal Services Corporation. Finally, in function 800, the 1 percent reduction does not apply to the Internal Revenue Service.

With that in mind I believe the issue is simple. No other domestic priority is in my mind more important than education. Everybody talks a good game about how much we recognize the need to move, to move decisively, to move boldly, and to do it quickly, and this is the quickest way that we can respond to the cry that is across the country for us to show that we are willing to do something.

Tomorrow many of us have been invited to the White House to join the President when he will publicly announce what is indicated to us by the White House press as a major initiative in education, an indication that, as he turns now from problems in the world arena to the domestic problems of this country, he turns first for his attention to the focus on education, and we welcome that, and we are looking forward to working with him on it.

□ 1030

I believe that the Congress today, since the budget is before us, can, consistent with that thought, indicate that we believe education to be such an important priority in our country that we are willing to take a little bit away from a lot of discretionary programs and put this additional money in education. We must be fair to the Budget Committee. They had already increased the new money for education by about $2 billion, and this is on top of what they did.

This is an additional amount of new money. When I say it is new money, I mean it is not money we are going to print. It is permitting, under the budget, the Committee on Appropriations to decide the appropriate way to spend an additional $400 million on top of the new money that the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] and the Budget Committee had already suggested in the budget resolution.

I hope that during this debate we will not get into arguments about which way is the best way to spend the money, because neither this amendment nor our action here can bind the Appropriation Committee. The Appropriations Committee will decide where within the function the money is going to be spent.

We are not operating in a vacuum. We have been in consultation with them. We have a pretty good idea where they think the immediate needs are, and where they are likely to do it. I have every confidence in the world that the House is going to be proud of the decisions made by the Appropriations Committee when they come back to us later this year with the appropriation to spend this money, if we make it possible for them to do it.

Obviously the Appropriations Committee will do their own job, but I am going to guess a little bit at some of the things they could do. It is possible to say, although we cannot say with any certainty exactly what they will do, that a $200 million increase in Chapter 1, which is compensatory education for early intervention in children's lives to bring them up to their peer group if they are running behind, will provide services for about 250,000 additional children. This is where you start to stop high school dropouts. You do not do that in high school. You do it in grade school. These are children at risk by everybody's standard. Every evaluation of Chapter 1 shows that these services narrow the skill gap between the children at the bottom of the scale and the rest of us, and that this is where we get the biggest payoff and the biggest bang for our buck.

Another $100 million for Head Start adds 25,000 preschoolers who can be better prepared for the world that they are going to find when they get to school. Children are being raised without a parent in the house during the day and without any preparation to go to school. I am happy to tell you that every evaluation that has been made for many years of Head Start indicates that we have never had a program of school preparation or anything related to education that has had the kind of payoff to the taxpayers that that program has provided.

Now, as little as $50 million invested to expand the TRIO Programs would offer hope of college education for about 75,000 minority high school students. And finally, adding about $50 million to the Job Corps could buy us 2,500 slots for disadvantaged kids who are hanging around on the street corner right now. Investments in the Job Corps have been found by many studies to return to us $1.46 for every Federal $1 that we spend.

The chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], and the members of the Budget Committee are to be commended for taking a step in the right direction in the areas of education and training, identifying those areas among the Nation's most important priorities. Our amendment will allow us to make a slightly greater stride in preparing this country's children for the future, and clearly indicates that it is Congress' intent to join the President in making education our No. 1 domestic priority.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. I want to talk about where we are in considering the funding for education in the fiscal year 1992 budget. No matter what number is proposed by the President, it is reasonable to expect that my friends on the other side of the aisle are going to outbid the administration, and that, of course, was not only predictible, it is exactly what happened. The curse of being President, when it comes to the budget, is that you go first.

That budget was laid on the table for all the world to see on February 4, and there has been plenty of time to look at it and see how to appear to one-up the President. The President, in putting a budget together, had to do something which the country needs but does not always sell here in the House of Representatives, and that is to have a comprehensive budget which has balance among all of the competing claims for funds. After all, this is a zero sum game under the new budget agreement.

Increases in one area obviously require cuts in another. I think it is interesting, therefore, as I listened to the presentation by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], that while he has said a great deal and very effectively, I might add, about what would be done with this money that he recommends be spent, he has said virtually nothing about where the cuts would come from.

Well, there are cuts, and there are dollar-for-dollar cuts to balance the increases which he has recommended. Those cuts are on top of cuts which the Democratic majority on the Budget Committee has already recommended to fund increases which they have proposed in education and in other areas.

Therefore, I would like to give some specific examples of where these cuts might come from. I listened very carefully to the description of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] concerning some of the areas which would not be affected by the cuts within a certain function, but I would like to go further and point out from where these cuts might come.

Under function 300, the natural resources and environment function, there would be cuts in budget authority of $100 million. That could effect protection of endangered species, wetlands conservation and restoration, protection of wildlife refuges, reforestation, protection, and restoration of the Civil War battlefields.

Under function 400, there is an additional $100 million in cuts from budget authority. That, of course, is the transportation function. Programs not protected, that is, exposed and vulnerable to the cuts which the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan would require, include the search and rescue missions of the Coast Guard, drug-related missions of the Coast Guard, the Maritime Administration,

NASA's aeronautics program, and the Northeast corridor improvement program.

And in addition to this, another $100 million is called for in cuts from function 750, the administration of justice function. Once again leaving out the things which would be protected under the proposal of the gentleman from Michigan, I note that programs which could be cut—and the cuts have to come from somewhere—include the Immigration and Naturalization Service, drug-related services of the FBI, the Customs Service, nonrelated activities of the Secret Service, and various court and judicial services. I do not know where these cuts that would come later would be made, but I know they are there and it is useful to recognize that fact.

My overall concern about much of the debate about funding for education goes back to the way in which the majority, in its report on the budget, has supported its increases. The focus is entirely on the money side, and I could not find a single word about education reform. Certainly to put more money into education sounds well and good, but to do that without pointing out areas which are indeed crying out for reform in the education system may not have the effect of increasing the quality of education, which, of course, is what we are after.

In my own community—and I say this with great sadness—my constituents have reached the point where they have for the first time in memory turned down the school levy necessary to keep our Cincinnati public schools operating.

□ 1040

Why? As near as we can figure it out, it is a feeling on the part of the taxpayers of the city of Cincinnati School District that they are dissatisfied with the quality of education being offered by those schools. They are dissatisfied with what they perceive to be excessive administrative overhead in the running of our own system. In other words, they do not think they are getting their money's worth. As a result of this, they do not want to pump more money into what is admittedly a very troubled school system.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should listen to people who make these pleas. I just observe again, with a degree of sadness, that there is no mention, really none at all that I have heard, and certainly none that I have read in the committee report, about the need for educational reform as a quid pro quo, or at least a major element in the increased spending that is recommended here.

Mr. Chairman, I am not here to support the Democratic budget. That is not my role, nor should it be. But I think it is useful to make this point: That adoption of the Ford amendment amounts to repudiation of the Democratic budget proposal.

Mr. Chairman, we heard in the Committee on the Budget and have heard on the floor that the proposal which the Democratic majority on the Committee on the Budget put together and unanimously supported is the greatest thing since sliced bread. It was so perfect, they were not willing to consider any changes in it when we marked up that budget proposal in the Committee on the Budget.

Now, with the ink barely dry on the committee report, we have a proposal to move around an additional $400 million of budget authority and $200 million of outlays in what we were told is, if not a perfect, then an awfully good document.

Mr. Chairman, I will listen as this debate proceeds on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] with great care to see what the response is of my chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], and others on the Committee on the Budget. Will they defend their budget here today, as they did yesterday, and as they did against proposals for change a week ago Tuesday when we took this up in committee, or are they just going to go along with this pressure for a change in order to keep some kind of peace?

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. FORD].

Chairman FORD's amendment would add $400 million to the $2 billion already in the budget resolution for the Department of Education.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to commend Chairman PANETTA for his tremendous work on this budget resolution.

Last year's budget agreement with the White House not only imposed strict caps on domestic spending, it also erected walls between the domestic, defense and foreign aid accounts, thus making it impossible to transfer funds to high priority programs such as education, Head Start and job training.

Under those tough conditions, Chairman PANETTA has all but worked a miracle to bring to this House a balanced, compassionate budget resolution which reverses the President's budget for working families and our children.

The Ford amendment builds on the excellent framework provided by the House Budget Committee's resolution.

Chairman FORD's amendment increases the Appropriations Committee's ability to provide significant funding for those programs which directly address the pressing needs of our Nation's children—education, Head Start, and job training.

Mr. Chairman, too often it seems we want to make our investments at the wrong end of the process.

We cannot find a cure for cancer or AIDS without educating the scientists and researchers who will work at our world-class labs.

We cannot design and build the roads, bridges, and airports without trained engineers and skilled workers.

We cannot build NASA's space station without the trained and educated people to design the blueprints, develop the new technology, and construct the station.

Yes, it is important to continue funding health research, infrastructure development, and science and technology.

But it is equally important to remember that we cannot make any long-term advances in these crucial areas without a well educated and trained work force—from the rocket scientists to construction workers.

Other countries understand the basic necessity of investing in education and training.

The elementary and secondary school systems in Germany and Japan are well-known for their ability to educate their students to a high level.

Our economic competitors place great emphasis on helping students make the transition from classroom to workplace.

As a result, their workers have among the highest literacy rates in the world.

Moreover, students from around the world come to study at our first-class universities and colleges.

They take back to their homelands the knowledge, the skills and the expertise to develop their Nation's industries, and run their business and governments.

One could say that one of America's major exports is our higher education system.

We must make sure that American children have at least as equal an opportunity as these foreign students to get a degree from our Nation's universities and colleges.

Mr. Chairman, America is already No. 1 in higher education—but many of our students are unable to go to college.

But keeping America No. 1 in higher education, and making us No. 1 worldwide in elementary and secondary education is not going to happen by just wishing it or by merely setting ambitious goals for our students, teachers and administrators, and it not going to happen by calling ourselves the education Congress or the education President.

It is going to take hard work—and money.

It is going to take cooperation—and money.

And it is going to take money invested in our children.

Our recent success in the Persian Gulf provided graphic evidence of our Nation's return on investment of almost $3 trillion in defense since 1981.

I would like to think that the $2 billion in the budget resolution—plus the $400 million added by the Ford amendment—represent this House's downpayment on a similar concerted investment in securing the future of our children.

I urge my colleagues to support the Ford amendment.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL].

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, we have two strong parties today and both are strong advocates of education. As former State senators, my good friend, DALE KILDEE and I, once wrote a school aid bill and served together on the Higher Education Committee in the State senate. I also served as chairman of the Committee on Community Colleges.

Mr. Chairman, the question before us is where do we put our scarce resources to improve the quality of education and be competitive in the year 2000?

President Bush has appointed, and the Senate has confirmed a new Secretary of Education, Lamar Alexander. As the Governor of Tennessee, he put through some major reforms in education working with the private sector, Al Shanker, and the teacher unions, to incorporate better pay for teachers and provide more State dollars for education. These reforms made Tennessee a national leader in the education of its children. That record is a matter of history today. The President will announce at the White House tomorrow approximately 46 new ideas with respect to education as his initiative to improve the quality of education in the United States.

As a former classroom teacher, a lot of this is not new. Some of these ideas have been around a long time. It seems that in education we like to recycle good ideas. But today we cannot afford to reinvent the wheel.

□ 1050

So we have to start with the dollars that are available. And I have to say at the outset that we have a national deficit that is unparalleled in American history, and if we are going to invest in our children I suggest that we be careful that we do not leave them with a legacy of financial debt that they cannot pay. The interest on the national debt this year is over $200 billion, right off the top of the general funding. The deficit is unparalleled, and as I have said, our children and our children's children are going to pay for that deficit.

I think we have to be very careful that we do not just add more dollars to existing education programs and put this country in peril and close to bankruptcy. I know we have the ability to print paper money here. My father brought me down here when I was 12 years old and we had a chance to visit the Treasury building and watch dollars being printed.

I think when States have to comply with the balanced budget amendments and the local governments are cutting budgets and Governors all over the country are cutting budgets, the Congress must accept its responsibility to address the deficit as well as spending programs. I hope that the Ford amendment and the President's initiatives tomorrow can be formulated into a compromise that takes the best ideas out of both those proposals. The compromise can be put into the appropriations mark by the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Education, chaired by Chairman NATCHER, with myself as the ranking member on the Republican side. I think we can do that within the caps and within the limitations of the budget.

Governor Alexander and the President tomorrow are going to announce some new ideas. I have not seen the specifics. We met with the Secretary yesterday morning. We discussed the umbrella ideas. He is proposing four major areas of concentration to guide our schools toward the year 2000.

We need better and more accountable schools. We know that. There is no question I think on either side of the aisle in respect to accountability and quality of education. One of the programs that is being talked about is national testing. I have mixed feelings about national testing because a question arises as to who makes up the test, who sets the test for the students in the 50 States. Are they uniform? Can we make comparisons between Michigan, Ohio, Kentucky and other States? I am not so sure we can do that.

But be that as it may, we ought to at least have the capability through this legislation to look at those ideas. I do not think we should close that idea out, although I personally do have some reservations. I think that the principle of allowing local school systems, the elected schools boards, the faculties, and the parents, to determine the priorities of education over the years has been basically a sound principle, and I support that, and I think most of us do.

However, we acknowledge that we have some weak programs in the country that need to be supported both by the State and the Federal level. The President is going to discuss things like demonstration grants and new opportunities to work with the private sector and the inner city school system.

We have a new superintendent in the Detroit school system, a young woman, 41 years old, who thinks that we should have choice. Her definition of choice is to be able to move within the Detroit system from one school to another. A bill that has been introduced by a State senator in Michigan, Senator Dan DeGrow and Representative O'Neil from Saginaw, proposes that choice be made within the intermediate school district, that you can move from one to another within a given intermediate district. So I think we have to be careful when we discuss the question of choice as to whether we include it in the broad sense of public versus private education, tax tuition credits, vouchers, and the like. But nevertheless, the Secretary would like some demonstration grants to at least look at some of those ideas, particularly the inner city schools in which a lot of the black community is suggesting that we look at choice or alternatives to the existing system, where we have dropout rates of up to 50 percent. The children in the city of Detroit are dropping out of the school system in great numbers that is unacceptable, I am sure, to all Members of Congress and to this Nation.

In the area of research and development, I have looked at some studies in which we have compared our first grade students in math and science with Taiwan and Japan. In the first grade we do very well. At the end of the fifth grade U.S. students are last in those categories.

The point I want to make with this study and these facts is that the Taiwanese and the Japanese students are going to school 200 days a year. I am not sure that is a positive idea, but we ought to look at it. We ought to allow a school system willing to try it to fund a demonstration grant and give that school system an opportunity to look at what the results could be in a 200 day-a-year school system. The Japanese and the Taiwanese students were ahead of us at the end of the fifth grade, light years ahead of us, not because they are any smarter, they were just working harder.

So with the President tomorrow announcing his program, with Congressman FORD's ideas on existing programs which I fully support, like Head Start, Tech prep and some of the others, I think we can work out a compromise that will be good for education, good for our kids and good for America.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for his support. His support of education has been consistent.

I do want to reassure him, however, I expect to be at the White House tomorrow as chairman of the Education and Labor Committee with an open ear and an open mind. I have heard all kinds of rumors, as has my colleague from Michigan, about what is likely to be in the announcement.

The one thing I can commit to in the presence of the House is that just because it comes from that side of the aisle or from the other end of the street does not mean it will not be treated fairly in our committee, and we will listen and pay attention. Sooner or later Members here will introduce the President's ideas in the form of legislation. As soon as we have specific things to look at, I can assure the gentleman that they will get our attention.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have always supported education. I have been on the Appropriations subcommittee that funds education for 26 years. In fact, I have been one of the Members who has supported most of the programs in effect today before they were ever started.

But it is a mistake to take $100 million out of the Justice function where it has already been reduced to $500 million less than the President's request in the budget resolution. In order to support education for another $400 million, when it has already gotten a $2 billion increase, a good share of the $2 billion already came out of the Justice function.

Members should know what they are voting on when they vote to take $100 million out of the Justice function. The administration's budget request for the Justice function was $14.8 billion. The resolution before the House only carries $14.3 billion, $500 million less than the budget request by the President, and the administration request did not include a dime for the Juvenile Justice Program. That is $80 million, with very strong House support. We have virtually always put that $80 million back in some way or another.

So the Justice function under the resolution is $580 million below the level that it takes to support the administration's request after we also fund juvenile justice. Now this amendment would take another $100 million out of it. That is not what we should be doing today.

What the House would be doing by adopting this amendment and the resolution would be to adopt the same approach that was adopted year before last. The House came in here in April 1989 with a budget resolution that robbed the Justice Department, but had to come back in September and scrounge around to find the money to put these reductions back in. That is what the House would be going to get into this year if you vote for this, because it is not tolerable to slash funding for the Justice function, no matter what the money is shifted to.

□ 1100

Now, it is said that some programs are exempt under this amendment if they deal with crime and drugs. Well, 97 percent of the money in the Justice function is for agencies that deal in some way with crime and drugs. There is not much funding left to reduce with that is not in some way or another concerned with crime and drugs.

The reason the administration requested an increase in dollars for this function is because we must annualize some big programs that we funded or approved right here in the House last year and the year before. Prisons are now completed and need to be opened. We funded the construction the year before last. They need to be opened now.

We need to fund parole reform, 85 new judges, S&L investigations. Both sides of the aisle tried to outbid one another last year in putting more money in for S&L investigations. That is one reason. We need to annualize that.

Do we not want to hire the additional people to investigate and prosecute these cases? If you vote for this amendment, you are voting to cut S&L investigations. There is no doubt about it, and prosecutions, too.

But, even if we could some way find enough money in programs which do not affect crime or do not affect drugs, what would they be? Well, here are some of the things, the few things that are left: one is the Missing Children's Program. We would have to have at least a 10-percent, probably a 20-percent, cut across-the-board in these programs if we exempt everything that is not connected in an agency with crime or drugs.

Missing Children's Program, do we want to cut that 10 or 20 percent?

The Juvenile Justice Program, we would have to cut them clear out, $80 million. We will have enough trouble cutting other programs enough to fund it.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is the second time you mentioned juvenile justice. I wish the gentleman would look at the report on page 31, and that is specifically exempted from this amendment, which is juvenile justice assistance.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. All right.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. It is specifically exempted. You mentioned several programs.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. No. That is juvenile justice assistance.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Nothing gets cut more than 1 percent.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is not true. It cannot possibly be true. There is no way that can be true.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. It is in writing, NEAL.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. What is a few words in a report? That is just smoke and mirrors, and you know that. I am talking about the facts and the money, the dollars. There must be funds, not just words, to fund it. We can write anything in a report and say that it does something it does not do, but they cannot write a check based on a few words in a budget report.

Also, the Child Abuse Program, this House came in here last year and passed a new Child Abuse Program. We cannot fund it with this budget resolution, let alone taking another $100 million out of this function. Are you against Child Abuse Programs? If so, why did the House vote for it last year? Those who vote for this amendment are voting to cut Child Abuse Programs, no question about it.

Also involved are the Antitrust Division, the Civil Rights Division, Tax Division, Parole Commission. We need to do a lot of work in the parole area. The U.S. Trustees, Legal Services Corporation, Civil Rights Commission; if you support this across-the-board cut, you are supporting a cut in the Civil Rights Commission 10 to 20 percent below last year's level. They want an increase, but even level funding would not be possible under this amendment. Do you want to cut the Civil Rights Commission 10 to 20 percent below last year's level? Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. It would be slashed by this amendment too. These programs are just some of the programs you would cut if you vote to cut another $100 million out of the Justice function when the resolution before us has already taken $500 million out of this function in order to help with the increase of this other function by $2 billion.

I think Members should look at the facts here.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, after all this debate all I know is this: We have gone full cycle, Gramm-Latta, Gramm-Rudman, Gramm bankrupt.

My question is: What is next? Why does not Congress just simply take all the debt and deficits off budget? Why not? Like crooks, Congress has two sets of books.

Now, think about it. All we would have to do is give it a catchy new name. How about Gramm larceny? And then we would all have another 5 years.

I see these two great chairmen debating over here. Mr. Chairman, if you are going to stop crime, if you are going to stop poverty, you are going to have to start educating people. It is time that Congress sets up some priorities. That is our job.

The priorities of this country are so misdirected by our budgets that if we threw our budgets at the ground collectively they would probably miss.

The Ford amendment is an on-target amendment, and if we would listen to Chairman FORD we would do more.

Crime, poverty, narcotics, alcoholism, social deviance, these are not themselves the major problem. They are symptomatic of a greater problem, and if we do not have education, we do not have jobs, we do not have individual growth, and we are going to continue to have them and become a second-rate social nation.

I support the Ford amendment. Damn it, find some money somewhere else.

It is time we come up with some money for education, and it is time that instead of talking about being the education leaders, the President and the Congress and the Senate, why not come up with some money? Then maybe 700,000 high school students could graduate and be able to read, because right now there are 700,000 high school kids graduating that can't even read. Shame.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair would remind all Members that Members ought to be addressed in the third person, as the gentleman from a particular State, and not by first names. And the Chair would advise Members, in characterizing the acts of this body, to refer to the House rules for guidance. Those House rules have not been followed in recent statements.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

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

Mr. Chairman, we are faced today with something similar to when you must choose between your children. What you try to do in those instances is be fair with your children, and the question today is fairness.

The gentleman from Iowa pointed out that while this amendment has merit, there are other programs that also have merit. It is the responsibility of a budget to make priority choices.

I am a strong supporter of "Chapter 1." I visited Chapter 1 Programs during the Easter recess, and likewise, of Head Start. Both serve a very worthy purpose.

However, I would urge the Committee on Education and Labor to take a look at the redtape that they have wound around the Chapter 1 Program. A lot more effective use of that money could be made if it were not for much of the redtape that is involved in Chapter 1. So let us address this problem rather than short other good programs today.

I want to point out that the Committee on the Budget, in dealing with natural resources—function 300—already took out $900 million below the President's request, whereas the same Committee on the Budget has added $2 billion to the education function above the President's request. They have been more than fair.

Let us recognize that there are many important functions of government. The Ford amendment would take $100 million out of function 300, a program vital to our Nation's future.

Now, what does that mean? That means reducing the America the Beautiful Program, that means reducing the EPA grants which our communities need, that means reduction in the number of wildlife refuges that we can fund, that means reductions in the Park Service, which are enjoyed by millions of Americans, that means reductions in fish and wildlife programs, that means reductions in our effort to protect endangered species, that means reductions in the soil conservation programs, that means reductions in the EPA program to deal with leaking underground water pollutant sources, and it means reductions in the underground storage program. It also, in the transportation function, means cuts in the Coast Guard which, of course, means that there will be less to deal with oil spills, to deal with response by the Coast Guard in prevention of spills, and in handling the problems of drug interdiction.

What I am saying here is, be careful. This is a vote that seemingly that you are doing something for education without penalizing any other needed program. Education has received an additional $2 billion, and I support that on the part of the Committee on the Budget, but let us not take an additional $100 million out of some very important and vital programs that have already suffered a reduction of $900 million below the President's request.

Some of the supporters of the point I am making, and in opposition to the amendment, are the Friends of the Earth, the Defenders of Wildlife, the National Parks and Conservation Association, the Wilderness Society, the Izaak Walton League, the Association of State Water Pollution Control Administrators.

Please keep in mind that we need to have fairness in the budget process, and we have to recognize that there are many different priorities, all of which are good.

Again, I would reiterate that we recognize the importance of education with a $2 billion increase, while at the same time we are reducing the conservation, the natural resource programs by $900 million.

Let us not take an additional hit of $100 million against natural resources, as this amendment would do. Weigh it carefully in terms of this Nation's priorities. I believe if you do, you will recognize that this amendment is not fair. It is not in the best interests of the overall equity in terms of budgeting.

□ 1110

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], a member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, everybody who has spoken so far in this Chamber is exactly on the point. This amendment is about tough critical choices for our future.

I met 1 month ago with the director of correctional facilities in Indiana. I asked him why we are spending so much money on building prisons in Indiana, hundreds of millions of dollars. We are spending nationwide billions of dollars.

He said that the biggest indicator of how many prison cells we will need in the year 2015 is the number of at-risk children in the second grade.

Now, if we do not make some tough choices here today supporting education funding and Head Start programs and preparing our workers for the future through preparation in vocational educational programs, in targeted Job Corps programs, we are going to be spending more money on prisons. We are going to have a larger debt with the Japanese and the Germans and we are going to continue to have, as I have, only 35 percent of my students enrolled in Head Start programs, a program that works.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, yes, we are receptive to change and reform. We need some new ideas in our schools and we will be receptive to looking at some ideas, such as national testing and magnet schools, and so forth. We are not throwing money at this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Ford amendment to increase funding for education, training, and related programs by $400 million. This amendment builds upon Chairman FORD's homefront budget initiative by increasing our commitment to education in the fiscal year 1992 budget resolution.

I commend the Budget Committee for its recommendation that education be increased by $2 billion, which is triple the increase proposed in the President's budget. However, I believe that we need to go further in increasing education spending.

Education must be a top domestic policy priority for the United States. Providing quality education is an investment in the future of our Nation. Numerous studies have shown that for every $1 spent on early childhood education programs, such as Head Start, the return on that investment is $6 in savings in terms of welfare costs, remedial education, crime, and other social problems.

Far too many of our youth continue to leave school without the fundamental skills to be productive in the workplace. If we fail to adequately educate these youth, we are foreclosing their opportunities to become productive members of society. Their hopes and futures turn into despair and failure. The costs to these youth are enormous in terms of lost opportunities and shattered dreams. The costs to

society are enormous as well in terms of our economy and our ability to remain competitive.

We must ensure that America remains strong economically and able to meet the workplace challenges of the future. We as a nation must work to improve the future of our children. Increased funding for education is a sound investment in our Nation's children and our future.

Although I personally believe that we could go even further in investing in education, I strongly support the Ford amendment and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], a member of the committee.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very vigorous and strenuous support of the recommendation of our committee Chair here for additional funds in the educational function.

I have heard the debates this morning, critical of the suggestion that there would be individuals in this body willing to stand up and articulate the importance of education to the future of this country. This is what this debate is all about.

It is a question of determining where your priorities are. This is an investment in our future. It is not a funding for today or a look back to yesterday. This is an effort of this Congress to look to the future of this country. There is no better way to spend an additional $400 million than on the future of our country and our children. This investment will pay enormous dividends.

If we are concerned about crime, about drugs, and about all these other things that plague our Nation, it is an investment in our children, in education, to give them an opportunity to see that there is a chance for them in the future that is going to make a differnce.

I admit that we should stand here and congratulate the Budget Committee for coming up with $2 billion additional money for education beyond the budget, but this is only a paltry beginning. Think of it. We have over 12 million children in our country who come from poverty levels, and yet we are only able to accommodate a little over a third in a Head Start Program that everybody says is the most excellent program that ever has been put in place by the Congress in years past.

We can only fund it at 35 or 36 percent. This is really tragic. We have to only talk about full funding in the next 7 or 8 years. I would like to see full funding right now, but I am content to say that we must make progress in small steps, and I cannot describe this amendment that our chairman has offered as anything but a small step toward a future that is so essential.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Ford amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from the Virgin Islands.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

I would like to associate myself strongly with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to make a statement today in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] to increase significantly the priority this Government places in education in this country by authorizing an additional $400 million and increasing outlays by an additional $200 million in the next fiscal year.

I salute the initiative Chairman FORD has taken on behalf of the tens of millions of people in this country who will benefit from the amendment he has offered. The Chairman's untiring commitment to this important legislation and his strong leadership in bringing it to the floor are remarkable, particularly in these times of budget constraints where we must operate under a virtual fiscal straightjacket. Chairman FORD recognizes—and is asking us to recognize—that every community, every city, every county, every State and territory has a stake in this important amendment. It is a solid commitment that will affect every family in America.

No domestic programs are more important than those that enhance and improve education. The future of the American people and the future of this great Nation, indeed the future of the global community, is dependent upon the education we endow to our young. For us to provide the quality of life we expect in America, for us to remain competitive with other nations, for us to share the American dream in this generation and for generations to come, we must ensure that our Nation's citizens have a solid foundation in learning.

Chairman FORD's amendment redoubles our support for a broad spectrum of programs, including health and nutrition, Head Start, training in science and math, student financial assistance, and vocational and adult education. History has shown that these programs really work and make a significant difference in the achievements of our Nation's students, from prekindergarten through postsecondary education.

These programs which Chairman FORD has identified are all crucial to successful learning in America today. They comprise a cornerstone of our democracy, for through knowledge comes freedom, in freedom comes strength, and in strength comes a more firm commitment to democracy.

I urge the Members to support this important amendment offered by Chairman FORD. It is an investment in the future of the American people and America itself.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about hard, tough decisions here today. We are talking about setting priorities so that we can invest in this great country, because right now 40 percent of the children who come to school for the first time as first graders are programmed to fail.

Mr. Chairman, the programs that we are crying about cutting are important, but they pale beside that statistic.

In the years since the Patriot missile was begun to be developed until it was used in the Persian Gulf, this country went from producing 70 percent of the world's consumer technology down to 5 percent.

We sent our Secretary of State around the world begging for funds to pay for that emergency. In another future conflict, we may be begging for the technology. We cannot afford to not invest in our children.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Committee on Education and Labor.

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

Mr. Chairman, during the past district work period, I circulated a proposal in the House that asked our Budget Committee to increase the amount for education, as the chairman of the full committee had supported, an amount four times greater than the increase upon which the Members will now be asked to vote. During that district work period, with Members out of town, in only 3 days I secured almost 100 signatures, in effect cosponsors, for a proposal 4 times greater than this. We know that the Members of this House, as do their constituents, strongly support appropriate funding for America's schools, America's children and college and university students.

The current deficit situation in the United States and the accounting principles inherent in the Gramm-Rudman law have created a situation which has made this Congress very much like the small town pharmacist who, because he does not have enough medicine in the back room to cure everyone in town, has decided he will cure no one. As a result, he puts just one drop of the curative in every little prescription bottle, and sends people on their way with a pat on the head, telling them to take two aspirin, swallow this taste of medicine and get a good night's sleep. That is what is happening in this country, and as a result have you noticed that we are curing nothing. The bridges are falling down. Some say the children are not being taught properly. The roads are not being repaired. We have trouble in space and all the rest.

Can't we decide to cure something in this country? Cannot this Congress

provide enough attention and assistance to make a true difference in at least one important American institution—education?

□ 1120

That is what Chairman FORD's amendment is all about. If adopted, let me just tell you a couple of things it might do. If we put this additional $400 million here and the Committee on Appropriations decided to spend it on chapter 1, the 3 R's, it would bring an additional 420,000 students in America under chapter 1. If you will vote for this and the appropriators will decide to put it into Head Start, it will bring 130,000 American poor children into Head Start. That will mean only 70 percent of the poor children in this country are not receiving Head Start services instead of 80 percent not served as it is this morning.

If we decide to put this money into Pell grants, it will mean that your sons and daughters will have a $200 increase in their Pell grant money to help them pay those high tuitions and fees. But more important, it will mean that 200,000 more students become eligible for Pell grants in the United States, almost a quarter of a million new students being assisted if this money is used for Pell grants.

Let us be the pharmacist who cures ills in the United States, let us vote for the Ford amendment and do something positive for the schools and for education in this country.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank my chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is time that we begin to improve public education in America. We will do so when we present to the States a constitutional amendment that will reinstitute voluntary prayer in public schools. The denial of this practice came to us in 1962, and ever since, this Nation has been adrift in how we are going to educate our children.

There are twin goals in public education, education of competence and education of conscience.

Education of conscience principally belongs in the home and in the religious community of the family. But it also belongs in our public schools in order for us to teach our kids that there is a God in Heaven who created this world and everything in it and in order to have discipline in the classroom which establishes an environment for learning.

I am sad to say that in my work on the Committee on the Judiciary in the last 6 years in this House, the committee has bottled up the constitutional amendment and never brought it to the floor for a vote.

I hope in this Congress we can bring it to a vote on the floor of the House so that Members can explain to their constituents where they stand on this fundamental reform that is needed if we seriously intend to improve public education in the United States.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out here by Chairman FORD and others who have addressed this issue, the Budget Committee gave a great deal of thought and discussion to the issue of education and Head Start and the need to make investments in our children, in our society. There is little doubt that if this Nation is going to become competitive in the future, we simply have to put more resources in these areas. And, in fact, education funding was the No. 1 priority in the committee budget that we present to the House. We tripled the increase that the President suggested to some $2 billion. We also put $350 million more into Head Start, putting it on a track toward full funding.

So I believe the committee did a good job in this area. But I also recognize and sympathize with those who want to put additional resources into it. I guess if there are additional resources to be put into an area, children should be our No. 1 priority.

Since this amendment does do it in a way that is deficit-neutral and takes it from the nonpriority areas, I am not opposed to it.

This week the President is going to announce an education initiative. His concerns are worthy concerns, and we should listen to them. But the test of any commitment to education is not just words, it is action. I think the committee recommendation and the Ford amendment will show that the House, when it comes to education, is ready to make this issue its No. 1 priority, not just in words but in actions as well.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to sum up in this way: I think it is perfectly clear from the debate itself and from the comments just made by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, that education is already funded in the budget resolution before us well above current levels. What bothers me about the debate on this issue more than anything else is that I do not sense that it is focusing on the need for real change in the schools. In my judgment, this amendment is not focusing on the need for real change in the schools. One listening to this debate might get the impression that it is only money that matters. And that simply is not true.

What can make a difference is added funding for some carefully designed research, incentives, and service programs to help States and localities reform and revitalize our education system and move that system and our children more rapidly toward achievement of our national education goals.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a free vote. It involves making choices. As debate has already brought out, it involves a choice between education and the environment. We have already heard from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] a listing of six national organizations interested in the environment who are opposed, and indeed they have sent us a letter opposing the Ford amendment.

This amendment involves a choice between education and child abuse funds, as has been pointed out quite forcefully on this floor a little while earlier by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

This amendment involves a choice between education and drug programs.

Mr. Chairman, whether you like the President's version, or you like the version brought here by the Committee on the Budget, they are at least balanced packages.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the Ford amendment.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Ford amendment. The engine which pulls America is education. If you look at the host of problems we confront today, that is going to be a long uphill road. We need more investment in education.

There has been a change since I was younger, looking to go off to college. That change in America is increasingly less affordable for working Americans, and we need to do more to invest in that affordability, that accessibility.

The Ford amendment will do that. It will give us a strong, powerful engine that will help pull us forward.

We talk about problems, we talk about problems in the environment, talk about problems in health care, but really the solution to those problems begins and ends with education.

Mr. Chairman, this is an appropriate, important, crucial amendment which should be supported by all Members of the Congress. I applaud its author, and I hope all Members will join in supporting this amendment.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Ford amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to turn all this rhetoric into results. Let us support it strongly.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close with one simple observation. Mr. GRADISON has proceeded as a gentleman, but his presentation has been a little bit misleading. This debate and this action was about the budget, and the budget is about money. Whether or not we adopt legislation that can be called the education reform will be done by the committees of the House and the Senate in the normal authorization process.

□ 1130

Mr. Chairman, that is not what we are doing here today. We are simply deciding how much money the Committee on Appropriations can spend in each of the functions of the budget, and what we have done is very carefully preserved the priorities that the Committee on the Budget set up by not touching those programs and taking a small amount, no more than 1 percent, from any program, from other budget functions, and I can understand when the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the subcommittee chairman of the Committee on the Budget, see money being taken from their functions and being put in another chairman's function and that they might not like that, and I regret the fact that I have gotten between friends of many years' standing.

However, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell my colleagues something. I am willing to take anybody on on this issue because I believe the American people have heard all the rhetoric they want about how much we want to do for their children. They are waiting back there saying, "All right; put up or shut up."

This is a chance to put up or shut up. I say to my colleagues, "Don't claim you're for education if you can't vote for it when it comes to the hard, tough choices of putting your money where your mouth is."

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Congressman FORD to increase spending for education and training programs by $400 million next fiscal year. The additional spending provided by this amendment will result in significant increases for several education programs so vital to our children's well-being and to our Nation's future productivity: the Chapter 1 Compensatory Education Program, Head Start, college student financial assistance, math and science education, and others.

Passage of this amendment will mean that tens of thousands of students will have access to these successful programs. Furthermore, passage of this amendment adheres to the desire of so many of us for full funding of these cost-effective education and training programs before the end of the decade.

It is important for Member's to know that this additional spending in programs we all identify as high priority is completely offset by reductions in other functional spending categories in the budget. Chairman FORD is to be commended for adhering to the spirit and the letter of the pay-as-you-go budget process now in place.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, which targets for spending increases the most cost-effective education and training programs currently in place, paid for by a reduction in low-priority domestic spending, deserves overwhelming support.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on perfecting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 261, noes 158, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

AYES—261

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allard
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Bennett
Bentley
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bustamante
Campbell (CO)
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gray
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Henry
Hertel
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Horton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Jacobs
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kopetski
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McGrath
McHugh
McNulty
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moody
Moran
Morella
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Pallone
Panetta
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Savage
Sawyer
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Traficant
Unsoeld
Upton
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yatron

NOES—158

Applegate
Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bereuter
Bevill
Bliley
Boehner
Bunning
Burton
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Cardin
Chandler
Clinger
Coble
Combest
Cox (CA)
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
DeLay
Dickinson
Doolittle
Dreier
Emerson
English
Fields
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Green
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Holloway
Hopkins
Houghton
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Jones (GA)
Kasich
Kolbe
Kolter
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Laughlin
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Long
Lowery (CA)
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McEwen
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morrison
Myers
Nichols
Nowak
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Patterson
Paxon
Pease
Pelosi
Porter
Quillen
Ravenel
Ray
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Sabo
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Tallon
Tanner
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torricelli
Traxler
Valentine
Vucanovich
Walker
Whitten
Wolf
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—12

Bryant
Dornan (CA)
Dymally
Hughes
Kostmayer
Lehman (FL)
Marlenee
Peterson (MN)
Roukema
Towns
Udall
Yates

□ 1154

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kostmayer for, with Mr. Lehman of Florida against.

Mr. Dymally for, with Mr. Dornan of California against.

Messrs. BOEHNER, LIPINSKI, and TRAXLER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. HENRY, GILMAN, COLEMAN of Missouri, ECKART, MOLLOHAN, and COUGHLIN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the perfecting amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for the vote on rollcall No. 68, the Dannemeyer amendment, and had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote No. 68.

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). 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. DANNEMEYER:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the budget for fiscal year 1992 is established, and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996 are hereby set forth.

RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 2. (a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1991, October 1, 1992, October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, and October 1, 1995:

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

Fiscal year 1992: $850,413,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $909,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $966,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,025,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,079,813,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1992: $0.
Fiscal year 1993: $0.
Fiscal year 1994: $0.
Fiscal year 1995: $0.
Fiscal year 1996: $0.

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

Fiscal year 1992: $82,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $88,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $94,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $100,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $107,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1992: $1,214,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $1,205,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $1,222,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,254,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,302,290,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1992: $1,149,475,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $1,132,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $1,136,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,098,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,139,594,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1992: $299,062,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $223,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $170,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $72,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $59,781,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1992: $3,993,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $4,364,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $4,707,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $4,966,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $5,237,700,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1991, October 1, 1992, October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, and October 1, 1995, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $14,699,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $115,695,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $14,977,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $116,989,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $13,583,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $118,897,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $13,446,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $120,913,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $13,688,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $122,544,000,000.

(b) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1992 through 1996 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $290,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,245,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $290,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $291,986,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $289,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,666,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $297,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,620,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $306,778,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $293,235,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $18,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,887,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,744,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,349,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $18,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,483,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,625,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,344,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $18,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,102,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,431,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,304,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $19,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,746,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,448,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,361,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $20,173,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,416,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,455,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,406,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $15,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,623,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $16,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,248,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $17,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,897,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $17,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,573,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $18,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,276,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $5,328,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,550,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,198,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $5,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,652,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,742,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,150,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $5,763,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,759,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $724,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $5,993,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,869,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $650,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $6,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,984,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $849,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,280,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $19,612,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,460,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $20,396,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,198,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $21,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,966,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $22,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,765,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $22,943,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,595,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $21,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,984,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,288,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $19,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,580,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,265,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $17,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,541,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,203,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $18,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,627,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,236,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $14,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,047,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,387,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,175,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $108,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,799,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,380,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $67,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $60,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,764,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,355,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $70,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $38,669,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,360,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,356,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $72,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $21,295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,141,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,341,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $73,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $21,720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,693,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,324,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $75,218,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $32,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,891,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $34,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,167,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $35,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,493,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $36,987,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,873,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $38,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,308,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,704,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $940,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $466,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $6,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,522,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $953,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $468,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $6,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,482,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $967,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $469,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $6,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,695,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $980,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $471,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $7,239,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,789,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $994,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $473,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $43,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,643,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,281,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $45,382,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,349,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $47,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,973,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $49,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,834,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,572,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $51,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,218,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,268,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $81,295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,703,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $185,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $89,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,609,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $120,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $97,650,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,296,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $60,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $106,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,424,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $115,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $110,141,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $118,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $114,450,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $129,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,865,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $140,295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,728,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $152,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $147,265,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $165,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $159,783,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $220,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,552,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $227,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $181,607,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $238,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,093,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $251,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $200,304,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $264,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $210,505,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $5,853,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,853,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $6,453,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,453,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $7,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,078,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $7,738,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,738,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $8,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,447,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $33,390,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,223,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,149,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $34,726,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,513,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,037,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $36,046,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,781,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $902,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $37,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,079,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $791,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $38,763,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,425,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $679,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $11,724,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $13,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,772,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $13,833,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,285,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $14,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,816,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $14,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,363,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $15,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,931,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $13,011,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,599,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $450,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $13,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,063,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $14,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,546,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $14,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,047,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $15,221,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,569,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $206,738,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $206,738,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $215,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $215,640,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $220,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,731,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $220,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,904,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $219,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $219,970,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $4,611,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $754,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $406,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(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 1992:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,817,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,958,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,958,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, −$44,168,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$44,168,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$46,451,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$46,451,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$48,351,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$48,351,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

SEC. 3(a) It is the sense of Congress that the Department of the Treasury shall initiate a program to issue Treasury obligations redeemable in gold, that

(1) have an annual investment yield not exceeding 2 per centum;

(2) have principal and interest redeemable at maturity in gold.

(b) The aggregate value of these obligations shall not exceed $20,000,000,000.

(c) Revenues collected pursuant to this program shall be used solely for the purpose of reducing the Federal budget deficit.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

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

Mr. Chairman, there are two policy courses that we should pursue in dealing with the budget. The first is to restrain to the greatest extent possible the increase in spending, 1992 over 1991, which is the year we are talking about, fiscal year 1992. The second is to address, the issue of monetary reform in order to reduce interest costs.

Mr. Chairman, this chart displays what has happened to the budget and spending of the Federal Government since 1968 when a historic decision was made, when we severed the link between the dollar and gold. The facts just jump out at you. You cannot deny it. The deficits have essentially come into our system since that time. This 23-year experiment with the dollar being backed by nothing should be declared over.

□ 1200

Mr. Chairman, the second policy option we should pursue is to take a step down the road of reforming the monetary system. This budget resolution has some language in it which directs the Treasury to sell not more than $20 billion of gold-backed bonds. Nobody knows what the interest rate on those bonds would be. I believe there is good evidence it would be between 2-percent and 3-percent interest. That would significantly reduce the cost of borrowing money not only to the Government, but hopefully for all Americans when we truly reform the monetary system by once again linking the dollar to gold.

Not linking the dollar to gold results in these deficits that are massive and staring us in the face. For instance, we are going to add $426 billion to the national debt in fiscal year 1992—$426 billion. That is the measure of the deficit. Over the next 5 years we will add $1.8 trillion to our national debt. That is the spending stream that we are now pursuing. That is one option that should be pursued.

The other option, as I mentioned, is to restrain the growth in spending. The budget alternative that this Member is offering to the House does not cut anything from what we are spending in 1991. To be precise, we are spending in this fiscal year about $1.392 trillion. The budget alternative that I am talking about will spend $1.430 trillion. It is an increase in spending of some $38 billion.

I believe it is a responsible alternative, and I think this chart shows each Member where we are headed. In 1980 it took 30 percent of the personal income tax in this country to pay the interest on the debt. That is the red line. In 1991 it is taking almost 60 percent of the personal income tax to pay the interest on the debt. If we continue on our current course, by 1997 or 1998 we are going to take all of the revenue of the personal income tax to pay the interest on the debt.

The green line is the percentage of all revenue exclusive of Social Security. In 1980 it took 20 percent to pay the interest on the debt. Currently it takes about 40 percent. Either measure is a clear indication that we just cannot continue on the current course of spending.

What this alternative does is just modestly reduce the increase that otherwise would take place, and we get there by going back to fiscal year 1990 and letting 1991 spending grow 4 percent over 1990. In 1992 spending would grow over 1991 an additional 4 percent. By effectively limiting growth to the rate of inflation, we exempt from this limitation Social Security, the Resolution Trust Corporation, Desert Storm, and unemployment compensation, because I do not pretend to suggest to my colleagues that we should be reducing any of those. We are going to have to pay those bills.

But this alternative, over the next 5 years, if adopted, will reduce this projected increase in our debt of $1.8 trillion by some $475 billion.

It is very, very important that we reduce the level of spending projected for fiscal year 1992, and this alternative produces the lowest spending level of all five budgets that we will be considering today. It is $46 billion lower than baseline, it is $28 billion lower than the Democratic alternative, it is $11 billion lower than the President, and it is $5 billion lower than my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH]. I commend the gentleman from Ohio for the work that he has done because I think his alternative is a responsible alternative as well.

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume and I rise in opposition to the substitute.

This is a substitute which we have seen in past budget debates. I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] who is now a member of the Budget Committee and is sincerely committed to his beliefs both with regard to the need to move toward the gold standard, and also with regard to his sense of priorities within our society. I do not believe that those priorities are reflected in a majority of either the Democratic or the Republican side, particularly when it comes to the discretionary area because he proposes an additional cut of almost $16 billion in the discretionary area which would bring the amount, for example, in the general science, space, and technology below the levels not only of the committee but also of the President. That is true also for energy, it is true for transportation, it is true for education and health care, for income security, for veterans, for the administration of justice.

I think all of us recognize that operating within the caps that were established in the Budget Committee is a difficult enough constraint in terms of these priority areas within our society, much less to go back and say that we ought to eliminate another $16 billion from those vital programs that serve people.

So it is for these reasons that I would oppose the substitute and ask Members to do the same.

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, let me just first say that I greatly respect the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER]. If this House, if this Congress, indeed if this Nation would just listen to the gentleman from California, who talks in real language, uses real figures

and understands real economics, we would not have the problems that we have in this country. We would be at a balanced budget. Indeed, if we had just listened to Senator PHIL GRAMM from Texas and adhered to Gramm-Rudman, we would be at a balanced budget today.

But what we are presented with today is a Democrat budget that raises spending to 25 percent of GNP, which is the highest that it has been since 1946. It puts us on a track that will get us to reaching 20 percent of GNP for taxes and for the first time in the history of this country for consecutive years thereafter, after 1994. That is what we are presented with, yet we very easily dismiss out of hand the Dannemeyer budget.

Spending is the problem, ladies and gentlemen of this House. Spending is the problem. While many Members point out that the 1992 budget resolution calls for only 2.6 percent increase in spending over 1991, a whole lot of smoke and mirrors are distorting the true picture. We use a lot of smoke and mirrors in this Congress. We should look at the increase over 1990 levels. Those are the levels from which we passed the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

The 1991 budget had 12.6 percent more spending than in 1990, and that is before $77 billion in supplementals that we recently passed. That means that Congress wants to increase spending by a massive 21 percent over 2 years.

Under the budget proposed by the Democrats, 60 percent of the total receipts, 60 percent of the total receipts from individual income taxes will be consumed by the interest on the national debt.

The budget agreement does not mandate spending. It sets caps and we have heard caps for 2 days, and rubber caps at that. But yet, both the Gradison budget and the Democrat budget spend just about all that is available to them.

We must cut spending. We are not prohibited from cutting spending by the budget agreement. We cannot make last year's budget agreement a floor for spending levels. It must be a ceiling. Congress is spending every penny allowed under the agreement, and as we all know, Congress will boost those ceilings later with supplementals.

The Dannemeyer budget offers real change. It reduces the deficit by $45.8 billion in 1992 and $472 billion plus over 5 years. It does it the old fashioned way: It cuts spending, which is the only way that it works.

I must say at this point for Members of my side of the aisle, this Dannemeyer budget does not pick up the tax increases that come from the budget agreement for 1992. It does not pick up the tax increases. So in essence, we are refuting the tax increases that were implemented on this country last year.

The Dannemeyer amendment excludes from the freeze all of the issues that give us political heartache, the RTC funding, Social Security, unemployment insurance, Desert Storm, and undistributed offsetting receipts. And the Dannemeyer budget maintains the budget agreement's defense spending figures which saves $9.8 billion in 1992 and $161 billion over 5 years.

□ 1210

Under mandatory programs, excluding interest, they are allowed scheduled beneficiary and inflation increases from the 1991 base. That allows these programs to grow by 7.1 percent which saves a lot of money, and then nondefense discretionary that we talk a lot about, the spending programs are held to 4 percent annual growth from the 1990 base which saves $26 billion in 1991, and $157.5 billion over 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity here, my colleagues, to actually do something to reduce spending and not continue on the devastating road that we are on if we adopt the Democrat proposal.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Dannemeyer amendment, but I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER], because he has brought forward some ideas that probably could be incorporated into a solid future for our country.

I am not too crazy about all the budget, so I would not be very upset about that, my not supporting the gentleman's substitute, I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

My concern is basically this: I think one thing we can do in America is take a look at the limited dollars we have and take care of America first. If there is any money left over, then take a look at some of our foreign accounts.

Second of all, I know it is preaching to the choir, but I think we have to look at some fair trade programs. Mr. Chairman, we are getting our clock cleaned by countries like Japan, and I think we could put together a trade program that will gnaw away that debt. We cannot separate our budget deficits from our trade deficits. That is basically where my concern is.

My concern is on the exodus of jobs. America's No. 1 export is jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I did offer for the committee as an amendment a particular amendment that would force the respective bureaus of our Congress and the General Accounting Office to file a report with the Committee on the Budget of both the House and the Senate to set forth in detail the impacts that this budget will have on American jobs, either the growth or the further demise of American jobs.

The Committee on Rules was instructed to take basically substitutes. I am not offended by that. But I would like to engage in a colloquy with our chairman, who I think has done a tremendous job on the issue.

Mr. Chairman, my little amendment calls, in essence, for some instrument or mechanism that would create an analysis of the budget and the impact it is going to have on either the further erosion of jobs or possibly the gaining of some jobs. Being that it was not allowed, I would like to know if the gentleman, in his particular capacity, might be able to add some language or to be able to effect, in essence, such a program, if you will, or a response, that might satisfy this. I think it is important for our country.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I understand the gentleman's concerns, and they are legitimate concerns. He discussed his possible amendment with me. I understand why it was not made in order, because it did not involve a substitute. But it addresses a legitimate area of concern which is: how do these budgets, in fact, impact with regard to jobs in this country?

It is something that I hope to look at in terms of perhaps some language directions that we can make within the conference when we engage in the conference with the other body on this issue, and if not, it would be my hope that I could write a letter to the General Accounting Office, the GAO, and ask them to look at this aspect of whatever budget is finally adopted.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. I am thankful that the chairman will at least take issue with it.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Dannemeyer alternative budget.

The time has come to admit a mistake and make corrections. The Congress was wrong to adopt a budget which dramatically increased the American people's tax load. The Congress was wrong to label that very same tax increase as a deficit reduction package. The Congress was wrong to tax America into a recession.

We told the Democratic Party that the budget agreement they foisted upon President Bush would cripple our economy.

Last month housing starts fell 9.3 percent. There has been a broad-based drop in manufacturing output—a 9.25-

percent first-quarter plunge. Unemployment is up to almost 1.2 percent since October. We have lost 1.3 million jobs in the past 6 months.

When last year's budget was passed, we were told the 5-year deficit would be $546.5 billion. Today we are facing a 5-year projected budget deficit of $865.2 billion. Some estimate it will turn out to be closer to $1 trillion, largely because of the negative impact that new taxes have had on the economy.

We're not going to control the deficit until we control the spending juggernaut.

The Gradison budget and the committee's budget may not appear to contain outrageous spending increases. A close look, however, reveals last year's and this year's budget package balloons Federal spending by 21 percent.

We can't keep going down this road. We will have a $318 billion deficit this year. This means we will spend nearly $30 billion next year just to pay for interest on this year's increase.

Last fall's budget agreement was not a deficit reduction package—it was a sham.

Congressional spending is like a runaway freight train; our economy is on a train ride to hell.

The time has come to pull the emergency cord and bring this runaway spending to a screeching halt. The Dannemeyer budget is an effective tool to put the brakes on Government spending.

The Dannemeyer substitute will reduce the deficit by $45.8 billion for fiscal year 1992 and $472 billion over 5 years by holding the increase in nondefense discretionary spending to 4 percent.

If Congress had enacted a Dannemeyer-type approach last session, we would be well on our way to a balanced budget. But as we all know, Congress adopted a tax and spend sham package which has driven our economy into recession, closed our businesses and thrown our people out of work.

We have a chance today to make amends. I urge my colleagues to support the Dannemeyer budget and vote for fiscal responsibility.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the efforts by my colleague, the gentleman from California, to offer an alternative to the inside-the-beltway groupthink that now dominates our budget deliberations.

Some years ago, when I first came to Washington to work as a lawyer for President Reagan in the White House, we were in the midst of what was called the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit reduction glidepath, a 5-year program of deficit reduction which eventually would bring us to a zero annual deficit.

Fiscal year 1992, under Gramm-Rudman, was to be a zero-deficit year. Instead, what we are looking at under the proposal in advance by this Congress is perhaps the largest deficit in American history.

The proposal by my colleague, the gentleman from California, does not cut spending. Instead, in some accounts, it increases spending by 7 percent, overall by more than 4 percent. There are no spending reductions even in this proposal, which is viewed as too difficult to swallow by most in Washington.

□ 1220

Not everyone, however, is sticking with the rhetoric of just last fall when we were talking about the Budget Agreement as the deficit reduction agreement, because now the facts are out.

Now that the more than 1,000 page document has been made available to the American people, and they have read it. Here is what one of the authors of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings bill, our colleague from the other body has to say about that bipartisan agreement: "That agreement," he says, "is a lie and a fraud." I am quoting from the March 11, 1991 Washington Post. "The truth is that last fall's deal has catapulted the United States into a new era of hyperdeficits. The budget submitted February 4 by the Office of Management and Budget acknowledges that we will add $378.6 billion to the National Debt in 1991, plus another $343 billion in 1992. Expect these numbers to increase dramatically as the recession continues." My colleagues conclude, "As a blueprint for genuine deficit reduction, this plan is a sham."

What we are doing here today is voting upon a resolution that will seal that agreement, that sham. I, for one, intend not to participate, but rather to vote for the much more responsible alternate offered by my colleague from California. I should add that it is time that we look at overhauling the entire Federal budget process because the process itself, inexorably, drives the United States to this slipshod and outrageous result.

I offer H.R. 298, the Budget Process Reform Act, cosponsored by over 130 Members in the House. If adopted, it will put the United States in a different environment in which the system can be responsible, even if we individual Members feel it not possible to vote that way all the time.

Again, I compliment my colleagues for offering this responsible alternative. I intend to vote for it, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the debate and have found in the past that the gentleman from California, [Mr. DANNEMEYER's] amendments probably tended to support them more often than not. We have always lost by substantial margins. A few years ago it began to occur to me that we could make all the great speeches, as we have heard today, and cast all the blame we could possibly cast about who is at fault, and never get anywhere.

The budget agreement that has been much maligned that occurred last year, whether a Member wants to admit to it or not, is a small step in the right direction, at least in this Member's opinion. It is much better to take a small step in the right direction than to take a gigantic step, and not have anything happen.

Now, I have listened to many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle talking about the big spending Democratic Congress. I would like to have, perhaps, an exchange of some debate on this issue as to the numbers that we are talking about. I want to use the 8 years of the Reagan administration, which this Member as a Democrat, voted with more often than not. However, when we look at what President Reagan asked this Congress to spend every year, and compare it to what we spent, I find these results, certified by CBO, and I believe OMB would also do the same. President Reagan asked Members to spend $7,383,000,000,000; we spend $7,568,000,000,000 in actual outlays. That is $195,000,000,000 more. In discretionary spending, which is really what we are talking about today, because let there be no mistake on any Member's part, the Democratic budget is living within the same caps that the Republican budget is living within, and this one Member is dedicated to seeing that we not exceed that.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. On the gentleman's figures, does the gentleman include in those figures the rescissions that President Reagan asked for during that same period of time, that covered some of that spending?

Mr. STENHOLM. No, we do not. We are talking about requests and actual performance.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, that is right, but the fact is that the President did offset a number of his spending requests with significant rescissions, which the Congress did not act on, and thereby increased spending by not acting on the rescissions.

Mr. STENHOLM. That perhaps could be factual, but how many dollars would the gentleman concede that we had an actual rescission request?

Mr. WALKER. I do not know that figure, but I do know that the figures that the gentleman quotes strike me as being figures that do not include the rescissions, and that does, in fact, have an impact on the request.

Mr. STENHOLM. Without knowing the numbers exactly, I would concede that point to the gentleman, and concede that and be happy when reviewing the remarks to put the numbers in, and still make the point that I am making today, because if we are talking in terms of a $195 billion difference, I doubt that President Reagan asked Members to rescind $2 trillion in the last 8 years.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PANETTA. The gentleman does not have to concede to anything because the fact is that the Congress provided about 90 percent of the savings that were proposed in the rescissions by the President. We did not accept the President's rescissions, but other savings were found within the appropriations bills.

So the gentleman, if he is making the comment that somehow we have rejected all the savings that the President recommended, he is wrong.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank my colleague from Texas for his contribution, and I will be the first to admit on the floor that the gentleman's contribution on the issue of budget and spending, if it were followed by the majority of the Members of the House, we would be a lot closer to a balanced budget than we are today. I want to thank the gentleman in the well for that.

However, I would make one observation about the comparison the gentleman has made, and I do not have this analysis before me, but I will put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when I revise my remarks, because I had an analysis made comparing the Reagan budget requests all the years that he was here, with what Congress responded, in the way of spending. What we have to understand is that it is interesting to compare requests to spending by Congress, but what is more important, is that once the level of Federal spending ratchets upward as it did with Congress, the President was in the position, if he wanted to reduce spending by lower levels of what Congress has appropriated, it is very difficult to do that, as the gentleman knows. Therefore, we were unable, because we did not have the votes around here in the decade of the 1980's, to restrain the growth of Federal spending, and that is the problem with this institution.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I concur with the gentleman's observations in that.

My point, and I have listened to the debate, and I have listened to Members make statements that insinuate that it is all Congress' fault. My only purpose in participating now is to suggest that there is equal fault on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue regarding the spending question, and it is not a fair assertion to be made on the floor that it is somehow our fault. I said "our" collectively.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I say on that point, the Presidents propose and Congress dispose. A President can only spend what we appropriate. The responsibility in the Constitution is right here. We are responsible to the American people to the level of spending, not what a President does.

Mr. STENHOLM. Again, I obviously concur to that.

Let me say in concluding, with a point I wish to make, we sometimes take great liberty in casting blame. My point, if it is 90 percent, or whatever the rescissions were, it cannot be totally the Congress' fault that over the last 8 years we have added $2 trillion of new debt, when spending by Congress has come within a small percentage point of the amount that the President has asked and demanded that we spend.

Now, there is a perception by the general public out there that tend to believe Members of Congress when they stand in the well and say it is all our fault that we have literally spent ourselves into oblivion. Members cannot prove that by the spending numbers that we have had. Members cannot add up $200 billion or 10 percent more, if my chairman is correct and I assume him to be correct, Members cannot add up $200 billion more spending by the Congress and come up with $2 trillion of new debt on spending alone. Something else has had to happen. That is where I think the budget debate today is. I wished I could support the gentleman today, but I have made a decision that I would rather move Members a small step in the right direction than to continue to participate in some activities in which there is reason to believe that we cannot get anywhere. Perhaps I am wrong in that.

Again, the gentleman has been very honest with me. I would be honest with him. Some of the difficulty, and I will be parochial, agriculture last year alone in this budget that we passed in the fall that no Member liked at the time, we cut agricultural spending entitlement version 15 percent.

□ 1230

Now, that is real, 15 percent cut.

Now, the gentleman would cut us again.

Now, there is a limit to how far we can go and how fast. I would agree with the general direction, but we cannot make those kinds of cuts without a plan.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, you know, we talk about cuts and people may listen and believe we are cutting something. Let us focus on what is going on.

In 1991, the current fiscal year, we are going to spend $1.392 trillion. Under the budget proposal that I am talking about, we would spend $1.430 trillion. That is an increase of $38 billion, 1992 over 1991.

Under the proposal of the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] the chairman of the Democrat Committee, the spending would go up to $1.458 trillion. That is $28 billion higher than what I am suggesting.

If you want to lower the whole base of Federal spending, here is the chance, I say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes a good point. I have difficulty counteracting that one at all at this stage.

I am just saying, let us give the appropriating process a chance to function. It is going to be interesting as we listen to the debate on this floor today, when we get into individual appropriation bills late this year, as this gentleman sticks with all my colleagues who want to live with this law that we are passing today, you say it is not good enough, but I am saying it is good enough for me this year. We will fight the battle again next fall and into next year as we make the step in the direction the gentleman wants to go; but I look particularly in the area of national defense and I will predict right here and now that this spending level that the gentleman says is too high is going to be very binding on those of us who beleive that national security is important in this country and who have not yet completely focused on the caps on defense and what it is going to be doing to us, and that is my point, the major point that I would make to the gentleman today.

Let us look at this proposal. It is not nearly as bad as some would make it. It is not perfect, but it is moving us in the right direction. I think the gentleman goes a tad too far at this stage.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I would contend that what we are doing is making a fundamental macroeconomic decision when we decide on budgets. In

that sense, the Dannemeyer budget is a very good presentation.

I came here yesterday and spoke on the relative priorities between the Democratic budget and the budget offered by the President in the area of science, space, and technology. If you want to look at relative priorities, it seems to me that the President's budget makes more sense than the Democratic budget; but the overriding objective to get out of parochial interests, whether they be agriculture or science, space, and technology, the fundamental macroeconomic question before us is, are we going to invest dollars in this country for the future? How are we going to invest in the future?

I would suggest to you that it becomes impossible to appropriately address the future if you are coming up with massive deficits, and therefore massive debt. If that debt is in fact driving you toward massive interest payments where the interest payments are driving out our ability to make good expenditures for things that are in the national interest, be they defense, be they space, be they technology, whatever they are, there are a lot of things that we could be spending the money better on than spending it on interest. As long as we continue to pile up debt and deficit we drive out our ability to do good spending because of interest payments that we have before us. That leads to significant economic decline.

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

Mr. WALKER. Surely, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making the point again, one of which I certainly would like to agree with, but try to answer this question for me. If spending in the last 8 years of the Reagan Presidency, and let us use that for the base, but we can say for the last 8 years or whatever, if spending by the Congress which has the constitutional obligation, if spending went up approximately $200 billion or $220 billion, if we accept a 10-percent float in here, how can it be spending alone that created $2 trillion of new debt during the same period.

Mr. WALKER. Well, in large part because we spent away much of the economic progress that the country made. We had a significant increase in the overall economic performance of the country and we spent all that away, plus some.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. I thought, Mr. Chairman, we were following an economic game plan that we said was moving us in the right direction.

Mr. WALKER. But we did not.

Mr. STENHOLM. An economic game plan that was set by the administration.

Mr. WALKER. We continued to spend at rates much higher than the inflation rates. We spent vastly more than the inflation rate throughout the decades of the 1980's, be it the President who was proposing it or be it the Congress that was spending it.

The fact is that what we did was took the inflation rate, doubled the inflation rate, spent at that rate, and so we are not raising the kind of revenues out of the economic growth that covered all that spending. So therefore, we continued to massively pile up deficits.

What I am suggesting to the gentleman is that during that time, those deficits also drove up the interest payments that we have to make each year and that ultimately is going to result in an economic decline that this country can ill afford.

I think what we ought to be doing is voting for budgets that drive down debt, drive down deficits, and encourage entrepreneurial activity.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

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

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, we are talking about a point of philosophy now and judgment regarding economic policy.

But would the gentleman concede that a President and a White House, with the Treasury and the OMB and the movement, tries to set the economic direction for a country, and would we not assume that a President, when he submits a budget to us, is taking all those things into consideration when he presents a budget to the House?

Mr. WALKER. Well, I would suggest that they do, but I would also suggest that Congress did not follow any of those budget recommendations. As a matter of fact, Congress declared most of those budget presentations of the Reagan White House dead on arrival on Capitol Hill and took off and did its own thing.

Mr. STENHOLM. On both sides of the aisle.

Mr. WALKER. And did many things detrimental to the economic performance. I think had we followed the Reagan plans in many instances, we would have ended up with greater growth activity that might have covered some of this, but the fact is that Congress did not do that and instead went its own way, and in my mind undermined some of our ability to perform.

I think some of the things we did with regard to taxes along the way, ultimately the President might have come on board, but was not in his original budget plan, probably hurt the economy and therefore hurt our ability to get the money that we needed to sustain the spending we were doing.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL].

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to take my 2 minutes to make two points. First, I want to pay special tribute to a colleague of mine from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER], who has steadfastly over the years, year in and year out, stood up for the high principles of fiscal responsibility in this country. To the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] and his colleagues and his staff, I want to pay special tribute.

The second point I want to make is that over the years both Republican and Democratic Presidents have failed to use a constitutional tool that we have given them, and that is the exercise of the veto. We have spent enormous amounts of time talking about balanced budget amendments and the line item veto. Obviously, you need a two-thirds vote of the House and of the Senate to accomplish those objectives. But I think the President of the United States should exercise the power that we gave him, and that is to exercise the veto on appropriation bills that exceed the bounds of fiscal responsibility.

President Reagan was usually identified as a conservative, but I think you will find that in his 8 years vetoed only 2 appropriation bills, 2 continuing resolutions, and 2 supplementals, out of about 85 appropriation bills.

Now, I ask you, was he a fiscal conservative or not?

This President is not exercising the constitutional veto. He has vetoed appropriation bills, but not for fiscal reasons.

So I suggest that we have within our grasp on the Republican side a minority who could sustain a veto both in the House and in the Senate. I have suggested to the President that if we are going to bring this fiscal dilemma under control over a period of the next 5 years, that the President of the United States must exercise that veto and the Congress must sustain that veto. Together, we can bring down these deficits.

□ 1240

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would advise that the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] has 4 minutes remaining.

The Chair would also advise that the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] has the right to close.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I do not see the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] on the floor, and I therefore yield myself such time as I may consume.

I see the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], chairman of the Committee on the Budget, on the floor, and I ask his attention to these comments because they relate to what was supposed to have been done in the budget summit agreement last year.

In August of last year the projection was that if we did not do something, we would add a little over $1 trillion to the national debt over the next 5 years. That was the premise on which the reduction package was adopted last fall, which contained the tax increases of $160 billion over 5 years. That was the claim that was made. It was said to all of us that we were supposed to reduce the projected deficit by some half a billion dollars over 5 years, roughly. The package came, I think, totally to about 490 in the closing days of the session, but that was the claim.

Then, when we got back here in January of this year, what did we find? That the projected deficit over the next 5 years is still $1 trillion. Now, part of the explanation, of course, is we are spending money for the Resolution Trust Corporation which was not considered, part of it for Desert Storm. I admit that. Those total about $130 billion.

My question is: How did it come to be that we raised taxes on the American people $160 billion over 5 years and claim some savings, and yet the projected deficit over the next 5 years in January of this year is the same amount that was projected in August of last year that was used as the justification for the tax increase?

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], please explain that to me?

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PANETTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, obviously it is a question that ought to be addressed to the Office of Management and Budget as well as to the Congress. But it relates specifically to some of the areas that the gentleman just pointed out. The biggest contributor to the deficit that we are looking at right now in the $300 billion category is about $100 billion next year that goes for the S&L situation.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Right, I admit that.

Mr. PANETTA. And in addition to that, you have got the recession, which resulted in reduced revenues. The combination of those——

Mr. DANNEMEYER. On that point I am going to reclaim my time. Can it not be, sir, could it not be that the cause of the recession was the tax package that this Congress adopted and inflicted on the American public?

Mr. PANETTA. Certainly, that is the gentleman's viewpoint, but it is not the viewpoint of the White House, and it is not my viewpoint. I think the basic thrust that drove the recession was essentially the Persian Gulf crisis and the spike in oil prices that took place in September.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank my colleague for his response. I believe that if we want to get out of the recession, there are three taxes we should lower right now: capital gains tax rate in order to provide increased jobs for this country; we should remove the penalty on senior citizens who want to work beyond 65 and if they choose to work, they pay a huge penalty up to age 70; and we also should rescind the 1-percent increase in the Social Security tax. I do not agree with my colleague, Senator MOYNIHAN, on a lot of things, but on this he is right. It was not necessary to raise that tax on Social Security by a little over 1 percent effective January of last year, and we should rescind that.

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am stunned to hear that the recession started with the Persian Gulf crisis. The fact is that the economic indicators started down the first part of July, almost immediately after the announcement at the White House that we were going to raise taxes. So the fact is that in July the economy began to show weakening at the indicator level and by August we were actually in the recession. So that I think it is a little bit stunning to hear that we are now blaming the Persian Gulf crisis when, in fact, it was the tax policy that drove the recession.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] has expired.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] has time remaining. Would he yield to me?

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] and I would ask him to yield.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is correct, there was a weakening in the economy. Dr. Boskin has often testified time and time again that the one thing that eventually threw us into a full-scale recession was the oil spike that took place during the initial Persian Gulf crisis.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Well, since that oil spike has now been removed, one would believe if it was the cause, we should be out of it right? The gentleman from California is not saying anything in response, Mr. Chairman. I am puzzled. The gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is not a man who is at a loss for words.

Mr. PANETTA. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is not that naive. He knows that once we get into a recession, it is not just a matter of changing oil prices, it is a matter of pulling out of a number of areas in order to try to resurrect from what is a deep recession.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I hope my colleague will join us in reducing the taxes that I have described because I think it is the most constructive thing we can do to get this Nation out of the recession along with adopting a budget for the Federal Government which restrains spending and reforms the monetary system.

Earlier today Mr. STENHOLM of Texas and I discussed Reagan budget proposals and congressional responses. Enclosed is an analysis which shows that from 1982 to 1990, if Congress had appropriated each year what the President requested, the total level of spending in 1991 would have been $234 billion lower than what it was. Congress is responsible for the deficit mess, not the President.

FEDERAL BUDGETS—THE PRESIDENT VERSUS CONGRESS

[By fiscal year; outlays in billions of dollars]

Function	President's requests			Actual outlays		
	WED (1)	CBO (2)	OMB (3)	WED	CBO	OMB
1982						
National defense	188.9	188.8	186.8	186.3	185.3	185.3
Medicare	46.6	47.1	43.2	46.6	46.6	46.6
Social security	159.6	154.7	156.7	156.0	156.0	156.0
Net interest	82.6	82.5	68.4	85.0	85.0	85.0
Other	217.8	221.1	253.6	272.8	255.5	272.9
Total	695.5	695.3	708.1	745.1	728.1	745.7
1983						
National defense	221.1	221.1	220.0	209.9	209.9	209.9
Medicare	55.4	55.4	51.0	52.6	52.6	52.6
Social security	173.5	173.5	175.3	170.7	170.7	170.7
Net interest	112.5	112.5	97.1	89.8	89.8	89.8
Other	195.1	195.1	230.1	285.3	273.0	285.3
Total	757.6	757.6	773.3	808.3	796.0	808.3
1984						
National defense	245.3	245.3	245.0	227.4	227.4	227.4
Medicare	59.8	59.8	59.8	57.5	57.5	57.5
Social security	178.2	178.2	178.9	178.2	178.2	178.2
Net interest	103.2	103.2	106.3	111.1	111.1	111.1
Other	262.0	262.0	273.4	277.6	267.6	277.5
Total	848.5	848.5	863.3	851.8	841.8	851.8
1985						
National defense	272.0	272.0	272.0	252.7	251.5	252.7
Medicare	69.7	69.7	69.8	65.8	64.3	65.8
Social security	190.6	190.6	190.6	188.6	190.2	188.6
Net interest	116.1	116.1	116.1	129.4	129.4	129.4
Other	277.1	277.1	291.7	309.8	301.4	309.7
Total	925.5	925.5	940.3	946.3	936.8	946.3
1986						
National defense	285.7	285.7	285.7	273.4	273.4	273.4
Medicare	67.2	67.2	67.2	70.2	70.2	70.2
Social security	202.2	202.2	202.4	198.8	198.8	198.8
Net interest	142.6	142.6	142.6	136.0	136.0	136.0
Other	276.0	276.0	276.1	311.9	311.6	311.6
Total	973.7	973.7	973.9	990.3	989.8	989.8

	COM (4)			COM		
1987						
National defense	282.2			282.0		
Medicare	70.2			75.1		
Social security	212.2			207.4		
Net interest	148.0			138.6		
Other	281.4			300.7		
Total	994.0			1,003.8		
1988						
National defense	297.6			290.4		
Medicare	73.0			78.9		
Social security	219.4			219.3		
Net interest	139.0			151.7		
Other	295.3			323.7		
Total	1,024.3			1,064.0		
1989						
National defense	294.0			303.6		
Medicare	84.0			85.0		
Social security	233.8			232.5		
Net interest	151.8			169.1		
Other	330.6			352.4		
Total	1,094.2			1,142.6		
1990 (5)						
National defense	303.0			297		
Medicare	94.9			97		
Social security	246.7			249		
Net interest	170.1			179		
Other	337.1			380		
Total	1,151.8			1,202		
	Cumulative					
	WED	CBO	OMB	WED	CBO	OMB
National defense	2,389.8	2,389.7	2,385.8	2,316	2,315	2,316
Medicare	620.8	621.3	613.1	630	629	630
Social security	1,816.2	1,811.3	1,815.9	1,800	1,802	1,800
Net interest	1,165.9	1,165.8	1,139.3	1,186	1,186	1,186
Other	2,472.4	2,476.7	2,569.2	2,816	2,768	2,815
Total	8,465.1	8,464.8	8,523.3	8,749	8,700	8,749
DEVIATIONS 1982–88 (6)						
National defense	−74	−75	−70			
Medicare	+9	+8	+7			
Social security	−16	−9	−16			
Net interest	+20	−20	+47			
Other	+344	+291	+246			
Total	+284	+235	+226			

[1] Rep. W.E. Dannemeyer: President's budgets as submitted (FY 82 Reagan budget submitted in March, 1981); actual outlays as reported.
[2] Congressional Budget Office: President's budgets as submitted, excluding off-budget programs (FFB); actual outlays (updated), excluding off-budget programs.
[3] Office of Management & Budget: original budget requests adjusted for comparable accounting (defense includes imputed accruals for military retirement, Medicare includes premiums as offsetting receipts, totals include off-budget outlays).
[4] Composite: estimates have been identical beginning in FY 1987.
[5] Estimated.
[6] Actual outlays less President's requests.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Chairman, again I think there are many who respect the viewpoint of the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] in terms of how we confront what I think is a legitimate concern, which is the horrendous deficits that face this country.

But in addressing the deficit, it is always the same approach. Somehow when you address a problem as severe as the deficit, what you cannot do is go after some holy areas that should not be touched.

You should not touch defense spending. Interestingly enough, his proposal does not reduce below the cap, as he does in other areas, the defense number. That you should not raise any revenues of any taxes even if it is on the wealthiest individuals in the society. Somehow that is wrong.

So what you ought to do if you are really serious about going after the deficit is go after the investments that we make in people in our society; go after education, go after health care, go after nutrition, go after housing, go after science and research. Those are the areas, those are the areas where perhaps we can balance the budget if we just stick to cutting those investments within our own society.

Mr. Chairman, that does not work, and all of you know that it does not work. And the real thrust of the budget agreement last year by the President himself and by the leadership in the Congress, both sides, was to recognize the fact that if you are dealing with these horrendous deficits, you have to go after everything; you have to go after entitlements. There was a $100 billion reduction in entitlements in the budget agreement. You also have to go after discretionary savings, and there was $180 billion to $200 billion in savings in that area.

Two-thirds of that package involved spending savings. One-third involved revenue increases.

So if you are serious about the deficit, if you are honest with the American people about what has to be done, you will stop kidding them, stop kidding them.

Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] after I finish.

Mr. Chairman, let us stop kidding the American people. Do not pretend that somehow this horrendous deficit that faces us can just be solved by either restoring the gold standard or just cutting the hell out of domestic spending. It is not going to work. The gentleman knows it, and I know it.

So I think the Congress needs to recognize the statement that was made in the budget agreement, which is that the President and the Congress are going to join hands to try to stick to some firm caps on spending and we want to do it not only in 1992 but for the next 5 years, that offers the best hope within our system of trying to begin to reduce this deficit that confronts the country.

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

Mr. PANETTA. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat again so that we do not misunderstand what is going on: The budget spending total that the gentleman is talking about today for the country for fiscal year 1992 is $1.458 trillion. That happens to be an increase of $66 billion more than we spent in 1991.

The budget total I am talking about is $1.430 trillion, which happens to be $38 billion more than we are going to spend this year. Nothing, my proposal does not cut anything; it increases spending in 1992 over 1991 by $38 billion. It spends less than your total by some $28 billion, and if you want to do something about controlling the deficit, Mr. Chairman, vote for my proposal because it will spend $28 billion less in a very responsible way and in the out years will significantly reduce this deficit that is mushrooming in this Nation.

□ 1250

Mr. PANETTA. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] is correct. He offers reduced spending, but he offers reduced spending in the areas that he wants to reduce spending in. He does not offer it in areas across the board. He is willing to go after the most vulnerable citizens in our society. He says they do not count, they are the ones that ought to pay the sacrifice, and leave the people at the upper income levels alone. Go after the most vulnerable Americans.

Mr. Chairman, it is for that reason that I oppose this proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Dannemeyer substitute and in opposition to the alternative budget resolution for fiscal year 1992 which was reported by the Budget Committee.

The Dannemeyer substitute provides the most dramatic deficit reduction of any of the alternatives that will come before us today, and it does so with no new taxes.

The deficit will total $49 billion less under the Dannemeyer budget than under the President's budget in fiscal year 1992. It will total $63 billion less than the Budget Committee's plan.

Unlike either of those alternatives—which start from a current services baseline and thus build a 12.6-percent increase in spending from the very start—the Dannemeyer budget freezes domestic discretionary spending at fiscal year 1990 levels with only a 4-percent adjustment for inflation. It maintains defense spending at the levels set in last year's budget agreement, saving $9.8 billion in fiscal year 1992 and $161 billion over 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, it isn't good enough just to stick with last year's budget agreement. Some of us argued then, and we all know now, that that agreement was not a deficit reduction plan at all. It was a blueprint for higher taxes and dramatically increased Federal spending, with deficits remaining at unacceptably high levels for the foreseeable future.

There was an alternative to the budget agreement last fall, an alternative which parallels the Dannemeyer substitute in many respects, but the Democratic leadership denied the members of the House the opportunity to even vote on it at that time. It would have resulted in significant reductions in the deficit, without resorting to tax increases. Well, we

have an opportunity to demonstrate to the American people today who is serious about reducing the deficit and how that should be accomplished.

I urge support for the Dannemeyer substitute.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, during the past couple of years many in the Congress have focused aggressively on U.S. efforts in basic research and development, math and sciences education, advanced defense and commercial technology and manufacturing as well as export promotion—all key components of the American competitiveness puzzle. And, many of us have worked hard to ensure that adequate funding, and not only rhetoric, is available for key programs that will make America economically stronger and healthier.

The areas I've mentioned are not new, but ones which have been overlooked and neglected by the administration. However, the need to include these basic ingredients in U.S. competitiveness policies has been enforced in report after report, ending with the most recent one entitled "Gaining New Ground: Technology Priorities for America's Future" issued by the Council on Competitiveness in March 1990.

The budget resolution's initiative on technology and competitiveness is consistent with the consensus recommendations included in the Council's report. And it is necessary, if as the report states:

> America is to regain its once-commanding lead in critical technologies and establish a pragmatic plan for public and private-sector action.

Last year was the first year that the House had as part of its budget resolution, a competitiveness and economic development package. In the resolution we are considering today, there is once again an effort to enhance our country's competitiveness. This initiative, developed as a result of expertise and leadership from the Budget Committee, is our effort to establish priorities that the administration has identified but not funded in its budget.

Our serious commitments to the National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST] and its Advanced Technology Program [ATP]; DARPA; National Science Foundation math and science education programs; the Department of Defense's manufacturing technology, science and engineering education and technology support programs; the Export-Import Bank, the Trade Development Program [TDP] and the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service will strengthen the U.S. technology and industrial base and encourage U.S. exports to new and old markets abroad.

The direction given to U.S. technology and competitiveness policies through the important programs included in the budget resolution will no doubt help us regain the lost edge we have witnessed in these areas. By going back to the basics of American economic prosperity we will, as the Council on Competitiveness stated, "once again stand head and shoulders above other nations in the world because of our great technological strength."

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the American people will be shocked to know that the largest single item in the 1992 budget resolution we consider today will not provide a single dollar for the education of our children, health care or housing for families, for our national security, or for the benefits promised to our Nation's veterans and retirees.

The largest single outlay in this budget resolution is the $304 billion that our Nation will pay in interest on the national debt that will exceed $4 trillion next year.

Much has been made during this 2-day debate about the need to balance the Federal budget, and this Member has been one of the most vocal over the years in this regard. My colleagues should be aware that if not for the interest payment on the national debt, we actually would have a $23 billion surplus in fiscal year 1992. In fact, without the annual interest payment, we would have had surpluses this fiscal year and in each of the 4 prior fiscal years.

The fact is, that of the increase in the national debt during the Reagan and Bush administrations, $2.274 trillion, or 74 percent of the increase, went just to pay the interest on the national debt. The accumulated interest payment would have been even higher had President Reagan's economic policies not cut in half the interest rate during the early 1980's. Following my remarks, I will include a chart which details the growing interest payment on the national debt and its direct contribution to the national debt.

As I said in my opening remarks, these funds cannot be used to improve the quality of our children's education, the health care for young and old, the building of highways and bridges, health care and compensation for our Nation's veterans, or for the maintenance of our national security. And over the next 5 years, this payment is going nowhere but up. Between fiscal years 1992 and 1996, we will pay an additional $1.627 trillion in interest.

For more than 20 years, I have been warning my colleagues that the day of reckoning would come when they would be held accountable for their tax and spend policies in which the revenue generated by their tax increases never quite caught up with their spending on new and bigger programs. Throughout this same time, I also have urged my colleagues to face the budget head on and cast the difficult votes necessary to establish our Federal priorities.

Instead, this Congress has relied on gimmicks and phoney accounting year after year to claim to the people back home that we have discharged our fiscal responsibilities. Along came the Gramm-Rudman Act in which a computer was supposed to calculate and spit out automatic across-the-board cuts. I strongly opposed this legislation because it simply allowed Members of Congress to avoid casting the tough votes that would reduce Federal spending.

When Gramm-Rudman's spending reductions became too painful, the Congress stepped in to exempt a whole list of programs from its automatic cuts. In the end, more than two-thirds of all Federal outlays were exempted from sequestration. It soon became obvious that Gramm-Rudman would not succeed and its deficit-reduction targets were altered and its timetable for a balanced Federal budget was extended. Under the new scenario, the 1992 budget we considered today was supposed to be balanced. Instead, we are faced with the prospect of a $281 billion deficit.

With the failure of Gramm-Rudman, the Congress last year spent more than 9 months searching for a new gimmick. When it became obvious that all the gimmicks had been tried and failed and that years and years of phoney accounting and shifting of expenditures from 1 fiscal year to another had finally caught up with us, the leadership convened a series of private negotiations at an Air Force base 20 miles from the Capitol, to attempt to come to agreement on a 5-year, $500 billion budget reduction package. After weeks and weeks of these secret meetings, and the defeat of the first agreement, the leadership brought to the House and Senate a budget agreement that raised taxes, increased Federal spending, and will leave our Nation, at the end of this fiscal year, with a deficit of $318 billion—the largest in our Nation's history.

If the precariousness of our fiscal house is not already obvious, my colleagues should stop and consider the impact on our Nation of a sharp rise in interest rates. Although currently less than 10 percent, a prolonged 2-percent increase in interest rates could push our annual interest payment over $400 billion. A return of interest rates in excess of 20 percent, as they were in 1979 and 1980, would prove to be catastrophic and could dive the interest payment to more than half a trillion dollars per year.

Mr. Chairman, there should be no surprise in finding that more than 30 years of sustained deficit spending has left our Nation in fiscal chaos. Just like any individual consumer who continues to buy with a charge card without ever reducing their principal, the rising interest payment soon overwhelms the ability even to meet the finance charges. That is where we find ourselves today and why it should be evident that we need a real reform of our budget process to force this Congress to once and for all face its fiscal responsibilities head on.

We need to prohibit a repeat of last year's closed door budget negotiations, the imposition of gimmick legislation such as Gramm-Rudman, and the reliance upon accounting techniques which shift outlays between fiscal years or low-ball budget estimates with the hope that the shortage will be covered in future supplemental appropriations bills.

What we need is a new budget process which cuts away the layers of bureaucracy that have made the current process so ineffective and have actually contributed to the problem. We need to early in the year develop a simple estimate of revenues and the balancing level of outlays. Then we should allow the Appropriations Committee, and those committees responsible for mandatory entitlement programs, to bring before this House individual bill after bill, under open rules, allowing Members to have the opportunity to scrutinize every program and to debate and where appropriate amend the legislation. This is how our forefathers envisioned this process working in full view of the American people.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] for his amendment today which provides a real solution to the ongoing burden of the annual interest payment. Included in his amendment is the authorization for the Secretary of the Treasury to issue up to $20 billion in gold-backed Treasury bonds which

could finance a portion of the national debt at less than half the current rate of interest. This is a proposal my colleague from California has brought before this House time and again and which deserves our serious review and support.

Mr. Chairman, the day of reckoning has arrived and we are now being held accountable for decades of unrestrained Federal spending. We should make a commitment to the American people today that we will begin the process of making the difficult decisions and casting the tough votes to put our fiscal house in order. That is the challenge before us in the 5 months we have before fiscal year 1992 begins October 1.

INTEREST PAID ON THE NATIONAL DEBT

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Fiscal year	Interest paid on the national debt	Fiscal year deficit	Total accumulated national debt	Total Federal outlays	Interest as a percent of total outlays
1980	$74.8	$73.8	$908.5	$590.0	12.7
1981	95.5	78.9	994.3	678.2	14.1
1982[1]	117.2	127.9	1,136.8	745.7	15.7
1983	128.6	207.8	1,371.2	808.3	15.9
1984	153.8	185.3	1,564.1	851.8	18.1
1985	178.8	212.3	1,817.0	946.3	18.9
1986	190.2	221.2	2,120.1	990.3	19.2
1987	195.3	149.7	2,345.6	1,003.8	19.5
1988	214.1	155.1	2,600.8	1,064.1	20.1
1989	240.9	153.4	2,867.5	1,144.1	21.1
1990	264.8	220.4	3,206.3	1,251.7	21.2
1991[2]	286.3	318.1	3,617.8	1,409.6	20.3
1992[2]	304.0	280.9	4,021.1	1,445.9	21.0
1993[2]	320.0	201.5	4,365.5	1,454.2	22.0
1994[2]	330.0	61.7	4,586.8	1,427.1	23.1
1995[2]	334.5	2.9	4,773.3	1,470.3	22.8
1996[2]	338.5	19.9	4,949.4	1,540.9	22.0

[1] The fiscal year 1982 budget was the first submitted by President Reagan.
[2] Estimate.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 79, noes 332, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

AYES—79

Allard
Armey
Ballenger
Bliley
Broomfield
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Coble
Combest
Cox (CA)
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
DeLay
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Fawell
Fields
Franks (CT)
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gingrich
Goss
Grandy
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Holloway
Hopkins
Houghton
Hunter
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Kyl
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lowery (CA)
McEwen
Miller (OH)
Moorhead
Nichols
Oxley
Packard
Petri
Porter
Pursell
Quillen
Ravenel
Rhodes
Ritter
Rohrabacher
Roth
Schaefer
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shuster
Slaughter (VA)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOES—332

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Baker
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bustamante
Byron
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Henry
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Horton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hutto
Hyde
Jacobs
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Nussle
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Poshard
Price
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Scheuer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yatron
Young (AK)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—20

Alexander
Aspin
Bevill
Bryant
Dornan (CA)
Dymally
Gephardt
Hughes
Kennelly
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Lehman (FL)
Levine (CA)
Marlenee
Rose
Roukema
Towns
Udall
Volkmer
Yates

□ 1313

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Dornan of California for, with Mr. Hughes against.

Mr. WYDEN and Mr. RIGGS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. JAMES changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). 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. KASICH:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the budget for fiscal year 1992 is established, and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996 are hereby set forth.

RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 2. (a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1991, October 1, 1992, October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, and October 1, 1995:

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

Fiscal year 1992: $849,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $914,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $1,000,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,077,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,143,800,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1992: $2,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: −$400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: −$600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: −$4,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1992: $82,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $90,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $96,814,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $103,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $110,190,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1992: $1,235,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $1,180,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $1,228,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,273,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,324,400,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1992: $1,184,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $1,175,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $1,133,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,165,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,226,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1992: ($334,700,000,000).
Fiscal year 1993: ($261,400,000,000).
Fiscal year 1994: ($133,600,000,000).
Fiscal year 1995: ($88,100,000,000).
Fiscal year 1996: ($82,400,000,000).

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

Fiscal year 1992: $3,978,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $4,313,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $4,529,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $4,715,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $4,889,600,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1991, October 1, 1992, October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, and October 1, 1995, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $14,698,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $190,235,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $14,976,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $193,517,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $13,581,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $196,717,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $13,447,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $199,992,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $13,658,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $202,539,000,000.

(b) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1992 through 1996 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $290,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $290,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $291,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $291,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $295,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $297,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $293,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $21,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,745,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,349,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $20,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,625,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,344,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $19,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,432,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,305,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $20,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,449,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,360,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $19,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,455,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,406,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $15,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $16,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $17,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $17,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $18,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $4,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,197,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $5,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,741,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,150,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $5,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $724,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $4,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $650,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $5,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $850,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,280,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $19,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $19,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $18,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $18,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $20,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,288,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,464,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $17,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $14,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,265,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $16,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,202,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $16,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,236,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,387,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,175,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $104,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,380,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $142,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $9,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,355,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $147,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $11,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, ($33,600,000,000).
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,356,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $150,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, ($38,200,000,000).
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,341,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $152,915,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, ($26,100,000,000).
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,294,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $155,242,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $33,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $34,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $35,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $36,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $39,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $939,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $466,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $5,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $953,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $464,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $966,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $459,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $980,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $452,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $5,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $993,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $443,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $45,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,281,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $44,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $44,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $45,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,572,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $45,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,268,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $80,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $185,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $91,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $120,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $102,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $60,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $113,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $112,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $126,000,000.000.
(B) Outlays, $125,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $113,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $124,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $138,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $154,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $154,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $174,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $222,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $184,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $232,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $193,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $241,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $201,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $249,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $210,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $258,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $219,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $6,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $7,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $7,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $32,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,149,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $32,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,037,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,625,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $34,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $901,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $35,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $791,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $36,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $679,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $11,725,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $14,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(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 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $15,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $16,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $11,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $11,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $12,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $229,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $229,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $239,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $246,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $246,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $248,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $251,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $251,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $34,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $36,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $34,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $34,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $36,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Does the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] oppose the amendment?

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, this gentleman is opposed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I watched with great interest the discussion that went along on the last amendment. I want to explain basically what I am doing, because I think this is an amendment that Members can support across the board.

Mr. Chairman, I am not involved in my amendment in gutting the operations of the Federal Government, nor involved at all in going in and doing anything different than what the administration does in the area of entitlements, or on the premium for Medicare.

Mr. Chairman, all I basically do to get the bulk of my savings is hold the rate of budget authority growth to the rate of inflation for 5 years. By doing that, I save $8.1 billion more than the administration's plan in the first year, and $85 billion over 5 years. Those numbers, as opposed to the Panetta plan, I will save $13.4 billion in the first year, and $172 billion over 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, I want all Members to focus on this chart. This is, I believe, a miniature scandal that is brewing here when it comes to the way in which we do our budget numbers. You may recall that last year we got together and said we should not use the surpluses from Social Security to mask the deficit. So we moved the Social Security calculations off budget.

Lo and behold, we are now using the S&L crisis, the calculations of the savings and loan crisis in this country, to mask the real cost of the deficit and the real glidepath of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, if you look at this chart, you can see that the argument that we are only increasing spending marginally over these next 5 years as provided for under the budget agreement looks pretty well like they are right. One can see that the increases are rather small. There are no dramatic increases.

What one must understand is that under the calculations of the administration in the last 2 years, there is at least $90 billion in revenue they are projecting is going to come in from the S&L crisis.

Mr. Chairman, nobody in this country has been right, let alone in the Washington, DC area, in terms of the total revenues that are going to be generated from the S&L crisis.

What I say is let us take the S&L funding completely out of the picture and look at what happens to this budget deal. When one does that, they can see the dramatic increases in the growth of Federal spending.

Mr. Chairman, what we are doing is we are hiding that dramatic increase in Federal spending by masking it with the S&L crisis. When you strip the S&L crisis out of the calculations, you can see that the increases in Federal spending are absolutely dramatic on a year-to-year basis.

Furthermore, there was a discussion about how bad things were in the Reagan years, how spending went up so high. We happen to have a chart that reflects that as well.

What you can see in this chart is that the Reagan rate is the bottom number, and the top rate is the current spending rate. This is what I would call the deficit wedge. The deficit wedge indicates that the growth in Federal spending is up dramatically in these 5 years as opposed to the Reagan years.

Mr. Chairman, going back to the chart that has to do with the S&L crisis, whether you believe that we have done a good job or not, or what kind of chart we are setting a course on, or whether the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is right, or the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] is right, or whether this gentleman is right, the bottom line is over the next 5 years we are going to add $1.3 trillion to the national debt, and that is absolutely crazy.

Then we come to the floor and we applaud ourselves for the fantastic job we are doing in controlling Federal spending under the budget deal, while at the same time we add $1.3 trillion to the national debt.

□ 1320

Under the Kasich plan, all we do is hold the growth in budget authority to the rate of inflation, and we will, over a period of 5 years, save a modest $85 billion over the administration's plan, and as compared to the Democrat plan we save $172 billion.

Look, folks, nobody should be afraid to go home and tell their constituents that they voted to hold the growth of discretionary spending to the rate of inflation. No Member should be opposed to that.

This is a good plan and I ask for Members' support in vast numbers on a bipartisan basis.

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Yesterday, I testified before the Appropriations Committee and requested funding for discretionary programs within the Maritime Administration and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

I have also requested funding for Coast Guard programs, Corps of Engineers programs, and Department of the Interior programs.

The Appropriations Committee is already facing a difficult job to fund necessary programs and projects in which committees and Members are interested. Across-the-board reductions in domestic spending allocations make its job even harder.

Any Member who has requested appropriations for any programs or projects cannot, in good conscience, support this amendment.

I urge opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just a moment to applaud the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for the thoughtful work and the expensive work he has put into this process. Working virtually alone, he has come up with a very good alternative. I would also like to remind the body that what we are doing is marking up the budget beginning with a base instrument of the Democratic majority's budget from the Budget Committee, and anything we vote on will be an amendment to that. So the question Members must ask themselves is: Is this proposal before us a better alternative in budgeting than the alternative brought by the Democratic majority in the Budget Committee?

I am going to say that the Kasich alternative is a better alternative we must all vote for. Let me just talk for a quick minute about the fundamental problem with the committee mark, which is that it is based on unrealistically optimistic economic assumptions. I am going to give a quick example.

During the period of time in which the Nation is in a recession, given the assumption that the recession will be shallow and short by the Congressional Budget Office, the Democratic budget proposes cuts in unemployment insurance by $431 million, and by making that cut, by assuming those increased revenues of some $11 billion, they make it possible to increase spending in other mandatory levels of spending.

The upshot of that is that we will be back, if this budget passes and we pass legislation to conform with it, looking for special supplemental appropriation bills to cover such things as the shortfalls in unemployment insurance unless the optimistic forecast of the Congressional Budget Office holds up.

Let us take a look at the budget. Entitlement spending is 52 percent of our budget; $1 out of every $7 of that 52 percent finds its way into the hands of people at or below the poverty level of income. If six out of every seven entitlement dollars are going to people with greater than entitlement incomes, we must see the need, the opportunity, and the ways in which we can have entitlement reform. Kasich does that; the Democratic budget in report language allows that the committees ought to discuss it while Kasich does it.

We ought to try to find a way to hold down the interest on the debt, 20 percent of our budget. We ought to have real restraint in the growth on discretionary spending, and we ought to keep the tax extenders in the law as the President proposed. Kasich does that and he retains in that some vestige of

respect for the American people, their entrepreneurial talent, their creativity, their ability to spend their money on a more productive basis on behalf of themselves and their families than the Government can. Kasich understands these things, he does these things. The Democratic budget ignores them or allows for the possibility to talk about them.

I say vote for the Kasich amendment.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of our committee for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Kasich substitute and in support of the House budget resolution.

While both budgets are constrained by a pitiful lack of resources given the urgent unmet domestic needs around the country, the House budget resolution more reflects my values and priorities, and is therefore more deserving of my support.

One of the more troubling aspects of the Kasich substitute is that it is silent or ignores a number of modern day issues which, if confronted, could begin to reshape our country's future.

His substitute supports a cut in the capital gains tax, despite the fact most of the benefits would flow to the very wealthy at a time when income inequality in our country is greater today than at any time since the Great Depression.

The House budget resolution strongly rejects a cut in the capital gains tax. It opposes the economic policies advanced over the last decade by Republican administrations which have led to the top one-fifth of working Americans taking home more money than the other four-fifths together.

The substitute does not provide any funding increases over inflation for successful programs like Head Start, WIC, prenatal care or childhood immunization to help pull children out of poverty.

The House budget resolution provides for large increases above inflation for these programs. It addresses the cruel condition that in the richest country in the world, one of five children is born into poverty.

In the few minutes I have left, I would like to focus on the international affairs part of the Kasich substitute—one of the most glaring flaws of the proposal.

The Kasich substitute cuts international affairs programs by $500 million below the House budget resolution and close to $1 billion below the allowed budget cap.

Mr. Chairman, since 1985, U.S. foreign aid spending has declined by $4 billion, from $19 billion to $15 billion—in real terms by almost a third. The poorest regions of the world, principally Africa, have seen drastic declines in United States assistance. After decades of clear world leadership, the United States has now fallen behind other developed countries in foreign aid spending—at the expense of our political and economic influence worldwide.

The Kasich substitute does nothing to reverse these disturbing trends, and while perhaps, unintended, exacerbates them.

Instead, it retreats from our country's ability to seize the initiative on significant historic events taking place in Eastern Europe and poignant and tragic human disasters taking place around the world.

I know the gentleman from Ohio supports the historic political and economic transformation taking place in Eastern Europe—but his substitute does not reflect this support. Surely, the transformation of communism to capitalism and totalitarianism to democracy is worthy of more American resources that his substitute provides.

Neither does the gentleman's substitute adequately provide for the human suffering and tragedy we are witnessing among Kurdish refugees in Turkey, Iran, and Iraq. The whole refugee account totals less than the $500-million cut being proposed in the substitute.

Other desperate refugee problems are developing in the Horn of Africa, the Sudan, and South Africa. Eastern European and Southeast Asian refugees continue to overwhelm the world's ability to cope.

Does the gentleman really want to cut back our efforts in these areas?

What about programs to feed starving children and to provide much needed health care to the poorest of the poor? What about population planning and the multilateral development banks? All these programs would be cut under the gentleman's substitute.

The House budget resolution does recognize the dramatic changes taking place around the world, as well as other unprecedented worldwide demands and provides sufficient resources to address them. It rejects declining foreign aid budgets of recent years.

It recommends shifting foreign aid away from military assistance into humanitarian and development assistance.

It also provides for new initiatives in Africa and Eastern Europe. And it makes no reduction in the level for aid for Israel and Egypt.

In addition, the House budget resolution provides a large increase over last year for the Export-Import Bank. This increase reflects that American foreign aid in the 1990's must go beyond promoting democracy and stability in the world. It must be used as a strategic policy tool by the Federal Government to gain markets in the emerging democracies in Eastern Europe and around the world. Western European and Pacific rim countries have been providing this assistance to their businesses for years. The United States must be commensurately involved in this area if we are to compete with them economically.

Mr. Chairman, we must change our notion of national security for the decade ahead. The events of the past 10 years, particularly since 1989, provide historic opportunities for the United States to foster freedom, peace, and stability in a dramatically changing world. The committee's budget assumes vital assistance increases to the poorest regions of the world, and to fragile democracies. It targets the root economic causes of international conflict to make our post-cold-war world more stable and secure.

In our $5 trillion economy, I believe that the United States can and must provide substantially more in foreign aid than we have done in past years, and certainly more than the Kasich substitute. The committee budget does so in the context of obvious fiscal constraints, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

□ 1330

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman from California who just spoke to support my amendment, and let me tell the Members why.

In the income security area, I actually provide $1.5 billion more in budget authority than the Democratic alternative and $4.3 billion more in outlays in the category of income security. So if the gentleman is worried about the programs of the poor, I am more generous to the programs of the poor in the category of income security than his alternative is.

The gentleman is criticizing me for being a skinflint there. He ought to be criticizing his own people.

We have taken care of the problem for the people who are the poorest, which are the people that we target in terms of helping them. Additionally, the numbers speak for themselves. The other point is, as the gentleman knows, it has never been my intent to take the half billion dollars a year out of the foreign aid category, aid to nations. It has been taken out of a bureaucracy that has been created that does not even serve in the area of direct aid to nations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich budget substitute.

Much is going to be said this week and on this floor about how Congress is

doing its part to restore fiscal discipline to the Federal budget. Unfortunately, we have a long way to go, believe me.

Yes, there is a holding of the line in defense spending, but just look at what is called domestic discretionary spending. This year it is going up over 9 percent.

In the budget before us, in the Democratic party's budget before us, it is going to go up over 6 percent next year. What it comes down to is domestic spending is growing much faster than the rate of inflation.

Mr. Chairman, these trends cannot continue if we are going to be serious in our efforts to reduce the deficit and balance the budget.

The Kasich budget provides an alternative to runaway spending and high deficits. Simply put, it is a flexible freeze proposal which limits increases in domestic discretionary spending to the rate of inflation, thereby providing those programs with a cost-of-living adjustment.

The Kasich budget is humane, as has just been pointed out. In that area of income security that most affects the needy in our society, the Kasich budget actually spends slightly more than the majority's budget, or the majority's budget spends less. Modestly slowing the rate of spending growth, which is what the Kasich budget does, is not a cut. It is a slowing of the rate of growth while revenues rise.

Mr. Chairman, the Kasich budget achieves real savings relative to what this Congress would otherwise spend in the Democrats' or the President's proposal: $13 billion this coming year, close to a $100 billion better in deficit reduction over the next 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, these savings alone will not eliminate our huge budget deficit, but the Kasich budget, I believe, is a good first step.

For this reason, I urge its adoption.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget alternative offered here by my good friend Mr. KASICH of Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, last year many of us argued for reduced spending and voted against the budget resolution because it raised spending and raised taxes. I worked with Mr. KASICH, my colleague from Michigan, Mr. PURSELL, and others to develop a budget alternative that provided real reductions in spending but were not allowed to bring it to the floor for a vote. The budget alternative offered here today by Mr. KASICH embodies many of the ideas we fought for last year.

Mr. KASICH's proposal brings the fairness of our progressive tax structure into the budget by applying means testing in the Medicare Program. It reduces international spending—foreign aid if we must make sacrifices at home, so should our foreign beneficiaries. It at least holds domestic spending to the rate of inflation or the President's budget request, whichever is lower. And perhaps most importantly, it does not further increase the deficit by spending all the way up to the domestic budget cap.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of the budget alternative we finally choose today, none of us should remain complacent or pretend we have solved the continuing budget crisis simply because we have met the requirements of last fall's Budget Enforcement Act. All the budget alternatives we are considering today will start fiscal 1992 with projected annual deficits of almost $300 billion. During fiscal 1992, Mr. Chairman, outstanding Federal debt will top $4 trillion. Just the interest payments alone will exceed $200 billion. Mr. Chairman, a little over a decade ago we were outraged at annual deficits of $40 billion and a Federal debt that hadn't breached the trillion dollar mark.

We have become immune to the sound of such enormous numbers as if they have very little meaning. And we have cynically turned our backs on the effect this mountain of red ink has on our ability to fund desperately needed programs. Had we not incurred this massive debt, the $200 billion we will pay as interest would go a long way toward feeding the hungry, educating our children, and maintaining a sound economy.

Our current path does little to truly stop our massive overspending and mounting debt. Future budget debates will not focus on our visions for a better world but will degenerate into contentious battles over increasingly limited resources. We will be forced to dedicate an even greater portion of those resources to fund the debt we will leave our children.

Mr. Chairman, as many of us have said time and time again, we cannot continue on this course. I look forward to the day when we face up to our fiscal responsibilities and debate budget alternatives that present real choices.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF].

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich budget proposal, because it makes sense. It is the only realistic, viable proposal before us this week.

It is a live within your income approach to fiscal sanity. The people of New Hampshire, and the people of America, who paid their income taxes this week, have to live within their means. In our small businesses, we have to live within our revenues. Our cities and our towns have to live within their income. The Federal Government should do the same.

The Kasich budget proposal simply says that the U.S. Government should hold its domestic discretionary spending increases to no more than the rate of inflation. In plain English, it says let's make a start today toward living within our income. Let's operate the Federal checkbook the same way we operate our family and business checkbooks. Let's keep our rate of spending increases to our rate of income growth.

This budget proposal should be supported by all who opposed the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of last fall. This budget proposal should also be supported by all of you, who campaigned for tax fairness last fall. It calls for a modest start to means testing both Medicare and farm subsidies.

The Kasich budget proposal is a good start toward a return to common sense, live within your income budgeting. That's why I shall support it, and I urge my fellow Members of Congress to do the same.

□ 1340

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, this is the fiscal year in which the Federal budget was supposed to be balanced under the original Gramm-Rudman Act. Instead, what we have is a record-setting $378 billion deficit if we include the so-called off-budget items.

Last year, last October, there was another agreement reached, and that was supposed to balance the budget by 1995. By December, it was clear by the people who reached that agreement, that that date was unrealistic. I say we should get serious about balancing the Federal budget. The way we do that is by making cuts that hurt a little bit.

Now, there are some cuts in the Kasich, and some reductions in the increase of spending, in the Kasich legislation that I do not like. However, I think we all have to share a little pain if we are going to bring our spending in line with our revenues. It is not that unreasonable to do. All we have to do it slow down the rate of growth of spending.

I believe that the debate, the argument between the two sides and the similarities between the administration's budget bill and the Democrats' budget bill are moot. Neither side should be proud that their package looks like the other. It provides for $290 billion in deficit.

Now, we are already spending 20 cents on every dollar to pay the interest on the national debt. There is no way we are going to be able to dig ourselves out of this situation if we let that debt continue to grow, and that wedge of interest payments continue to grow. What we need to balance the budget is a balanced budget constitutional amendment. We need a line item veto. However, what we need more

than anything, is for Members of Congress to say no to unnecessary spending. The time to begin is now.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM].

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, it is not lost upon me that the last three speakers, including myself, are freshmen Members of Congress. First, let me speak to the freshmen Members of Congress who were involved in campaigns last year, many against incumbents, and me being one. The budget was a big issue, the budget and fiscal responsibility was a big issue in the campaigns. This is Members' last and only chance to do something about the promises that Members made during that campaign. This is the only budget that Members will see that do anything about at least approaching the problem of deficit spending. This is the Members' opportunity.

When we go back home, this is the vote that people are going to look at. This is the chance for all Members.

Let me clear one other point if I may to the Members at large, in picking up with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] said, which I think is an important point, perhaps glossed over. That is, what this budget does in the area of income security. We, in the Kasich budget, put $12 billion more over the next 5 years in income security. We do more in this budget than the Democrats do in their budget for poor people in this country in the area of income security. This is a compassionate budget. This is a fair budget. This is a budget that at least starts the process of having some measure of responsibility in this body for the future of this country, and the kind of debts that we are enduring.

Mr. Chairman, $1.7 trillion. I repeat, $1.7 trillion is going to be added to the deficit under the budget cap and the budget summit that was approved last year, if we do not do something about it now. This is only a drop in the bucket, frankly, but our only chance. Please support this budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich amendment.

Today, the House will be considering two indistinguishable budget proposals—one by the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] and one by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON]. With all due respect, either could be called a Bart Simpson plan. Each offers more of the same old budgeting today, but promises better deficit reduction tomorrow. In that regard, both are underachievers.

The budget proposal offered by the majority would result in outlays 16.5 percent higher than those produced by the fiscal year 1990 budget while the one offered by the minority calls for only $6.8 billion less than the majority.

That means real deficit reduction is going to be put off until 1993 when the budget crunch may be even worse and the likelihood of reductions even more remote.

The difficulty can be traced back to last year's budget agreement. The summiteers agreed to do almost nothing to reduce expenditures in the short term; instead, they allowed spending to be judged against a rising baseline.

Thus, the agreement relieved all parties of the responsibility for dealing with past fiscal excesses. At the same time, it delayed the kind of spending cuts that are necessary to ever balance the budget without new taxes.

The impression given the American people was quite different, however. What they understood us to say was not "deficits happen" but "give us more taxes this year and we'll get serious about spending reduction soon after." And by "spending reductions" they hoped we meant real reductions—reductions that cut the deficit—not reductions from projected spending increases. The test of whether we really intend to reduce spending is today.

Regrettably, the budget of the distinguished gentlemen from California [Mr. PANETTA] proposes to spend almost every penny allowed by last year's agreement in the area of discretionary spending. The substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] is not much different.

The American people expect more—more financial discipline, more deficit reduction, more of the hard choices that are essential if we are ever to get our house in order.

I believe we should treat last year's agreement not as a means of doing as little as possible but as an opportunity to do as much as we can—as quickly as we can. Procrastination will only make the job more difficult.

And if you don't want to take my word for it, read the March 11 Washington Post column by a Member of the other body from South Carolina. Look in particular at how he describes the apologists for procrastination in terms that might be ruled out of order if used here on the floor.

I urge my colleagues to support the proposal by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH]. His substitute calls for $16.5 billion less in outlays in fiscal year 1992 than the House Budget Committee proposal and $172.2 billion less over the next 5 years.

Specifically, the Kasich substitute cuts spending for foreign aid by $500 million a year, holds increases in discretionary spending to the rate of inflation—using fiscal year 1990 as a base—and initiates the task of entitlement reform. At the same time, it does not penalize the elderly by cutting Social Security; nor does it reduce veterans' benefits below last year's spending levels.

Mr. Chairman, let us not be underachievers. As my colleague from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] has pointed out, interest payments on the national debt took up roughly 60 percent of the individual income taxes collected in fiscal year 1991. Six of ten Americans work and sweat and save to pay their taxes to do what—to pay interest on the national debt. Such a situation cannot continue. I again urge adoption of the Kasich substitute.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kasich budget amendment. I rise in opposition to the Democratic proposal. I rise in opposition to the President's and the Republican Party's budget proposal.

In my view, neither of the major budget proposals addresses the major crises facing this country in terms of the underfunding of education, in terms of the underfunding of nutritional programs, in terms of the underfunding of housing, in terms of the underfunding of environmental needs, and in terms of the underfunding of a host of programs that have been thoroughly neglected during the last decade.

In addition, in my view, neither of the major budget proposals addresses the very serious deficit crisis facing this country, and we are now looking at the largest deficit in the history of the United States this year. There is no reason to believe that it will be better at all next year.

□ 1350

Nor do either of the major budget proposals deal with the extremely unfair tax situation which exists in this country today in which the wealthiest people in our country who have become much wealthier over the last decade are still able under both budget proposals to pay significantly less in taxes than they did 10 years ago, while the middle class and the poor are paying more, nor in my view do either of the major budget proposals address the fact that finally the cold war is over and now we have an opportunity to significantly cut military spending, and yet neither proposal deals with that reality.

Mr. Chairman, today in the Washington Post, the distinguished Congressman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], chairman of the Budget Committee, writes an article which is headlined, "Our Budget Is Better." In fairness to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], I agree with him. The Democratic budget is in fact better than the Republican budget.

The Republican budget proposes a $25 billion cut in Medicare over a 5-year period of time on top of the $43 billion

proposal passed by Congress and the President last year over a 5-year period of time. To cut back on Medicare and shift that burden to health care consumers all over this country when the cost of health care is now out of control is to my mind unconscionable.

The Republican proposal, as I understand it, cuts back on veterans' programs—unconscionable.

The Republican proposal talks about a reduction in capital gains taxes for the rich, when the rich are in fact enjoying huge tax breaks already—unconscionable.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] however writes, representing the Democrats, that they are going to put $2 billion over the 1991 budget into education, but the fact of the matter is that $2 billion goes nowhere far enough to addressing the enormous educational crises facing this country, where 25 percent of our kids ar dropping out of high school, when millions of young working class kids cannot afford to go to college.

I would ask the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], I would ask the Republicans, why is it in Western Europe, in Scandinavia, college education is the right of virtually all their young people? Why cannot the United States do the same?

The gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] talks about a $315 million increase in 1991 in terms of Head Start. We all know that Head Start is a wonderful program. It is a cost-effective program. Why are we not saying once and for all that every young child in this country, every kid, has the right to Head Start, has the right to decent child care? That should be our proposal.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] talks about increasing funding for WIC, several hundred million dollars for that. A recent study came out which pointed out that 5 million children in the United States of America go hungry. We are not talking about the Third World. We are talking about the United States of America. A budget proposal should come before this Congress which says that hunger for children, hunger for any American, is an absolute disgrace. We are going to wipe out hunger within a year.

This is the United States of America. This is not a Third World country, an underdeveloped country.

So I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], yes, your program is in fact better than the Republican program, but it is not a very good program and we in the Congress deserve a budget proposal which says let the wealthy start paying their fair share of taxes so that our children do not have to go hungry. Let us cut military spending so all of our people can enjoy a decent standard of living.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, for the past 2 years now I have heard on this floor a constant chorus, and we just completed one, as a matter of fact, about the budget deficit and the national debt. I can imagine how that chorus of concern heightens as Members go home and talk to their constituents about the fact that we have maxed out our credit cards.

For the past 2 days we have heard a prolonged listing about every program in the Federal inventory, as if the world would cease to turn if we did not fully fund each of them. I reject that notion.

I support the Kasich budget. I believe it does a great job of saving more.

I want to say that I understand it is not easy to work with the budget, and I compliment the chairman and the ranking member for undertaking this really difficult job. It takes two things for us to save a little money and have a responsible budget. One is to have a discipline in this body to set priorities and work within the available resources we have. We have not shown an inclination to have that discipline.

The second, of course, we have to have taxpayers and voters who are willing to do that, and I suggest to you that many are.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Kasich budget and I urge my colleagues to do so also.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. KASICH] for this time.

Mr. Chairman, it is about time that we get serious about the deficit. We have heard lots of calls today and lots of speeches about lofty goals and a heartfelt belief that our Government should have some sort of responsibility for this program or that program of this group of people that needs help or that group of people, wherever they are in the world, wherever they are in this country. How are we going to pay for that?

Yes, we hear lip service about the deficit, but we keep hearing all sorts of rhetoric about new spending proposals.

Well, we have a budget deficit right now even before all of these lofty goals are met of $350 billion to $400 billion a year. How much money will be left for meeting the basic needs of our people if we keep adding $30 billion to $40 billion a year more in spending just to pay for the interest on last year's increase in the deficit?

Yes, we do not have the Third World country, but we have some people who are willing to spend us into a Third World economy. If we keep handling our economy the way we have been doing, we will not have the money to meet any of the basic needs of our people. We will not have the money to keep the peace of the world. As our economy shrinks and the ranks of the jobless increase because we have been irresponsible today, we will hear even more heart-wrenching stories tomorrow.

The Kasich budget offers us an alternative. It is not Draconian. It is responsible. If we can just keep the level of spending down to the rate of inflation we can work our way and grow our way out of this budget challenge, but if we do not, if we are irresponsible, if we try to spend so much money that we have an ever-increasing amount of money that we have to spend each year just to pay for the interest, we are all going to live in poverty. The future will be a future of despair, of deprivation and decline.

I believe the Kasich budget puts America on the road to prosperity and to progress, and I urge a vote for the Kasich budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, a lot has been said about the Kasich proposal. We all know that it is the only real spending restraint that we have before us now.

We have two votes coming after the Kasich vote, and I have expressed myself on those two items.

Let me just try to appeal to my colleagues' sense of politics. If you want to go home and tell your constituents that you were for spending restraint, then vote for Kasich.

This is not a vote against the President. This is not even a vote against the proposal of the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] and the Democratic proposal. This is a vote that you can hold up to your constituents and tell them that you indeed were for spending restraint. That is the very least that you can do.

□ 1400

I have been home, like many of us, over the last 3 weeks, and there is a brewing tax revolt out there. The American people are tired of paying taxes and they are tired of their Government spending too much money. At least show your constituents that when you are given the opportunity for spending restraints, you choose spending restraint and vote for the Kasich proposal.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the 5-year budget plan is working and, in my judgment, working very well. For the first time, we are having a real debate about priorities.

The President has submitted a budget which is within the spending limits and, frankly, so has the majority party of Congress when it slightly amended the President's budget.

As someone who voted for last year's 5-year spending plan, I never viewed the spending caps as the minimum, but as the maximum that could be and should be spent.

The Kasich amendment brings spending in below the spending caps and it does it responsibly. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Kasich amendment.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] I understand is at the baseline here in terms of his time, and I, therefore, yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] yields 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KASICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this additional time.

Mr. Chairman, I really want to take this time to praise LEON and BILL GRADISON for their hard work. I have worked with LEON now for 3 years. I mean what a gentleman and nice guy who is, without question, committed to where this country is going.

I was hoping that last night that the ghost of future debts, wrapped with chains, would visit LEON in his sleep and today he would stand in support of my amendment. But here is the situation: I think we all have to be concerned about it. This is where I come from on my proposal.

You increase the Federal debt by $1.3 trillion over the next 5 years. My proposal is not the greatest thing since sliced bread, but it is $85 billion less than at least the administration proposal, more than that in terms of the Democratic proposal. All we do is a simple thing of holding the growth of budget authority to the rate of inflation. It is not radical surgery, we are not reducing spending. We are above, like they say, we are at least at the rate of inflation, and I think it is a very reasonable proposal, one that I believe the Democrats can vote for and still consistently—maybe you have to vote for LEON's proposal, then you go ahead and do that. But what you are saying is Congress needs to have a new direction, we have to have some restraints, and we are willing to do it in a reasonable manner. That is what this proposal represents.

To my Republican colleagues who feel as though they want to support the President, you can support the President as a substitute for what LEON is doing. Supporting my proposal basically says you want to slow the growth of Federal spending to the tune of $85 billion less than what the President spends over 5 years.

The Chamber of Commerce has strongly endorsed this proposal, as have a lot of the taxpayer-concerned groups that are in the Washington, DC, area.

If we had a national plebiscite on this vote, I promise you the American people would say, "Adopt this budget proposal," because it is very reasonable in its approach.

We are not talking about last year's cuts or anything like that, but we are talking about basically restraining the growth.

Frankly, if my proposal is adopted, it would only be the beginning for what should be our task, which is to rein in this incredible growth in Federal spending that we have seen in this country.

I appreciate the Chairman's leniency in terms of the stopwatch today, and again I thank the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair would once again remind Members that the rules do ask us to refer to Members as "the gentleman from" or "the gentlewoman from."

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes in order to close debate.

Mr. Chairman, there is really no other member of the Budget Committee who has worked as hard as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] in trying to develop the substitutes that he has presented, not only in the past but today as well. He has sincerely committed himself to the same goal that I think we all share, which is to try to achieve the fairest and most equitable approach to reducing the horrendous debts that face us not only now but in the future as well.

There has always been a certain attraction to his approaches because there is a certain equity, when he talks about a freeze, that I think has always attracted Members. One of the problems that I have with this particular approach that he has presented today is that it really is not a freeze. It targets certain areas for deeper cuts than others.

So it does not present the equity that we sometimes have seen in past proposals that try to freeze spending across the board. That is not the case here.

At first glance, the main problems are, again he targets Medicare with a $25 billion cut in Medicare. While I think the gentleman is legitimately interested in means testing, of that $25 billion, which is the President's number, only $1.2 billion comes from means testing. The bulk of the $25 billion is going right at the hospitals, right at the providers.

As everyone knows, we have lost almost 600 hospitals in this country because of the reductions in that area, and there is another thousand that are likely to be shut down if we impose these additional cuts on the hospitals.

Second, on discretionary spending, again it is the same basic target of most of the proposals from the other side of the aisle. This one cuts almost $20 billion below the cap with regard to discretionary. The fundamental concern I have is, I guess, again the fairness issue because every substitute has to be measured, still, on the basis of fairness.

Mr. Chairman, I was visited by a ghost last night, and it is the ghost of what I have seen happen during the 1980's, where the main burden has fallen on the elderly, on working families, on children, and on the middle class. And when you look at this proposal, again who is targeted? The $25 billion in Medicare cuts impacts on the elderly, $20 billion in cuts on discretionary that again impacts on education, on health care, on nutrition, on veterans, and many others who are vulnerable Americans.

This proposal would tax State and local employees on Medicare. That is OK to tax State and local employees with regard to Medicare. The $1 billion in user fees, it is OK to provide $1 billion in user fees that largely impact on the middle class. That is no problem. But then at the same time, he provides a 30-percent cut in the capital gains tax, from which the benefits go to the wealthiest in our society, and also add to the deficit, I might add, anywhere from $11 billion to $12 billion.

So it is fundamentally on this issue that I would ask the Members to reject the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Kasich substitute budget. I would like to commend my colleague for his tireless efforts to identify means to reduce the deficit without cutting critical Federal programs.

The Kasich substitute will reduce the deficit by $172 billion more than the Democratic alternative. It reduces bloated farm subsidies, holds down overall domestic discretionary spending below the rate of inflation, and makes significant reductions in our foreign aid budget. These are important steps and I will vote for this substitute.

There is, however, one element of this package to which I strongly object. Included in this budget are excessive cuts in the Medicare Program. Most objectionable to me are proposals that some portions of Medicare be means-tested. The notion of means testing, which is included in the President's budget, is not without some merit. Those who are better off should be less reliant on the Government for Medicare. I am afraid, however, that this proposal sets a dangerous precedent.

Since Congress implemented the prospective payment system for in-patient hospital services in 1983, reimbursement rates have failed to keep pace with rising costs. I am

afraid that the same will be true of Medicare beneficiaries. Today, we speak of means-testing for the wealthy elderly. Next year, will we include the middle class? Will 1993 see the end of subsidies for lower income senior citizens?

Congress has fallen down that slippery slope too often. I do not want to see that happen to our senior citizens. For that reason, I will have very serious reservations about any legislative proposals which implement such a means-testing scheme.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the Kasich budget, because it is the best package to be considered today. I hope, however, that the fiscal year 1992 budget debate will highlight the dangers of initiating a means-test for Medicare. Because I am unwilling to drive our seniors down that slope.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 114, noes 303, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

AYES—114

Allard
Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Bateman
Bennett
Bereuter
Bliley
Boehner
Broomfield
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Coble
Condit
Cooper
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
DeLay
Dickinson
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Fawell
Fields
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goss
Grandy
Gunderson
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Herger
Hobson
Holloway
Houghton
Hunter
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Kasich
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lowery (CA)
Martin
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
McMillan (NC)
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Moody
Moorhead
Myers
Nichols
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Penny
Petri
Porter
Pursell
Quillen
Ramstad
Ravenel
Rhodes
Ridge
Riggs
Ritter
Rohrabacher
Santorum
Schaefer
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Slattery
Solomon
Spence
Stump
Sundquist
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Walker
Walsh
Weber
Weldon
Wylie
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—303

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bellenson
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Conyers
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Hertel
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hutto
Hyde
Jacobs
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kopetski
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McGrath
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Nussle
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Pallone
Panetta
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Poshard
Price
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rinaldo
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Scheuer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Aspin
Bryant
Dornan (CA)
Dymally
Gray
Hughes
Kostmayer
Lehman (FL)
Levine (CA)
Marlenee
Roukema
Towns
Udall
Yates

□ 1433

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Dornan of California for, with Mrs. Roukema against.

Mr. PICKLE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BROOMFIELD 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my congressional district earlier today. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 68, the Dannemeyer substitute, and "no" on rollcall No. 69, the Kasich substitute.

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

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). 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. GRADISON:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the budget for fiscal year 1992 is established, and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996 are hereby set forth.

RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 2. (a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1991, October 1, 1992, October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, and October 1, 1995:

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

Fiscal year 1992: $849,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $914,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $999,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,077,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,143,500,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1992: $2,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $4,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1992: $82,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $90,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $96,814,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $103,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $110,190,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1992: $1,248,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $1,192,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $1,238,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,286,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,340,500,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:
Fiscal year 1992: $1,192,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $1,189,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $1,152,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,186,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,249,100,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:
Fiscal year 1992: $342,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $275,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $152,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $108,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $105,600,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 1992: $3,986,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993: $4,327,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994: $4,548,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $4,736,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $4,912,800,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1991, October 1, 1992, October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, and October 1, 1995, are as follows:
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $14,700,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $190,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $193,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $13,600,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $196,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $13,400,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $13,700,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $202,500,000,000.

(b) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1992 through 1996 for each major functional category are:
(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $290,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $290,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $291,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $291,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $295,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $297,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $293,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $23,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $21,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $20,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $20,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $21,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,400,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $18,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $20,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $22,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $23,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $25,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $4,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $5,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $5,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $4,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $4,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,300,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $19,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $19,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $18,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $18,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $20,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $17,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $16,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $16,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $14,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,700,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $104,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $142,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $9,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $147,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $150,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $152,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$26,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $155,200,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $34,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $35,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $35,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $36,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $39,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $5,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $5,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $450,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $5,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $47,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $46,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $45,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $45,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $45,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $81,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $91,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $102,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $102,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $113,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $112,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $126,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $113,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $124,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $138,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $154,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $154,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $174,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $222,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $184,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $232,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $194,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $238,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $204,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $249,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $215,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $258,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $223,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $6,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $7,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $7,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $34,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $34,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $35,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $36,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $31,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $11,700,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $14,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $15,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $15,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $16,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $17,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $12,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $12,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $13,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $14,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $230,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $230,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $240,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $240,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $248,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $252,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $255,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, $100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, $100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $1,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1992:
(A) New budget authority, ($34,500,000,000).
(B) Outlays, ($34,500,000,000).
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1993:
(A) New budget authority, ($36,900,000,000).
(B) Outlays, ($36,900,000,000).
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, ($34,000,000,000).
(B) Outlays, ($34,000,000,000).
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, ($36,600,000,000).
(B) Outlays, ($36,600,000,000).
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, ($36,000,000,000).
(B) Outlays, ($36,000,000,000).
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] will be recognized for 1 hour and a Member opposed to the amendment will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, this gentleman is opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON].

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to offer a substitute amendment to House Concurrent Resolution 121—which, as you all know, is the President's budget.

Presidential budgets during the Reagan administration received painfully little support, even among Republicans. There were three House votes on Reagan budgets in the 1980's. His fiscal year 1985 budget received 1 vote. His fiscal year 1987 budget garnered 12 votes. The following year he attracted 27 votes. None of these votes included even a single Democrat. Both parties instinctively recognized that it was the "loyal opposition's" proper role to set forth an alternative in response to the agenda of the Republican President.

Similarly, today, it is fitting that the President's budget be placed before the legislative branch. But this year,

President Bush's budget appears destined for a different—and better—reception than Presidents' budgets in the last decade. As I have noted on several occasions, this budget was not "dead on arrival." Even the Washington Post, hardly a bastion of support for Republican administrations, called it "the first mainly honest Presidential budget that the country has had in 10 years," and applauded its "return to basic credibility."[1]

For further evidence of the strength of the President's budget, simply look at what the loyal opposition has to offer. The Democrats propose the same defense spending as the President, the same international spending, and virtually the same total domestic discretionary spending. The real difference in discretionary domestic spending between the two plans nets out to a little less than $3 billion, or two-tenths of 1 percent of the total $1.45 trillion budget.

Democrats' "Reordered Priorities"

[Domestic discretionary account, in billions of dollars]

Added to President	$8.25
Cut from President	5.45
Net changes	2.8

Change percentage: 1.3 percent of Domestic Discretionary. 0.2 percent of Total Budget.

The differences are slight because the President's budget was a credible and balanced plan to begin with. It is a document intended to guide the activity and policies of a major world power during the upcoming year, not a political pamphlet intended for the soap box of a party trying to figure out what it stands for. It is offered by the people whose job it is to administer the Nation's policies. It is, in short, a plan designed for governing.

The Bush budget is a balanced plan: It recognizes that under the budget agreement, we have finite resources controlled by a tight discipline. But within that framework, the President makes responsible choices and tradeoffs. The result is a package with which the administration can truly govern through fiscal year 1992. I have no hesitation in offering this amendment and the administration's fiscal plan for next year.

Now, considering the many similarities between the two proposals remaining before us, why do I urge my colleagues to support the President's budget and reject the Democrats'? There are several reasons, which I would like to discuss with you.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

The Democrats talk about strengthening the economy, but they do nothing to pursue this goal. Yesterday, in fact, they completely ignored the part of the budget debate—the Humphrey-Hawkins debate—specifically set aside for discussion of economic goals and policy. Given all the attention on the other side of the aisle devoted to anti-recession, anti-unemployment policy options, it is hard to fathom why they ignored what should have been an important discussion.

The President has not ignored these issues. He encourages savings through family savings accounts. He promotes investment through extending tax provisions such as the research and experimentation credit. He seeks the capital gains tax preference to stimulate business investment. The Democrats offer no savings incentives, no growth incentives, and no tax extenders—in fact, the Ways and Means chairman expressly rejected these just the other day.

INVESTING IN THE FUTURE

The President expands our commitment to science and research—areas with a proven track record of return on Government investment. If we truly intend to remain competitive, if we want to seek and develop new technologies and remain a leader in the world, these investments are necessary.

To the Democrats, science is little more than this year's cash cow. They would cut $1.26 billion from the President's science request, representing 30 percent of all the domestic discretionary reductions they use to pay for other things. They used to do this with the defense budget, but that's no longer available to them.

The Democrats say this reduction is intended to slow down the space station, because of a few problems that have arisen. In fact, their proposal will ground the space station. It also will force us to cancel several shuttle flights, and will relegate us to second- or third-class status in the space exploration community—we, who are supposed to be the world leaders in exploring new frontiers.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The President's plan shows a budget surplus by 1996; the Democrats still have a $65 billion deficit in that year. Savings in the President's budget exceed those required by last year's budget agreement; the Democrats barely meet the maximum deficit amount for 1992, and are curiously vague about what happens after that. The President specifies where his savings would be; the Democrats resort to vague 1-percent reductions, $919 million in unspecified reductions—victims unknown—and wind up spending almost $300 billion more than the President over 5 years.

That $300 billion is half again as much as we are supposed to save in defense spending over the period. The Democrats show us that they don't save money, they just spend it elsewhere.

PRESERVING MEDICARE

The fourth issue is preserving Medicare. This is a sensitive point to many Members, and it should be—Medicare is an important program for many senior citizens, sometimes the most important program. But we must also recognize that unless we continue to wrestle down the growth in Medicare costs, we might not be able to provide Medicare 15 years from now. That's when the hospital insurance trust fund is currently projected to become bankrupt if changes are not made.[2] Medicare costs grew by more than 11 percent a year through the 1980's and in the next decade Medicare is expected to surpass even Social Security as the largest domestic item in the budget.

Medicare Spending

[In billions of dollars]

1980	$32
1986	75
1991	116
Current law 1992	129.7
President's budget 1992	126.9

The President suggests holding down Medicare costs by $25 billion over the next 5 years. This is an on-going effort, building on the progress made last year. Opponents may try to scare the elderly by saying this is an unfair cut in their benefits, but consider two things. First, annual Medicare spending will grow by $60 billion by 1996 even after this $25 billion restraint.

Second, the President's proposals are focused on cutting costs, not cutting benefits. Individual Members may disagree—as I do—with some of the specific cost restraints the President suggests, but no one who cares about securing the future of Medicare can disagree with the fact that something must be done to bring cost increases under control.

SOCIAL SECURITY/JOBLESS BENEFITS

A fifth issue has to do with Social Security and unemployment benefits. The Democrats cut $431 million from funds for administering unemployment compensation, based on a Congressional Budget Office [CBO] projection that the recession will be shorter and shallower than the Office of Management and Budget [OMB] predicts—based, in other words, on a rosy scenario. This is the party that has complained vigorously about the need for recession relief, and yet they cut funds to distribute that relief. They also cut $52 million from Social Security administrative expenses—again based principally on hope.

These two items are especially interesting considering that in the last 2 months, 52 Democratic Members have written to the President urging him to release $120 million in "emergency" Social Security administrative funds, which they now are cutting by $52 million. Furthermore, 81 Democrats have written to the President complaining

[1] "Mr. Bush's Budget," the Washington Post editorial page, Feb. 5, 1991.

[2] See the Report on Medicare Projections by the Health Technical Panel to the 1991 Advisory Council on Social Security, March 1991.

about underfunding in the administration of unemployment compensation. Now they're cutting that, too.

FAIRNESS

Finally, let's talk fairness. This is a subject on which our Democratic friends have expressed themselves early and often. But what have they really done about it?

For one thing, they have started a little bidding war. The President's budget has been on the table since February. So in the name of fairness the House Democrats added $10 million here, $15 million there so they could be more fair than the President. Then here on the floor, education was bid up yet again. Wait until next week in the Senate—they will probably raise the bid yet again.

Democrats seem to equate more spending more with more fairness. In contrast, the President equates fairness with targeting Government benefits to those most in need. He would reduce entitlement subsidies to the wealthy—subsidies that are paid for by middle-income working people. The Democrats pay lip service to the idea but shy away from commitment. The President would extend the health insurance tax deduction for self-employed people. The Democrats, who keep telling us they are so concerned about the uninsured in this country, astonishingly reject this extension. Who's fair?

Finally, the majority seems to suggest that curbing entitlement spending is unfair. They would have you think that entitlement spending goes mostly to the poor. This is not true. About 80 percent of entitlements go to the nonpoor. They would also have you think that the President's budget cuts entitlements for the poor. Again, that's simply not true. In constant 1992 dollars, entitlement spending for poor people was $13 billion in 1962, $56 billion in 1972, $84 billion in 1982 and will be $141 billion under the President's budget in 1992.

Clearly, the President's budget is not unfair in its entitlement spending for the poor.

Most entitlement spending involves the Government taking tax dollars out of some middle-income pockets and returning it to others. The President offers several proposals to make this entitlement transfer system more fair and to control runaway entitlement spending. As I mentioned earlier with regard to Medicare, he has thereby challenged the Congress at least to come up with a different alternative for entitlement savings—but the Democrats have simply backed down.

The President squarely faces the problem of runaway entitlement spending, proposing $34.5 billion in savings in this area. He has thereby challenged the Congress at least to come up with a different alternative.

But the Democratic budget looks the other way. The Democrats seem to believe the entitlement problem will take care of itself.

These are the broad outlines of the differences between the two budgets. From them, I believe it is clear who is investing in the future, trying to expand the economy, trying to be responsible with taxpayers' money, and trying to promote fairness—and it is not the Democrats.

A CLEAR CHOICE

Let me conclude, Mr. Chairman, with a few remarks aimed principally at my Republican colleagues.

The budgets we are debating here today are framed, by necessity, along the lines of last year's budget agreement. Some Members who voted against that agreement feel that supporting the President's budget now would be inconsistent.

Let me say to those Members: I, too, voted against the budget agreement. But it is now law. We are committed to following its guidelines.

Some of you supported the alternative offered by my able colleague from California, Mr. DANNEMEYER. Some supported the proposal by the gentleman from my own State of Ohio, Mr. KASICH. If you preferred those alternatives fine. But we now must recognize that neither was adopted. So we are left with the choice of the President's budget or the Democrats'.

For the reasons I have outlined, I think the choice for Republicans is very clear.

□ 1440

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we begin the debate on the President's budget. First of all, my thanks to the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] for offering this proposal so that the House could consider it. He offered it in committee and now he offers it on the floor of the House. The President is entitled to this vote. Each year he is the first to have to proceed with a budget proposal, and it lays out his priorities for the country.

The issue we decide today by our vote on the President's budget is whether or not it represents our priorities as well. It is clear that the budget agreement that was agreed to by the President and the Congress constrains the flexibility of both the President and the Congress as we try to deal with this budget. We are both forced to adhere to the caps that have been established in defense and international aid and domestic discretionary. We are both forced to adhere to the pay-as-you-go requirements with regard to any entitlement expansions or tax reductions. And we are both, for the first time in a long time, required to be straight with the American people about the size of the deficits that we confront and the economic realities that this country confronts at the present time.

The President's budget, and I said this yesterday and I repeat it now, the President's budget is indeed the most honest budget that has been submitted by a President in the last 10 years. He has discarded the games, the smoke and mirrors, and the deceptions that we saw in the budgets presented to us during the 1980's.

But in that effort the President had the opportunity to set a new direction for this Nation, not only in terms of budget honesty, not only in terms of confronting the realities that we face on the deficit as well as the budget, but he also had the opportunity to change the priorities of the Nation as well.

□ 1450

The great failure of the budget presented by the President is that he failed to fully seize the opportunity to break with the past. Instead, the shadow of David Stockman still lurks over the President's budget.

The cuts of the 1980's are still present, and those are cuts that we have seen time and time again and rejected time and time again, not just on this side of the aisle but on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats alike.

Listen to the past repeated in this budget. Education is less than baseline. For all of the discussion about education, it is less than baseline in the President's budget. Energy is cut by $242 million. Low-income weatherization is cut by $176 million. Rural housing is cut by $189 million. Maternal and child health, nutrition, food assistance, job training, mass transit, we have seen them time and time again and rejected them time and time again.

Listen to the entitlement programs that are targeted in the President's budget. It is a page from the Gramm-Latta book of cuts.

Medicare, $25.2 billion. No question, no question that we have to look at this issue.

But is the issue to close more hospitals in this country? We have closed 600. Do we close another 1,000? Is that the way we reduce costs in Medicare? No.

We had understood in last year's agreement we were going to do $43 billion in Medicare cuts, and that was in terms of the providers and hospitals, but don't hit them again and again and again.

Veterans' cuts, $3.5 billion in pensions, and in other benefits that flow to veterans at a time when we are talking about expanding veterans' benefits for those returning from the Persian Gulf.

Student loan cuts of $1.1 billion; foster care cuts of $1.7 billion; trade agreement assistance, at a time when we are confronted with lost jobs in our

own society, wiped out, wiped out in the President's budget, $905 million cut; $1.9 billion cut from agricultural programs. Those are not the priority of this Nation in the 1990's. Maybe the 1980's, but not the 1990's.

Our priorities are working families where people are having a difficult time educating and feeding and protecting their children. Our priorities are economic security, energy security, and fairness for all, fairness for all.

We have gone through the 1980's where the haves got more and the have-nots got less. That time is over with. If we are going to share the burden, let everyone share it equally. That is the choice that faces the House today as we vote on these budgets.

Some would say that that choice is rather insignificant. My view is that it is a choice between the failures of the past and the opportunities of the future.

I would urge Members to vote for the future, reject the President's budget, and vote for the committee budget.

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

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is very important to reframe the debate for a few minutes to look at important domestic and economic policy issues which the Democrat budget resolution does not address—but which the President's budget meets head on with sound initiatives.

In particular, I would like to draw your attention to a number of important tax incentives contained in the President's budget—and paid for in his budget—which are totally absent from the Democrat plan.

Do you care about low income housing? The targeted jobs tax credit? Research and development? Health insurance for small businesses? Savings and capital investment? Energy?

If you do, you had better think twice about voting for the Democrat budget. You won't find incentives there. None of them is accommodated in the Democrat budget resolution.

We are talking about core incentives for economic growth and savings, international competitiveness and concern for human resources which should enjoy bipartisan support: a permanent research tax credit, family savings accounts, changes in individual retirement accounts to allow withdrawals for first-time home buyers, enterprise zones, the 25-percent health insurance deduction for small businesses, a capital gains tax reduction, extension of the low-income housing tax credit, extension of the targeted jobs tax credit, and energy tax incentives.

The absence of these important domestic and economic policy concerns in the Democrat budget is a fatal flaw.

One of the few facts upon which economists can agree is that research and experimentation has been the single most important factor for growth in advanced countries.

The President's budget accords recognition to its importance by permanently extending the current-law 20 percent R&E credit and extending for an additional year the R&E foreign allocation rules.

In contrast, the Democrat budget resolution would eliminate both the R&E credit and the allocation rules at the end of 1991.

Similarly, the Democrat budget would eliminate at the end of 1991 the current law deduction for 25 percent of health insurance premiums paid by self-employed small businessmen and women. If you care about the plight of the uninsured, how can you eliminate that modest protection for small businessmen and women and their families?

The same thing is true of the low-income housing credit and the targeted jobs tax credit. Under the Democrat plan, they're eliminated at the end of 1991.

Many have expressed concern in recent years that our country's national savings rate is too low to sustain adequate growth and to maintain our economic standing. The Democrat budget is ominously silent in this regard.

In contrast, the President's budget addresses this concern through a series of proposals—including the creation of family savings accounts to allow nondeductible contributions of up to $2,500 per tapayer to stimulate personal savings.

The President's budget also recognizes that the purchase and buildup of equity in a home is the single most significant form of savings for the average American. His budget facilitates investing in a home by allowing first-time home buyers to withdraw penalty free up to $10,000 from an IRA.

To help economically distressed areas share in the benefits of growth, the President's budget would designate up to 50 enterprise zones which would receive specified wage credits and investment incentives. This is an important step in rebuilding and revitalizing our inner cities and economically distressed rural areas. The Democrat budget is silent on the issue.

The President's budget proposal also reduces the tax rate on capital gains. There has been a lot of abstract discussion—too much in fact—on whether cutting capital gains taxes is fair. Are lost jobs and reduced economic growth fair? Is further dependency on foreign investment fair?

There is no question that a preferential rate for capital gains will increase economic activity and speed the economy back on the road to growth. Have the politics of envy become so powerful that we are willing to forgo new jobs and economic growth because of the way someone can play with a so-called distribution table?

In conclusion, the Democrat budget resolution fails to address critical tax issues which can strengthen America's long-term future. In contrast, the President's budget proposal would promote increased savings, capital formation, infrastructure, and international competitiveness. Rather than merely paying lip service to incentives, the President's budget proposal incorporates them—and pays for them.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Democratic budget resolution.

Like President Bush's budget, our budget hits the target set last fall; it says within the limits set for all three categories of discretionary spending: domestic, defense, and foreign aid. We likewise follow in this budget resolution the agreement of last fall by requiring that any new entitlements be funded with new taxes under the pay-go rules. But when it comes to domestic spending priorities, we part company with the President. We take money from programs like the manned space station and put it into needs that we consider more pressing, such as children, education, and the Nation's infrastructure.

In the case of children, we provide a $2 billion increase for elementary, secondary, and higher education, three times the increase sought by the President, whose education budget would not even keep pace with inflation. Our budget gives Head Start a $350 million increase, which is almost four times the increase the President sought. At this rate of increase, we can fully fund Head Start in 9 years; at the President's rate of increase, it will take 50 years to fund Head Start fully.

In the case of infrastructure, we provide increases of $1 billion for the highway program, $1 billion for aviation, $281 million for mass transit, and $26 million for Amtrak.

Finally, we commit more to the safety net. We provide increases of $2.014 billion to finance homeless and low-income housing programs and a 12 percent increase or $1.264 billion for the antidrug program. And we reject the President's proposed cuts in programs for veterans.

We also restore cuts in three other areas. First, we reject the President's request to cut $990 million from the Postal Service budget over the next 5 years by making the Postal Service pay a larger share of the costs for health benefits and cost-of-living adjustments for retired postal employees

and their survivors. Second, at a cost of $25 million, we save the postal subsidy for rural newspapers. We do, however, accede to the President's request and scale back significantly the postage subsidy for nonprofits. Third, we reject the President's proposal to cut the Rural Electrification Administration [REA] budget. During the past decade, the Reagan and Bush administrations have tried to eliminate REA, an agency that helps millions of our constituents who live in rural areas.

To pay for these selected increases, we propose a 1-percent across-the-board cut in nonpriority programs, deeper cuts in low-priority programs, and some program eliminations.

In the area of defense, this budget and the President's budget agree, at least as to total spending. In last year's budget agreement, we capped defense spending—function 050—in fiscal year 1992 at $290.8 billion in budget authority and $295.3 billion in outlays. We appropriated for fiscal year 1991 less than the ceiling, and made it clear that the cap is a ceiling but not a floor. A good part of the defense cuts that we are counting on come from downsizing our standing forces. The Persian Gulf war postponed the build-down in force levels, so Congress allowed the Defense Department a shortfall of some 16,000 off the reduction of 100,000 in end-strength legislated for in fiscal year 1991. This will have an impact on fiscal year 1992, since these 16,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines will be on the payroll when fiscal year 1992 begins. Our aim since last year has been to reduce military personnel by 25 percent over 5 years, but to accomplish the reduction with as little pain as possible, relying on early outs for those who want them, and on voluntary retirements rather than forced and arbitrary reductions in force. Certainly, in the aftermath of the war with Iraq, we want to continue that policy; we don't want to end Desert Storm by dropping arbitrarily some of the men and women who served us so well. That's one reason for budgeting to ceiling.

Another reason for budgeting to ceiling is that the ceiling isn't that high. It represents a defense spending reduction of about 3 to 4 percent in real terms. To budget at the ceiling of $290 billion, DOD had to terminate 13 programs on top of the 9 terminated last year. The terminations include the M-1 tank and the Bradley fighting vehicle, as well as the Apache helicopter and the OH-58D [AHIP] helicopter, leaving the Army with virtually no major systems in production. The Navy has terminated the top-of-the-line F-14D fighter, the A-12 attack plane, and its advanced tactical fighter, as well as the P-7A ASW airplane; and the Navy is stopping the Trident submarine at 18 rather than 20 boats as planned. The Air Force decided last year to end production of the F-15E fighter; in 2 years, the Air Force will end production of the F-16 fighter. Granted, the Pentagon still found room beneath its ceiling to ask $4.6 billion for SDI and $4.8 billion for the B-2 bomber. I don't expect either request to be fully funded by Congress, but I do think they will be changed mostly at the margins. By the time we deal in Congress with the V-22 tilt-rotor aircraft, sundry equipment for the Guard and Reserve, the F-14D fighter and the follow-on to the A-12 attack aircraft, personnel issues, and the Army's tank production line, among other things, we will be bumping the ceiling ourselves.

So, at $290 billion, we are close to the margin, but we are buying enough to maintain a strong defense. We keep defense spending on a downward path, as we should in a world in which the Warsaw Pact has disintegrated and the Soviet threat has receded. We downsize our forces, but still provide enough to keep faith with the men and women who have served us well. We terminate programs, but provide enough to hedge against change and to maintain the essentials of a defense industrial base.

By complying with last year's summit, our budget resolution represents a significant effort to cut the deficit down to size. It is not sufficient, in my opinion, but it is significant. Last year's agreement helps control spending, and I think that without its constraints, the deficit for next year would be higher than projected. Given political realities, I believe it is the best we can do this year. But the fact remains that our on-budget deficit for next year will still be $362.1 billion, virtually the same as the 1991 on-budget deficit. I think the deficit is the gravest economic threat facing our Nation. The national debt has reduced national savings, reduced productivity, and reduced our autonomy, forcing us to rely on foreign credit. Between 1950 and 1980, the national saving rate was about 7 percent of GNP. Today, the national saving rate is 2 to 3 percent of GNP, about one-third the prior rate. I am voting for this budget resolution because it upholds last fall's agreement; but next year, I think we should revisit the agreement of last fall and do more to reduce the deficit.

□ 1500

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, 1992 is the second year under the discipline of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 which set spending caps, mandatory pay-go provisions and tax revenue adjustments to reduce the baseline deficit by $500 billion over 5 years. The ultimate goal is a balanced budget in 1996. The Republican proposal meets that goal using OMB estimates.

I would like to request unanimous consent to insert the following two analyses in the RECORD.

We are off to a slow start due to the essential funding of deposit insurance and the recession which together impacts the 1991 and 1992 deficits by about $150 billion. To achieve our objectives, we must hold outlay growth to half the rate of inflation with no new taxes from this point on.

The Republican budget holds outlay increases for fiscal year 1992 to 2.6 percent over fiscal year 1991. The Democratic budget is slightly higher. More importantly, it limits compound outlay growth to 1.8 percent from 1991 to 1996. The Democratic budget is slightly higher.

Proposed Democratic changes amount to only 45 additions totaling $8.252 billion and 17 decreases totaling $5.226 billion out of 1,005 discretionary accounts affecting only 0.4 percent of the President's proposal. They accept the discipline of the agreement and 99.5 percent of the President's proposals.

We've heard a lot of exaggerated rhetoric about the necessity of those changes and its impact on life in America. However, the real truth is that they are minor adjustments to play to one interest at the expense of another. In most cases, it is simply a case of one-upping the President and the Republicans with a little more money for some Energy, Housing, Education, Health and Welfare programs at the expense of a wide range of other programs. This is, after all, a zero-sum game.

We have heard about all of the great increases in the Democrat's budget but what about the cuts?

First, the Democratic budget reduces funding to the FEMA disaster relief fund by $74 million in outlays for fiscal year 1992.

The people in North and South Carolina who had to suffer through Hurricane Hugo and the people of California who suffered through the earthquake can't be too excited to hear of such priority cuts. In fact, most people believe FEMA needs more money to meet the unexpected natural disaster situations that are sure to come along each year.

Second, the Democratic budget underfunds Unemployment Insurance Administrative costs by $431 million below the President's request.

I thought their budget was a budget for working families. How can such cuts be helpful to families as we pull out of this recession?

Third, the Democratic budget calls for unspecified cuts in the following programs: education, health grants, research and development, housing, agriculture, transportation, and justice programs.

The real work of the Budget Committee, the authorizing committees, and

the Appropriations Committees lies ahead of us. It is going to be tough to live within the discipline of the Budget Enforcement Act and address the foreign and domestic challenges we face.

The Budget Enforcement Act requires a 5-year reconciliation, and the President's proposal does that with initiatives to stimulate higher economic growth and to encourage the development of cost-effective alternatives that enhance essential policy goals and Government services.

One example of success is the defense budget which is managing a reduction in real terms of close to 3 percent per year as we downsize our forces. The Persian Gulf war showed us that we can, in fact, get better results out of a shrinking budget. Suppose we did the same in the areas of education, housing, or health care?

The situation compels us to also look at reforms in entitlement programs, not to reduce essential services, nor to ignore unmet needs, but to address the causes of costs running out of control. If we fail to address runaway costs, we will fail to provide the resources required to address real needs in health care, education, the environment, and restoring our broken communities.

Health and Medicare are prime examples of where the House has an opportunity in the coming year to make substantial progress. These costs have increased at a compound annual rate of over 10 percent for the last decade and are projected to exceed that in the next.

MEDICARE

One notion that must be dispelled from this debate is the accusation that the seniors of this Nation have something to fear from the proposals in the President's budget regarding Medicare. The Democrats want to treat Medicare as some sort of politically correct speech that must be restricted on the floor of this House. They want the seniors of this Nation to think that somehow the infidels are coming to take away their Medicare benefits and only the Democrats are standing strong in their defense.

Well, if you look at the truth of the matter, the Democrats' main concern is with one of the President's proposals that would call for high-income seniors, those with singular incomes over $125,000 or couples with incomes over $150,000, to pay for 75 percent of their premiums, up from the current 25 percent that everyone currently pays now. That means if you are a billionaire senior citizen retiree, the Democrats want to protect your full subsidy of 75 percent of the Medicare premium which will be $1,113 in fiscal year 1992. And they want to make sure that everyone else is forced to pay more than their fair share in taxes to make sure that billionaire continues to get that full $1,113 subsidy in 1992. So much for looking out for the working family.

Amid all of the posturing and gesticulation over there, the Democrats fail to mention that the committee language unanimously endorsed the President's concept of income-relating the Medicare part B premium in their own report language adopted April 9. So when you hear the protestations over there on Medicare, just remember that fact.

The other thing that the Democrats fail to mention is that in their desire to make political hay out of Medicare once again, they are in effect saying that nothing is wrong with the system as it is and that we should continue to operate Medicare like we have done in the past. By doing that, they are implicitly saying that we should continue to let the question of defensive medical practices go unchecked in Medicare which drives up costs to patients, providers, and the Federal Government.

I have one rural county in my district where there is only one doctor who is currently taking any new Medicare patients. Why? The administrative headaches of complying with all of the Medicare directives coupled with the low reimbursement rates and the increased liability exposure for treating Medicare patients have made it prohibitive in terms of costs and time to extend health care to new patients. These are the realities the Democrats are trying to sweep under the rug by failing to even mention Medicare in their budget other than to pump it up with more money.

We have to look at the fundamental causes that are driving up Medicare costs, Medicaid costs, and privately provided health care costs in this Congress before any more people are priced out of the health care delivery system. And to do that, we must start talking honestly and openly about Medicare and take it off of the politically correct pedestal.

They are being driven by defensive medical procedures which Secretary Louis Sullivan estimates to be about $150 billion per year out of our total annual national health care expenditure of $650 billion or about 23 percent. Defensive medical costs really serve no other purpose than to provide doctors and hospitals with evidence they have done everything conceivable to a patient as a protection against litigation even if those procedures are not necessary. We also have the problems of duplication of capacity and excessive overhead in the health care system often imposed by Government.

We have financial resources already to resolve the issues of lack of access and affordability of health care if we take the bull by the horns in this session of Congress. We need to address issues of defensive medicine, liability, duplication, and excessive overhead. Payments for defensive medicine by Government could be as high as $75 billion by 1996 if we don't act now.

My hope and expectation is that the Budget Committee will begin to work in a bipartisan way to develop guidelines for cost-effective alternatives for authorizing committees to pursue fields for fiscal year 1993 and beyond. This is the only committee in the House with a global perspective. If we do not do so, we will once again find ourselves in the box of budgeting for appearance rather than for results.

I urge my colleagues to support the President's proposal, but more importantly, let's start debating performance and cost-effective alternatives instead of add-on one-upmanship. That is the real way to help working Americans and bring this budget to balance.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I insert a chart for the RECORD.

TOTAL BUDGET

	Fiscal year—						
	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Democrats budget:							
Budget authority	1,358.5	1,490.3	1,590.1	1,816.5	1,866.3	1,732.0	1,827.2
Outlays	1,251.7	1,392.7	1,458.8	1,470.9	1,499.9	1,483.7	1,561.8
Revenues	1,031.3	1,092.8	1,169.2	1,250.7	1,331.5	1,415.4	1,495.4
Deficit	(220.4)	(299.9)	(289.5)	(220.2)	(168.4)	(68.3)	(66.4)
Social Security surplus	.....	62.8	72.0	83.9	98.4	113.7	130.9
Deposit insurance	58.0	103.0	87.0	47.0	25.0	(47.0)	(43.0)
On-Budget (without Social Security):							
Budget authority	1,083.8	1,187.5	1,269.4	1,272.6	1,300.9	1,341.6	1,407.3
Outlays	1,026.6	1,155.2	1,212.5	1,212.1	1,234.4	1,209.1	1,276.9
Revenues	749.7	793.0	550.4	808.8	966.3	1,025.7	1,079.8
Deficit	(276.9)	(362.2)	(362.1)	(302.3)	(258.1)	(183.4)	(197.1)
President's budget (OMB scoring):							
Budget authority	1,368.5	1,520.0	1,577.8	1,533.7	1,605.8	1,677.5	1,759.6
Outlays	1,251.7	1,408.6	1,445.8	1,454.2	1,427.1	1,470.3	1,540.8
Revenues	1,031.3	1,091.4	1,165.0	1,252.7	1,365.3	1,467.3	1,560.7
Deficit	(220.4)	(318.2)	(280.9)	(201.5)	(61.8)	(3.0)	19.9
Social Security surplus	.....	60.4	82.4	73.3	89.3	103.9	121.8
Deposit insurance	.....	111.8	88.1	44.2	(38.1)	(42.3)	(29.9)

TOTAL BUDGET—Continued

	Fiscal year—						
	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
On-budget (without Social Security):							
Budget authority	1,083.8	1,218.9	1,260.7	1,193.1	1,239.0	1,286.6	1,340.7
Outlays	1,026.6	1,171.7	1,194.2	1,187.8	1,150.2	1,183.8	1,246.1
Revenues	749.7	793.2	849.8	914.0	999.8	1,077.5	1,143.5
Deficit	(276.9)	(378.5)	(344.4)	(273.8)	(150.4)	(108.3)	(102.8)
President's budget (CBO scoring):							
Budget authority	1,368.5	1,507.1	1,590.8	1,598.2	1,547.4	1,710.8	1,794.2
Outlays	1,251.7	1,401.7	1,461.9	1,466.9	1,498.9	1,479.5	1,542.3
Revenues	1,031.3	1,093.5	1,172.2	1,246.3	1,325.5	1,408.8	1,486.2
Deficit	(220.4)	(308.1)	(289.7)	(220.8)	(173.4)	(70.7)	(56.1)
Social Security surplus		60.4	69.0	79.0	97.0	112.0	128.0
Deposit insurance		103.0	97.0	47.0	25.0	(47.0)	(43.0)
On-budget (without Social Security):							
Budget authority	1,083.8	1,204.2	1,269.9	1,254.7	1,282.6	1,321.4	1,375.4
Outlays	1,026.8	1,182.0	1,212.7	1,205.3	1,230.7	1,202.0	1,254.8
Revenues	748.7	793.8	853.4	905.3	960.3	1,019.1	1,070.6
Deficit	(276.9)	(368.2)	(359.3)	(300.0)	(270.4)	(182.9)	(184.2)

BUDGET PROJECTIONS AND UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS

[In billions of dollars]

	fiscal year—					
	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Budget projections:						
Baseline total deficit	298	298	239	211	128	135
Deficit assuming compliance with discretionary caps [1]	298	284	215	160	57	56
Deficit assuming caps and excluding deposit insurance	194	186	167	135	103	99
As a percentage of GNP:						
Baseline Total Deficit	5.3	5.0	3.7	3.1	1.8	1.8
Deficit assuming compliance with discretionary caps [1]	5.3	4.7	3.4	2.4	.8	.7
Deficit assuming caps and excluding deposit insurance	3.5	3.1	2.6	2.0	1.4	1.3
Economic assumptions (by calendar year):						
Nominal GNP (billions of dollars)	5,700	6,107	6,505	6,919	7,358	7,824
Real GNP	0	3.3	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.7
Fixed-weighted GNP price index (percentage change)	4.6	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8
CPI–U (percentage change) [2]	4.9	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
Unemployment rate (percent)	6.8	6.4	6.2	6.0	5.8	5.6
3-month Treasury bill rate (percent)	6.6	7.0	6.7	6.3	5.9	5.7
10-year Government note rate (percent)	7.9	7.7	7.6	7.4	7.3	7.2

[1] Include savings in defense and nondefense discretionary spending that remain to be enacted in future appropriation bills, along with associated debt service savings.

[2] CPI–U is the consumer price index for all urban consumers.

Notes.—Projections include Social Security and the Postal Service, which are off-budget. Projections assume the provision of additional resources to the Resolution Trust Corporation and the Bank Insurance Fund beyond those available under current law.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], who is also chairman of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time to me.

I want to say that I think this is very important, to back the committee's budget and turn down the President's budget. When we get into a budget debate, most people's eyes glaze over. They think, "Oh, boy, this'll be exciting." All Members are throwing numbers around and trying to say it is not that different, it is not that different. It is big time different. It is big time different.

There are 93 percent of the accounts that are different in the House Committee on the Budget's budget versus the President's budget. That is a very substantial difference. Let me say what I think is so critical. If we take every single American family, and they go through some economic downturn, my guess is when they are sitting at the kitchen table trying to figure out how to make ends meet, in a very difficult family budget, the last thing they are going to do is to not give the children shots this year, or not to send the children to school this year, or not to give the children much milk this year. They will try to hold the children in their family harmless from the budget cutbacks as long as possible. I do not think there is an American family anywhere that would not agree with those priorities.

Therefore, I want to say that the Committee on the Budget's priorities are much more like the American family's kitchen table priorities. This country truly is in an economic downturn. We have all sorts of problems.

□ 1510

I am very pleased that the Ford amendment passed today so we have more focus on youth, in particular this bill much more fully funds the WIC Program, the Women's, Infants and Children Feeding Program.

My goodness, even the CEO's from the Fortune 500 companies are back there saying that is the best investment portfolio America has.

The Budget Committee also puts money into funding Head Start. The way they have it in, it would fully fund it in 10 years. The way it is in the President's budget, we would wait 50 years. Boy, there is a big difference.

You know, we have seen the future. It is wearing diapers. It is going to inherit this national debt and we are not doing well in getting them prepared to inherit the national debt.

Now, children did not cause this debt. Children did not cause this recession. They did not even vote for anyone who caused the recession and they did not have anything to do with all the special interest groups who would rather have this or have that.

I think we ought to be holding children harmless from this economic downturn, and that is exactly what the Budget Committee's budget does.

So I really hope that if you are truly interested in the future of this country, which are its children and its young people, there is absolutely no question how these two budgets line up.

Here we are making real commitments. We are putting dollars behind it.

We have had so much rhetoric, we have had more rhetoric on families than we have ever seen, but it is now time that we really produce. The Budget Committee has produced it. It has produced even better with the Ford amendment today, and I heartily endorse it and I hope everyone votes for it, for our children's sake.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of ways to decide whether a budget resolution is any good. New proposals and proposals to substantially change spending priorities are bound to get a lot of attention in this House and have a big influence on how we vote; but how about the little proposals that seriously damage longstanding programs. I know to some of you this may be boring stuff compared to all the discussion of changing domestic spending priorities. But boring as it may be, it is not unimportant.

As Members on both sides of the aisle are well aware, the Republican Party has done everything possible in the last several years to protect the orderly function of the Nation's unemployment insurance program. As money for administration of the program by States declined because of declining unemployment, both the Reagan and the Bush administration did everything during those years to keep the States funded so they could continue to run good programs.

This year the administration even went so far as to seek an emergency supplemental appropriation of $150 million just so States could continue to effectively run their unemployment insurance programs.

Now, after all this fine work by Republicans and Democrats, too, the Democrat budget proposes to remove almost one-half billion dollars from the administration's $2.3 billion proposal to pay for effective administration of this program.

In a time of recession when many States are having trouble just getting the unemployment checks out the door, I find it incredible that the party of Franklin Delano Roosevelt would brazenly undercut a critical part of the domestic safety net in this fashion.

So Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, if you want long lines of unemployed, if you want your unemployed workers to wait a month or two to get the money to pay their mortgage, if you want hungry children on your conscience, support the Democrat budget. If not, I urge my colleagues to support the budget of the President.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPRATT) assumed the chair.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1992

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds to respond to the last Speaker.

Mr. Chairman, we treat the Unemployment Compensation Program exactly the way the President treated it this year, which is that when he provided a supplemental, he declared it an emergency and that is exactly the way we treated it in the budget we proposed to the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mrs. BOXER. It surprises me, Mr. Chairman, that the Republicans see very little difference between the President's budget and the Democratic budget.

Let us ask a little child who gets fed from the WIC Program if there is a difference between eating and not eating.

Let us ask the child who gets into Head Start.

Let us ask the worker who builds the highway that gets funded under the Democrats' budget, the AIDS patient and the veteran who needs health care.

Let us ask the senior citizens who would have to pay laboratory fees under the President's Medicare cuts, but does not under the Democratic budget.

Let us ask a foster care parent who can barely make it and who would be cut under the President's budget.

Education, job training, immunization, drug abuse programs, transit, energy assistance, solar and alternative energy research, the National Institutes of Health to find a cure for cancer and Alzheimer's disease. Is there a difference? You bet there is a difference.

The difference is that the Democratic budget starts to look at the needs of our people. I look forward to the day when NATO and Japan pay for their own defense. We spend almost $200 billion a year on them, 15 percent of our budget. Then we will really be able to make a difference in deficit reduction and investments in America.

But until that day, this Democratic budget is a step in the right direction. There is a difference. The difference is the Democrats stand up for the people.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE], a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, two headliners or two occurrences sometimes bring meaning to a budget debate. Today in the paper our Government is going to press Japan to allow more American contractors to build Japan's infrastructure. In another setting, our office in Charleston, WV, has people calling by the score wanting jobs in Kuwait to rebuild the Kuwaiti infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, do you realize that today following Operation Desert Storm there is a nation where half the highways are substandard, where half the bridges are deficient, where a major airport has not been built since 1974, and every one of them is hopelessly clogged. That is not Iraq. That is the United States of America.

Let us look at what the Democratic budget does versus the President's budget.

Federal aid to highways. The resolution's $1 billion increase in the Democratic budget is nearly 150 percent more than the President's requested increase. That is in the first year.

Check the second year, where we up it to $2 billion, double that.

Mass transit. The resolution's $281 million increase is three times, or 300 percent greater than the President's requested increase.

Aviation. The Democratic budget matches the President's budget on a $1 billion increase.

Waste water treatment grants, $80 billion worth of sewer treatment needs in this country. The President proposed cutting that $200 million. The Democratic budget rejected that.

Community development block grants, the last program really left since revenue sharing for many of our counties and cities, the resolution rejects the President's request for almost a $200 million reduction and instead increases funding by $70 million, or a 266-percent increase above the President's request.

I think it is great that we are fighting to build Japan's infrastructure. I am sure it is nice and it is important that we rebuild Kuwait's infrastructure. This budget needs to undertake and the Democratic budget does undertake more substantively rebuilding the infrastructure of the United States, and that is where we need to start.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman it has been enjoyable the last day and a half or so listening to the debate. I know it is hard for our colleagues on this side of the aisle when your theme song is more and it has been more and you are attempting to continue to use that theme song, but really what you have is a little bit more and a little bit less.

In today's Washington Post was a taking exception article from the chairman of the Budget Committee entitled, "Our Budget Is Better." If you will notice in terms of the quote he

says, "Budgets are not just numbers and dollar signs. They express the priorities of a nation."

That is clear when it is finally passed, but when it is presented by the Democrats or it is presented by the Republicans in terms of the President's budget, it is also the political priorities of a particular party.

□ 1520

I was pleased to note that the chairman of the committee indicated that the President's budget did away with smoke, did away with mirrors, and did away with deceptions. Those actually were discarded.

Unfortunately, the Democrats are heavily into recycling, and those very same items show up as part of the so-called Democrat budget. I say "so-called" because the budget was supposed to be a 5-year plan. The President addressed 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996 in a 5-year plan. the Democrats' budget does not. It addresses the years 1992 and 1993 in terms of real choices as to where money is going to be spent. But for 1994, 1995, and 1996 they simply baseline it. They do not go into the policies they want to make there. Why would they do that? Because under the 5-year argument, after 1993 you do have the distinct categories where you have got to even out the numbers. You can rob from one to put it in another. They will not tip off where they are going to take money in the out years where they have the ability to do it. They could not come to an argument under the budget procedure on their side of the aisle. So they simply baselined the numbers. In fact, the Democrats do not have a budget, what they have is a manifesto. Half of this article is the plea, "Our budget is better," and it is wrapped up in me-tooism. Women, Infants, and Children has been commented on. No one has noticed that the President put over $220 million more into that program. It is a good program. Two months later the Democrats put in $350 million more. They say, "We support women, infants, and children." Everybody supports women, infants, and children. As a matter of fact, the Democrats' political manifesto seems to be women, infants, and children, of America, unite, "You have a couple of bucks to gain."

In program after program, the Democrats look like a supermarket captive brand with a yellow slash across them, "10 percent more, buy me." In fact, the rhetoric is so canned in these areas that if the President, I firmly believe, had put in $350 million for Women, Infants, and Children, you would have put in $360 million just to be $10 million better, and used exactly the same rhetoric.

The Democrat manifesto plays up winners, their song is "More." But under this agreement, as everybody understands, if you are going to reward some, you have got to deny others, if you are going to pay Paul, you got to rob Peter, but you must at least have the decency to identify Peter. You do not. You hide it in terms of unspecified cuts. As a matter of fact, when the President talked about where he would make adjustments in the real budget, in a budget designed to govern, he offered changes that cry out to be made.

For example, it was mentioned in the veterans area, do you know what the President has suggested in part of those cuts for veterans? He said, "Look, you support, I support, we all support funding veterans getting that first home." Nothing down, guaranteed loan program. "But should we do that for the second home when they move up or the third home or their fourth home or their fifth home?" Let us give them that helping hand, but do you know, just 10 percent down cuts the default rate by 30 percent. Let us give them that first helping hand, but let us adjust it down in the out years.

Democrats' response: No. The President said, "Look, in Medicare part B, it is voluntary. Why is there almost 100 percent subscription in that area?" It is very simple: It is an $1,100-plus subsidy to every individual who signs up for Medicare B.

The President said, "Hey, how about those people making more than $125,000 who are retired, should we give them a 75-percent subsidy? Should those very same working women with infants subsidize a wealthy American for his Medicare Program at 75 percent?" The President said, "No. How about giving them only a $300 subsidy, make them pay 75 percent and the Government subsidize?" And when you say the Government, it is working men and women subsidizing these wealthy individuals at only a 25-percent level. Democrats said "No."

The President's budget can be criticized because he is honest in terms of where he pays money. But the Democrat manifesto ducks the out years. It is really telling that the heart of the Democrat program is the same old song, "More, more, more."

Finally, when you ask them where do the cuts come from, they do not have the courage to show them; they hide in the shadows of unspecified or across-the-board cuts.

The President's budget is responsible across the board. It is a product of governance, it is a product for all of us. The Democrat manifesto is not better for all of us, and even the Washington Post knows it.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, those who say that there is not much difference between the committee's budget and the President's budget have not spent much time in a Head Start Program where 3, 4, and 5 year-olds learn some of the basic skills they need to keep up with their more advanced peers. Nor have they visited a compensatory education classroom where elementary school children work to improve their literacy and math skills that could make a difference between staying in school or dropping out before graduation, or watched secondary school students in vocational education classes learning the computer and high-technology skills they will need to find a job in a competitive market, or visited clinics providing low-income mothers and infants the food and formula they need to stay healthy and out of the hospital, or talked with senior citizens who face the terrible choice between heating or eating.

Mr. Chairman, the budget which Chairman PANETTA brings to this House contains a vastly different set of domestic priorities from those of the President's budget.

The committee budget makes significant investments in Federal programs which have proven their effectiveness over the years.

The $2.4 billion increase for education, including compensatory education, vocational education, and Pell grants.

That is 3½ times the President's proposed increase for education.

Also $350 million for Head Start, again, 3½ times the President's proposal.

And we put the Head Start Program on track to reach full funding by the end of the decade.

Another $350 million increase for the WIC Feeding Program, and we assume full funding by fiscal year 1996.

We reject the administration's cut in job training funds and instead, provide a $266 million increase for these crucial programs.

We also reject the President's $600 million cut in the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program and provide funds sufficient to keep pace with inflation.

Mr. Chairman, those who say that there is little or no difference between the Democrats' budget and the President's budget must be looking at two different documents than what we have before us today.

Because the two budgets before us have crystal clear and critical differences in priorities.

Mr. Chairman, now is the time to invest in our childrens' education, in their health, in their nutrition, and above all, in their future.

We owe it to them and to our Nation's future.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Gradison amendment.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Chairman, the President's budget would reduce Federal support to the States for foster care services by $1.7 billion over 5 years.

It is widely acknowledged that the State programs which handle child abuse and neglect, and foster care, are under severe stress

The National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse reported just yesterday that there were 2.5 million reports of child abuse and neglect in 1990, a 31-percent increase over 1985, and a 167-percent increase over 1980.

Two out of 3 workers handling these reports claim that resources are inadequate to investigate all cases needing investigation, much less to provide services to the families to prevent the need for expensive foster care.

Is it any surprise that the foster care caseload rose 30 percent between 1986 and 1989?

The President would solve this problem by reducing Federal support to the States for some basic, yet important, activities, which are designed to reduce the need for the placement of children into foster care. For example, the referral of families to services, and the development of case plans for children who may enter foster care.

The Department has tried to cut this funding stream before. In 1987, the Departmental Appeals Board at HHS rejected the Department's claim that these activities are not allowable under the Federal statute. In fact, the Board found that limiting Federal reimbursement for these activities would work against the purpose of Federal law—which seeks to prevent the need for removing a child from his home and placing him in foster care.

Families that come to the child welfare system have fallen through many cracks—cracks which are getting wider and wider. But our President isn't concerned. His budget fails to address the plight of children and families in America today. Thus, he fails to pave the way for our country's future economic success.

A few selected facts:

Families face growing economic stress. The real income of the poorest 20 percent of Americans living in families declined 21 percent between 1973 and 1988. Today, one out of five children lives in poverty. Middle class families have felt the pinch too: real family incomes for the bottom 50 percent of families stagnated or declined between 1973 and 1988.

Single-parent families are becoming the norm. Over 24 percent of children lived in 1-parent families in 1989, compared with 9 percent in 1960. Based on current trends, it is estimated that 70 percent of white children and 94 percent of black children born in 1980 will spend part of their childhood living in a single parent family.

In 1987, the United States ranked 22d among industrialized nations for infant mortality rates. About 32 percent of all women nationally do not receive adequate prenatal care.

In today's economy, a high school education makes you or breaks you. Yet many of our youth drop out. High school dropouts are at risk for unemployment and welfare. But even those youth who stay in school aren't learning enough. One study reports that 50 percent of high school seniors have inadequate reading skills, and 80 percent inadequate writing skills.

□ 1530

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON], my friend.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, it is generous of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY] to yield.

Let me just point out that in the debate earlier in the day that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], from the gentleman's side of the aisle, criticized the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] which was under consideration because it would in its across-the-board cuts have reduced funds for child abuse enforcement.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the former chairman of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, tomorrow, with great fanfare, the President and his new Secretary of Education will launch a national education initiative. But what we ought to understand is that in that effort to educate the children of this Nation the President's budget destroys the basic building blocks of children in this Nation. In his effort to try and increase funding for the Women's, Infants and Children's Program, for the Head Start Program, in fact he misses the mark. He misses the mark of getting children who need to be prepared ready for school, and so his answer is to come back in the 12th grade and to test them to see how they are doing. Children who will be denied nutrition supplements so that they can learn will be denied the participation in Head Start Programs. Only one-third of the children in this Nation qualify, so they will not be school ready.

So, Mr. Chairman, the answer will be: "We will spend billions of dollars at the end of the process to try and make up for the inadequacies that the President's budget provides to those children." These are the most fundamental things we can do on behalf of children. We can feed them, we can educate them, and we can protect them from abuse, and the President's budget fails on all three grounds to provide the kinds of protections, the kinds of nutrition, and the kinds of education that very young children in this Nation need.

Now there is an alternative to the President's budget. It is the budget proposed by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the Democratic alternative, which in fact addresses these. Yes, it is more money, but it also speeds up the timetable by which more children can get the benefits of Head Start, more children can get the benefits of nutrition, more pregnant women can get the benefits of decent nutrition so that we do not have low birth weight babies, so we do not continue to syndrome in this country of low income children being born with less brain capabilities than children in middle income and high income families. We have got to understand that that is a road to the destruction of thousands of children in this country.

Mr. Chairman, that is addressed in the Democratic budget. It is about the building blocks of a society, it is about the building blocks of an education system, it is about the building blocks of a work force that almost every business organization that has looked at these proposals and has suggested that this country invest more, be on the Democratic proposal. This is the business organizations of this country that are saying that, if we do not make the kind of investments on the kind of timetable outlined in the Democratic budget, that they will not be able to assemble the work force necessary for this country to compete.

That is difference in this budget. The difference in the budget is about caring for children and not accepting that some children, through no fault of their own, under no control of their own, will just simply fall through the cracks and miss an opportunity to participate in American society.

Mr. Chairman, the Democrats repudiate that approach.

When the President introduced his 1992 budget, he told the Congress and the American people that the time had finally come "to reserve the long-term trend of underinvestment in children."

That's comforting and familiar rhetoric. But the President's budget reneges on the President's promises.

The Democratic budget proposal protects our investments in children and their families.

The Democratic budget rejects the administration's plan to pilfer money from community health centers and the maternal and child health block grant to fund a narrowly targeted infant mortality initiative.

We have made progress in reducing infant deaths, but that success is tempered by the fact that critically ill newborns are being saved with costly high technology rather than cost-effective preventive care. Congress rejected the President's proposal, and our budget restores funding to the critical prenatal care programs

that have proven to reduce low birthweight and infant mortality.

The Democratic budget proposal rejects the President's cuts in the child nutrition program and includes sufficient funds to move us toward full funding for WIC—also proven to ensure healthy births and to save money.

It rejects the President's 50-year timetable to fully fund Head Start and includes enough funds to make sure all eligible low-income preschoolers will be in Head Start by the end of the decade instead of the one-fifth participation rate today.

The Democratic budget triples the President's proposal for education with a $2 billion increase for elementary, secondary, and higher education, and substantial increases for student aid, math/science programs, compensatory and special education, and education for homeless children.

The President uses smoke and mirrors in his child welfare proposal, at a time when children are at greater risk than ever before. Just yesterday, the National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect released 1990 data: 2.5 million reports of child abuse—a 31-percent increase since 1985. And over 1,200 child-abuse-related deaths—a 38-percent increase in the same time period—were documented in 1990.

The President's 33-percent increase for child welfare would be negated by his proposal to eliminate the existing $250 million program to support State efforts to prevent placement of children in foster homes. The Democratic proposal rejects this sham.

The Democratic budget proposal recognizes the urgency of the day, for our children and families and for the work force of the 21st century.

The budget we are considering today also protects other vulnerable groups. The President's budget unconscionably requested a $154 million decrease from the fiscal year 1991 appropriation for the Indian Health Service. This at a time when 17 of the 50 existing IHS hospitals are older than 50 years compared with the average age of 7 years for private hospitals. The President also calls for a 92-percent reduction in funding for construction of health and sanitation facilities at a time when more than 20 percent of native American homes lack toilets. The Indian Health Service itself reports a backlog of $572 million for sanitation facilities including water wells, septic tanks, and water purification systems for Indian homes, yet the President asks for no new funding in this area.

The President proposed that his small increase be funded from third party insurance collections. The assumption is that $129 million would be collected. In 1990, the IHS was only able to realize $3.7 million in insurance collections. A jump to collecting $129 million in 1992 is completely unrealistic. Mr. Chairman, the Budget Committee has recommended that the Indian Health Service funding level be restored and instead of the 9.7-percent decrease proposed by the President, has asked for a modest increase of 5.8 percent over last year's funding level.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this recommendation as well.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], a former member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the President's budget and ask my colleagues to support the budget resolution developed by the Budget Committee. First, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished Chairman of the Budget Committee for his leadership in this difficult area. He has produced a budget resolution with the proper priorities, children, education, and crime. It is the last of these, the funding provisions for antidrug and anticrime programs, that I particularly want to discuss today.

Mr. Chairman, we have just completed a war in the Persian Gulf. If is now time to turn our full attention and resources to the war that is raging here at home—the war on drugs and crime. Just as we ensured that our troops in the gulf with sufficient supplies of the very best equipment to wage that war, we must also ensure that our troops on the front lines of the war on crime have the resources they need to fight that battle.

The committee budget provides the funding to wage the war on crime and it puts the resources in those areas where they are needed most. The committee budget exceeds the President's in funding of both antidrug law enforcement efforts as well as antidrug health, education, and treatment programs. The committee budget also matches or exceeds the President's in every significant anticrime area. For example, the committee budget exceeds the President's in such vital areas as the FBI, the U.S. attorneys, and prison construction. It also restores unconscionable cuts proposed by the President in the Juvenile Justice Programs and in Federal aid to State and local drug enforcement efforts.

Over the past decade we have witnessed a tenfold increase in drug control spending from $1.5 billion in 1981 to $10.5 billion in 1991. Despite this infusion of resources, drug abuse and drug-related crime remains one of this country's most serious problems. Clearly, the need for maximum funding of these efforts has never been greater.

The Budget Committee's resolution does just that. The Budget Committee resolution calls for an outlay increase of $1.2 billion for antidrug and anticrime funding. That is the largest outlay increase in the whole budget. In addition, the proposed increase of $1.5 billion in budget authority represents the third largest authority increase in the budget. The 12-percent increase in discretionary antidrug and anticrime programs represents the second largest percentage increase in the budget. Without doubt, this budget makes fighting crime one of its highest priorities.

Antidrug funding must be a top priority and the Budget Committee resolution exceeds the President's budget in funding antidrug programs. The Budget Committee resolution provides for $142 million more in budget authority than the President's budget and $74 million more in outlays. This brings the total antidrug funding for fiscal year 1992 to $11.8 billion, an increase of 12 percent over the freeze level. This funding restores cuts the President's budget would make in drug-related portions of the Secret Service and Office of Justice programs, the office within the Department of Justice that helps States and local drug enforcement efforts. This is no time to be weakening our commitment to antidrug law enforcement efforts. Nor is it time to avoid full Federal support of drug abuse prevention and treatment programs. The committee budget includes $179 million in budget authority above freeze level for health-related drug prevention and treatment. This is $62 million, over 50 percent, more than the President's budget provides for this vital area.

In the area on nondrug, anticrime funding, the committee bill is again far tougher and preferable to the President's. The committee bill increases funding for the FBI's anticrime efforts by $311 million over last year. This is $22 million above the President's recommendation. The committee budget increases funding for the U.S. attorneys by $112 million, $25 million above the President. The committee budget responds to the crisis of overcrowding in our Federal prisons—now operating at 160 percent of capacity—by increasing funding for prison construction by $61 million over last year. This is $50 million above the President's recommendation in this area. Finally, the committee budget calls for a $3 million increase in funding for juvenile justice programs. This is $70 million more than the President's budget which would cut juvenile justice funding by 90 percent.

In sum, the Budget Committee's resolution provides the funds needed to wage the war on crime and targets those resources in the areas where they are needed most, antidrug funding, the FBI, the U.S. attorneys, Juvenile Justice, and prison construction. I urge you to reject the President's bill and support the committee resolution.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, all of this grand rhetoric we are hearing this afternoon, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget knows and as everyone else in this room knows, runs totally into the realities of the Budget

Act. The fact of the matter is that there is nothing that the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] or anyone else in this room can do to build up one discretionary program without taking it from another discretionary program, but they are very silent on the other side of the aisle as to those programs they are reducing.

Mr. Chairman, I am here today just to make it clear to my colleagues that 1.2 billion of those dollars they shower on certain objectives come out of the 250 function, which is the science function in the budget. If there is ever a case of consuming our seed corn, it seems to me that cutting the science function is a perfect case of it. What is it we are going to cut? The Democrats say they want more for education. Yet a cut of the size that they propose almost certainly means a cut in the education functions in the National Science Foundation.

□ 1540

Or shall we cut the research NSF is doing to make America more productive? Or should we cut "Mission to Planet Earth" in the NASA budget, a program designed to give us some hard data so we will know whether or not we are facing a terrible crisis and an expensive crisis in global warming? About that they are very silent.

They tell us all the wonderful things they are going to do with the money they have stolen from the science account, but they do not tell us the loss they would impose upon that account.

Fortunately, the second reason the rhetoric is so faulty this afternoon is that it makes no difference anyway what they do with all these puts and takes in the domestic discretionary program, because under the Budget Act we cannot appropriate money for one program and take it from another program in the budget resolution. We can only do that in an appropriation bill, so all the puts and takes in their budget, as compared with the President's, are simply, in the end, a phantasm.

They are not binding on the Appropriations Committee, they are not binding on this House, and they are not binding on the Congress. They are binding on no one. That is the reality of what we are doing this afternoon.

Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. GREEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina. Just on that point, Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman's comments about Justice, I think in the aggregate the Democratic resolution increases funds for Justice by $204 million, but they make unspecified cuts of $769 million.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] has expired.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER], a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have enjoyed working with the chairman, ranking minority member, and other members of the Budget Committee. Many people have said before me that the differences between the Democrats' budget and the President's budget are small. That is true, but I agree the differences are significant. Yes, they both had to meet certain spending caps under last year's budget agreement, but there are significant differences.

When you look at the differences, the President's budget comes out ahead. Let us look at the tax side.

The Democrats claim that they support research and development as a way to promote economic growth in job creation. But then they ignore the President's proposal to extend the tax credit for research and experimentation.

The Democrats claim they are concerned about health care for working Americans, but they they ignore the President's proposal to extend the health insurance deduction for the self-employed.

Let us look at the spending side. The Democrats claim they are concerned about rising unemployment. Then they cut funds from the President's budget needed to administer unemployment compensation.

The Democrats claim they are concerned about investments, but they cut drastically funds from the President's budget for science and research. And, finally, the Democrats claim they are concerned about the environment, but you would not know it based on their budget, since they cut from the President's budget critical funding needed to protect endangered species, conserve and restore wetlands, protect wildlife refuges, and achieve reforestation.

Yes, there are spending increases in education in the Democratic budget, although without any educational reform. But they do it by cutting in the areas of administration of unemployment compensation, conservation and environment, and science and research.

When you look at these differences between the two budgets, they are small, but they are significant. And the differences favor our voting for the President's budget.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE], who is also a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Budget Committee's budget and opposed to the Gradison substitute. I would like to begin by congratulating our chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] for an excellent job. This is my first year on the Budget Committee. I have been very impressed with the job that he has done in leading the committee.

I would also like to congratulate President Bush for using real numbers, honest numbers, in his budget for the first time in 8 years under Republican administrations. And I would like to congratulate the President for coming up with a budget which is reasonable enough that the Republican Members of the House do not feel they have to run away from it. That is real step forward.

Last fall we spent a lot of time talking about fairness in trying to put together a budget summit agreement. I think it is a real achievement of last October's agreement that we insisted, especially in the area of taxes, on fairness across the income spectrum.

This year there are not huge differences between the President's budget and the Democratic one, but there are real differences and they speak to fairness.

The Bush-Gradison plan would cut back on Medicare, veterans' programs, guaranteed student loans, foster care, maternal and child health programs, community development block grant programs, community services block grant programs, low-income energy assistance and, yes, trade adjustment assistance, the only program to help workers who lose their jobs because of trade.

Let us look especially at the area of taxation. No one has mentioned it on the floor today, but the Gradison substitute picks up the President's recommendation for a lower rate on capital gains, a rate proposal that provides $11 billion in benefits, almost exclusively to high-income Americans.

That is not consistent with the fairness doctrine they adopted last fall. We ought to reject the Gradison substitute.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY], another distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Chairman, I am here at this moment to speak on behalf of rural Americans and the 27 percent of our population who still proudly live in America's small cities and towns. And in that regard, I am happy to rise and I have to rise in opposition to the President's budget and in support of the committee resolution. But I am proud that we are having this debate because it serves to highlight the differences between the President's budget and the committee resolution, and, oh, there are so many deep differences.

Mr. Chairman, rural America is drowning in a sea of troubles, and that is certainly no exaggeration. So the question quite simply for this national ship of state is whether we will throw

out a life preserver or a millstone. Quite simply, in my opinion, the President's budget constitutes a millstone around the neck of rural America. Why do I say that?

I think that these reductions are severe and very deep. There is a $500 million reduction for the discretionary programs serving rural America. There is a $400 million reduction in rural housing loans. There is a huge reduction in farm ownership and operating loans. There is a 25-percent reduction in rural water and waste disposal grants, when we have communities around our Nation where folks still live without running water and indoor plumbing.

There is a $125 million reduction in rural development direct loans for water and waste, for community facilities and business and industry projects. The President, in his proposal, tried to means test certain agricultural programs which in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, will serve to drive farmers off the land, into bankruptcy, and will severely impact the degree to which they can repay their farm loans.

In addition, the President proposes to terminate the Economic Development Administration and the Appalachian Regional Commission. Quite simply, Mr. Chairman, I would say that the President's proposal is really a millstone. We ought to defeat it and pass the committee resolution.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair wishes to state that the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] has 29 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] has 28 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], a member of the Budget Committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, let us take a moment to examine what it is we are asking the Members of this House to choose between today.

This is the President's budget. It was submitted in compliance with the law on February 4. It is a very detailed budget, full of hard choices, tough decisions, and real numbers. In fact, the realism of the President's budget has been applauded by everybody today, and it has been applauded by the Washington Post, I am told. This is a real budget proposal, with real numbers and a real analysis. It is concrete, it is detailed, and it exists. It has been here since February 4.

This is the Democrat majority's budget. It is built on false economic assumptions and on optimistic economic assumptions and faulty methodology. It represents a system of priorities and values. It was based on a specious analysis of inequity or alleged inequity of income distribution in America. It depends on the Congressional Budget Office, which shows itself to be incapable of even the most rudimentary economic analysis. In fact, it is mysticism.

□ 1550

That is it, pure and simple. Now, we have been hearing an awful lot about who is being fair to who around here in this budgetary process. Surely it is true when you take 25 percent of the Nation's GNP away from the American people who built it, who earn the money in making it, and put it in the hands of Government, that is not fair. That is not fair to anybody.

Then when you reallocate, redistribute that 25 percent of the GNP from these people instead of these people, somebody gets hurt and somebody gets helped. We are all bleeding our hearts with somebody else's money over who gets hurt around here, and nobody has spoken for the beleaguered taxpayer.

I know about that man and that woman who are working to support their children that the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] talked about so passionately earlier. I am that man, and I am married to that woman, and we have five children in college. Times get tough. We sit down and we work through our budget, just as the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] said. We do not ask what are we going to get from the Government. We ask what will the Government leave us of the money we worked so hard to earn?

That is compassion. Is it fair for the working men and women in this country to be left a greater share of the money they earn on behalf of their children and a greater degree of freedom and privilege and responsibility as parents to decide what is best for our children and for ourselves? Is that fair? I think that is fair. Or would we rather turn our money and our children's destiny over to the Government? I think not.

Mr. Chairman, I say vote for the Gradison substitute.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE], a distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget who has worked on veterans issues for the committee.

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Gradison substitute and in support of House Concurrent Resolution 121, as passed by the Budget Committee.

As a veteran and a former member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I would like to share with you some things I have learned about veterans' medical care.

The veterans population is aging as our World War II and Korean War veterans have reached or are approaching retirement age. As a result, the demand for VA medical services has increased. The number of outpatients treated by the VA has risen 25 percent over the last 10 years, and the number of veterans receiving nursing home care has risen 41 percent. Yet, the veterans medical care budget has declined relative to the growth of general medical costs. In constant dollars, the veterans medical care budget has increased by 6 percent over the last decade, while general per capita medical costs have grown 48 percent.

When I go back to my district, the veterans I have spoken with are worried about long waits for outpatient treatment, a shortage of hospital beds, and the closing of parts of hospitals. I am sure many of you have heard similar stories.

Yet the President's budget does not include adequate funds to address this problem. The 4-percent increase given for veterans' medical care is still $23 million less than what is needed to cover general inflation and is even more inadequate when you consider that medical costs are rising roughly 11 percent this year. We cannot continue this 10-year trend of not allowing veterans medical care spending to keep up with the needs of our veterans.

The committee budget begins to address this problem. Funding for veterans medical care is increased above the amount necessary to cover general inflation. These funds are needed to address the growing medical needs of our veterans.

Our veterans did not turn their backs on us when we needed them. We should not turn our backs on our veterans when they need us. If you want to make a real, tangible commitment to all of our veterans who have sacrificed for us, reject the Gradison substitute and vote for the committee budget.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I come to the well today with gifts for my Republican colleagues. There is a great propensity to wear yellow buttons, as all Members know, celebrating victories. Here is an opportunity for my Republican colleagues to celebrate another victory today, a yellow button that says, "I voted for the President's budget."

Mr. Chairman, we are hopeful that all Republicans who have spoken so eloquently for it today will proudly put that button on and follow their dictates when we have an opportunity an hour from now to register the priorities of the two political parties. Because the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is correct: the budget is the ultimate political document. It expresses the priorities and values of the people who submit them.

The red, white, and blue document we are about to vote on is the President's priority. Soon we will have a chance to vote on the beginning of a

blueprint for America's budget that will be offered by the Democrats.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I just wanted to thank the gentleman.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to be thanked. I will yield for that purpose alone.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, we are going to need a lot of those buttons.

Mr. FAZIO. We do have a lot of them. They are all going to be worn, I am sure. We look forward to the Republicans validating the fact that they want to cut $25 billion out of Medicare over the next 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, the Republicans came to the budget negotiations last year suggesting we cut $90 billion out of the Medicare budget. They were prevented from doing that, of course. But this is nothing new, because over the last 15 years proposals from Presidents Reagan and Bush, from 1981 through 1995, would have cut almost $200 billion out of the Medicare Program.

Mr. Chairman, this is part of a tradition. We think the votes today will validate their historic lack of commitment to the needs of middle income elderly in this country, low-income elderly, and even, frankly, some who might be able to afford a little more.

Mr. Chairman, veterans will appreciate noticing those wearing yellow buttons. For those who want to get on with the business of bringing Head Start to every young American child, they have an opportunity to see which side Republicans and Democrats are on. The yellow buttons are a signal, a beacon, which I think will be very indicative of the personal values that we bring to this budget debate.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to being clear about who cares about America's elderly and America's children. This debate is all about that, and these buttons will indicate which side one is on.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], who appears to be having some trouble getting one of those buttons. We very sincerely would like to wear them on our side. I just hope there are enough of them to go around.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I would yield to the ranking Republican on the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON], for a response.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, seriously looking at this budget, I did not see the union bug on it. I will not dwell on that. Maybe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] would want to say something about the subject

Mr. Chairman, I do want to comment very briefly about the Medicare Program. Of course, we are concerned about Medicare, because if the hospital insurance trust fund stays on autopilot, it is going to go bankrupt within 15 years. We are concerned enough to ensure the elderly that there is going to be money in the future to pay for their hospital bills under Medicare.

The changes which have been made in recent years, including those made last year, with the broad support, I might add, on the Democrat side of the aisle, were directed at the providers, not at the beneficiaries, who are protected. That is also true with regard to the proposals made by the President, the $25 billion we are hearing so much about. That is virtually all directed at providers. The beneficiaries are not only protected, but we are as anxious to protect them as you are.

□ 1600

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his comments in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of the President's budget proposal, the Gradison substitute. Since I do, I am very proud to be sporting the button. Thank you, Mr. FAZIO, for bringing the buttons to us here today.

Let me make it clear at the outset that both budget proposals that we are considering here today have more spending in them than I would like to see. But that was an issue we decided last fall in the budget summit agreement. The Congress agreed to the caps in defense and the domestic discretionary and international affairs accounts. While those caps may have been higher than I would have liked to have seen, that is the reality of what we are dealing with today.

At the outset we can say both of these budget proposals come within those budget caps. So within those constraints what we must examine are the differences between these proposals. People watching this debate might be excused for being a little bit confused. We have heard that the differences are large, we have heard that the differences are small; we have heard that the differences are significant, and we have heard that the differences are insignificant. I guess it is all a matter of whether you look at the glass as being half full or half empty, because I guess you could see it both ways. The differences are small in one sense, but they are also significant.

Candidly, and this is the first point I would like to make, quite candidly on the numbers side the differences are small. There is no way of getting around it, they are really ridiculously small in terms of the dollar amounts. In fact, there is a $3 billion net difference between the President's and the majority's budgets, and that is less than two-tenths of a percent of the total spending that is proposed this year. And the Democratic majority's budget changes only 62 of the 1,005 domestic discretionary accounts.

The second point is that there are some differences in priorities. First of all, the cuts, where there are cuts on the majority's budget, they are unspecified. People are always griping in this body about the Appropriations Committee being given too much latitude, and yet here we are telling the appropriators: "You decide where you are going to make these cuts because we are not going to do it."

The third point that I would like to make is that the cuts, where we do see them specified, are as the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] said, very much the seed corn of the United States. The cuts are in our science and R&D accounts. The increases are applied kind of across-the-board to a whole series of accounts that we all would agree are good, to alcohol, drug abuse, mental health programs, Head Start. Take the alcohol and drug abuse and mental health programs. There it goes from $3,079,000,000 to $3,099,000,000 or less than a third of a percent of an increase. But the cuts, the cuts in the R&D and science, those are significant.

The fourth point I would like to make is that the Democrats have relied on a rosy scenario. Surprise, surprise. In the past we have always accused the Office of Management and Budget of relying on too rosy a scenario. Here it is the other way around, and the result is $431 million less for the Unemployment Compensation Administration than is going to be necessary if their projections and assumptions are wrong.

The bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is that none of us should issue any laudatory press releases about either of these budget proposals, but on balance I think the President's budget is more realistic, and it is more fair.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], a member of the Budget Committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, the House Budget Committee offers the House a reinvest-in-America budget, an opportunity to renew and rebuild the basic transportation structures that support the great engine of growth that is our national economy.

On the eve of consideration by the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, chaired by our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], the committee is prepared to reauthorize the Nation's highway, bridge and mass transit programs for the next 5 years. This Democrat budget gives the Public Works and Transportation Committee the budget authority and outlay figures needed to fulfill some $80 billion in construction requirements to keep our transportation portfolio modernized and competitive and progressive.

The President's budget shortchanges the highway program and actually cuts mass transit. It will not lift us beyond gridlock. It will not lift us into a more progressive future of growth and economic expansion. Only in aviation does the President's budget match the House Budget Committee's resolution and keep pace with the system's users and with the legislation Congress enacted last year to draw down the surplus in the aviation trust fund and invest those moneys in safety and system capacity expansion and enhancement.

If Members want to move forward, if they want to move beyond gridlock, beyond decay and decline of our Nation's basic infrastructure facilities, if they want to lift this country forward and into progress and growth over the next 5 years and into the latter part of this decade, then defeat the President's budget and vote for the House Budget Committee's resolution which moves us on the right path and keeps us in the direction of rebuilding the Nation's portfolio of major infrastructure requirements.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], a member of the Budget Committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, lots of Members have been speaking on the budget today. It has really consumed the whole day and it goes the way of all budget discussions. I never knew a budget that was a happy affair. It is just like taking castor oil. You do what you have to do although you do not like it.

But in the process, the budgeting really is to determine the room in which we can operate during any set given time, and that is this next year. That room really was designed for us last year by the budget summit.

So what we can say is we are really putting our finishing touches on it. And what does that mean in terms of numbers? Let us not talk about Medicare, let us not talk about health, let us not talk about education. That was all decided. We are talking about sixtenths of 1 percent as far as the expenses are concerned, so really our work is done.

But is it? I wonder. Frankly, I do not think so.

You see, we have only decided to talk about the expense side of the budget. What about the revenues? I bet there are only a handful of people in this entire city who know what the revenues are expected to be in the latest forecast. Let me tell Members what they are.

Last year in January, the revenue estimate was about $1,200 billion. That is the income coming in under which our expenses rest. Then when the budget summit was agreed on, and this is by the CBO figures, those revenues had risen to $1,220 billion roughly. Then in January, the latest cut at this thing, the CBO says that they are now $1,170 billion, which means that since the budget summit was agreed upon, and we are only talking about the fringes now, the expense side, our revenues have fallen $50 billion.

So what do we do when revenues fall? If anyone has set up a budget over the year, they know you do two things. You either cut the expenses or you try to increase the revenues.

This House has decided today not to try to cut the expenses. It had two opportunities to do that and it decided not to. So the only thing left to do is to try to stimulate the budget and the economy with the money that we do already have, and try to boost the economy, boost jobs, boost business, and therefore boost our revenues.

We just cannot say the work was done. Certain things have to be done now. As everyone knows, the devil is in the details, and I submit the Gradison substitute budget does just this.

Let me add that frankly the only businesses that are growing in this country, to my knowledge, are businesses which have an edge, and they are the businesses which export. Those are the businesses which have a technological advantage.

What does the Gradison substitute do? It increases research and development, it improves competitiveness, it helps the National Science Foundation. There is not much room, but there is some, and we must use it wisely, and frankly, the Gradison substitute does that.

I urge Members' support for the Gradison substitute.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the President's budget which is before us today in the form of the Gradison amendment.

Last year was a difficult one for the Congress and the President. We struggled with a host of complicated, contentious issues, the most important of which was finding a multiyear response to our Nation's deficit problem. In the end, on a bipartisan basis, Congress and the President made a deal that will produce real deficit reduction over the next 5 years and—we thought at the time—eliminate for this year, another contentious and counterproductive budget debate.

That is why I am especially disturbed by the President's budget proposal. In my view, it breaches the 5-year budget deal we negotiated last year. The cuts to Medicare and foster care would be particularly devastating. The President achieves deficit reduction by proposing yet again items that have been soundly rejected by the Congress on a bipartisan basis in the past. He and his advisers know full well that these warmed-over proposals are unlikely to be passed this year. His budget also unnecessarily reignites the tax fairness debate and plays favorites with certain of the expiring tax provisions.

Let me highlight the most serious shortcomings of the President's budget and the Gradison amendment.

MEDICARE

Our budget agreement last fall included specific, painful reductions in Medicare, totaling $43 billion over the 5-year period. We met those targets in the reconciliation bill and understood that no further Medicare reductions would be necessary for deficit reduction purposes in fiscal years 1992 and 1993. That was the deal we all supported.

Now the President and his budget advisers ask us to cut another $25 billion out of Medicare. Let me be clear: I will not agree to an additional $25 billion of Medicare reductions this year. They are unfair to millions of Americans who rely on Medicare for their health coverage and to the providers of those services who have assumed that last year's budget deal set the rules of the game for the immediate future. I have two specific concerns:

First, the President's budget proposes over $20 billion in Medicare provider reductions over the next 5 years. These cuts would be in addition to the $34 billion in provider reductions adopted as part of last year's budget deal. Of particular concern is the $8 billion cut in funds for indirect medical education. This cut would hit hardest inner-city hospitals that have the highest rates of bad debt and charity care in the Nation because they serve so many uninsured patients. America's hospitals are providing $10 billion in charity care and deserve better treatment.

Second, the President's budget is replete with the usual array of tired old proposals for raising revenues and reducing Medicare costs that have been rejected time and again by Congress, often on a bipartisan basis. Proposals like requiring State and local employees to pay Medicare taxes are nonstarters. They have been rejected repeatedly in the past. They will be rejected again this year. When we brought State and local employees into the Medicare system in 1986, we made a compact by grandfathering all existing employees. In the interest of fundamental fairness, the Congress has rejected the administration's repeated attempts to break that deal. It is time for the administration to get the message—a deal is a deal.

FOSTER CARE

The President's policies for helping abused and neglected children are also disappointing.

Over the past 10 years, America's children have been getting a raw deal from Uncle Sam. This is especially true of abused or neglected children. We've all read stories about the lives these children lead. Crack cocaine is just the most recent of the many burdens we have asked them to shoulder. It doesn't take any great imagination to realize that the deck is stacked against these kids. The only consistent support they can count on is the support they get from foster parents. Take away $2 billion from foster care programs, as the President has proposed, and you take away the last bit of hope for a lot of troubled kids.

This proposed funding cut is not only unjust; it is foolishly shortsighted. Money spent on these kids today is an investment in the future, not a handout. It means that they have a better chance of leading productive adult lives. Without this chance, it's safe to say that the money saved today will be lost many times over tomorrow.

On this score, the budget resolution reported by the House Budget Committee is far superior. It shifts priorities from the President's budget, investing more in education and other programs of critical importance to children. By contrast, the President's budget offers no solid proposals for preparing poor kids for school, stemming the flow of abused kids into our foster care system, or improving the nutrition of America's children. The answer this administration offers is unresponsive, not kinder and gentler.

By rejecting the Gradison amendment, investing carefully now, and paying for those investments today, we will improve the country that our children and grandchildren will inherit from us.

OTHER ISSUES

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me make a few general comments about the President's revenue proposals and other issues raised by the budget resolution.

By again proposing to reduce the capital gains tax rate, the President has chosen to reignite the tax fairness debate and other distributional issues. Reducing the capital gains tax rate will cost the Treasury money without enhancing economic growth or productivity. It primarily helps the rich who had a pretty good 10 years and don't need the additional help.

I would also note that the President has played favorites with the list of tax provisions scheduled to expire at the end of this year. For example, he has proposed to make permanent the R&D tax credit but has suggested 1-year extensions of other popular provisions like the low-income housing credit. If we are going to walk down this road of selectivity, we best have good reasons for our decision to treat one expiring provision more favorably than another. It is not clear to me what the President's reasons are.

For instance, I recently wrote Treasury Secretary Brady inquiring about the administration's official position on the current exception from the alternative minimum tax under section 57(a)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code for gifts of appreciated tangible personal property which is due to expire at the end of this year. I specifically asked whether the exception should be broadened to include charitable contributions of other appreciated property, such as the gift of appreciated stock or real estate to educational institutions. Last year, the administration took the position during the House-Senate conference on the budget reconciliation bill that the limited exception contained in the Senate bill for gifts of appreciated tangible personal property should be expanded to a broader universe of appreciated property.

Thus, it came as quite a surprise to me that the President's budget for fiscal year 1992 did not contain any recommendation for an extension or expansion of the current limited exception beyond this year. Since the administration specifically recommended the permanent extension of the R&D tax credit, and the temporary extension of five other expiring provisions, I hope that the Secretary will clarify for me whether the omission from the President's budget of the current exception means that the administration has changed its position from last year or the omission is an oversight.

With regard to funding of the Internal Revenue Service, I would note that the budget resolution reported by the House Budget Committee provides $179 million more for fiscal year 1992 than is available this year. The resolution also assumes that, in accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, an additional $172 million in budget authority can be added in fiscal year 1992 for any compliance initiative, making the total additional funds equal to $351 million. The President's budget would have provided an extra $622 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1992.

I am concerned that the budget resolution reported by the House Budget Committee does not authorize adequate funding for the Internal Revenue Service and may impair the Service's ability to improve tax administration in fiscal year 1992. I have three specific concerns: modernization of IRS information systems, audits of high-income taxpayers and corporations, and reduction of the accounts receivable inventory.

One-quarter of the President's requested increase in IRS funding would be dedicated to modernization of antiquated and inadequate information systems. Without these funds, the IRS and taxpayers will be forced to rely on a labor-intensive and paper-driven Federal tax system designed for the 1950's.

Further, at funding levels below the President's request, needed improvements in the IRS's audit program are unlikely. Today, the IRS examines 50 percent fewer upper income taxpayers and 30 percent fewer corporations than it did a decade ago. Meanwhile, IRS expects to question 50 percent more working men and women about their tax returns. This is neither balanced nor fair and is unacceptable to me.

In addition, at funding levels below the President's request, it is doubtful that the IRS will undertake additional efforts to reduce its $100 billion accounts receivable inventory. That, quite simply, translates to lost revenues that we can ill afford to forgo. For all these reasons, I hope that our House conferees on the budget resolution will return with additional budget authority for IRS administration. It's an investment well made.

On the issue of Social Security administrative expenses, I am pleased that the budget resolution reported by the House Budget Committee accepts the President's full request of $2.54 billion for the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance programs. This amount, which is $246 million above the freeze level, will help the agency deal with a rising backlog of unprocessed disability claims and ease the financial pressure on thousands of disabled children and adults who are waiting for benefits across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I am profoundly disappointed in the President's budget proposal. I expected better: More recognition of the difficult task we achieved by approving last year's budget compromise and more creative solutions to the problems that remain before us. I hope we see better from this administration in the weeks and months ahead.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Gradison amendment. We can and will do better.

□ 1610

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP].

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, the President this year has put back on the national agenda a critical issue with respect to energy. Regrettably, his budget advisers have not listened to his energy advisers, and the Committee on the Budget here in the House has wisely come forth with a far more important and realistic proposal when it comes to how we are going to invest our money on these critical issues.

First and foremost, let me indicate that we are taking a step here in contrast to what the administration is advocating to see to it that we continue to build our strategic petroleum reserve, which is the most important protection for jobs and consumers when

there are oil crises. The President used it in January and helped rescue us from a clear and dramatic price increase that started the night before when the war started. Regrettably, he did not use it last fall when we might have protected our economy from a higher price that we paid for several months. Mr. Chairman, we are going to fill that reserve to have it available for future crises.

Mr. Chairman, second, we have a situation in which this country is losing its edge technologically, and throughout the energy budget proposed by the House of Representatives Committee on the Budget, we will begin back on the track of advancing that cause. We are going to do it in the area of renewable energy resources which we need desperately in this country and around the world. We are going to do it in upgrading our fossil fuel energy uses, our production facilities, and how we use fossil fuels. We are going to do it by promoting alternative-fuel vehicles that the President wants to have happen but this budget takes seriously and will help make happen.

Mr. Chairman, over and over again we are going to face in the future the problems of addressing how to have prosperity without poisoning ourselves, and that requires a skillful energy policy that helps advance technology for that purpose.

We can, and this budget helps us, move forward on the goals of making us economically competitive for the next century, making sure we are protecting our health in the next century and making sure we advance American technology.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CHANDLER].

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Gradison amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. Chairman, last year Congress agreed to a budget reconciliation package that would reduce the deficit, realizing, of course, that this goal is only achievable if spending is brought under control. I supported the agreement last year, and I commend the Gradison budget for living within that agreement.

The goals of the Gradison amendment are commendable as well as realistic. While the committee budget stresses fairness for all Americans and appears to target working families, it fails to identify where the unspecified reductions will come from or to include growth-oriented tax proposals. The Gradison amendment, on the other hand, rightfully extends tax credits which stimulate the economy and encourage savings and investment at a time when we need it most.

Such critical tax provisions include the extension of the research and experimentation credit and health insurance deduction for the self-employed. The extension of these and other tax provisions are important public policy, and the budget of the United States should include them.

It is easy in a debate like this to criticize specifics, and that has been going on on both sides. However, I must say that the Gradison amendment, representing the President's budget, is honest. It is consistent, and it is fair, and it will, if enacted, lead toward a balanced budget.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Gradison amendment because of the cuts in veterans' benefits, Medicare, and education.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn to another topic, the NASA budget. I really believe the space station is critical to our Nation's ability to lead the world in high technology and our ability to compete economically against other nations.

My understanding is that the budget resolution before us today contains funding for function 250 programs including NASA-related activities which totals approximately $17.7 billion. This amount is approximately an 8-percent increase over last year, but more than $1 billion less than the President believes is needed to maintain America's all-important leadership in space, science, technology, and industry.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], are these figures correct?

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PANETTA. They are correct.

Ms. OAKAR. In the gentleman's opinion, would America profit scientifically, educationally, industrially, from increased funding for function 250 programs beyond the committee's proposed level of funding?

Mr. PANETTA. If the gentlewoman will yield further, obviously, this is an area where we were faced with constraint within the priorities that were established, and clearly we want to make these investments. We have made about $1.1 billion above the President in science and technology and about another $200 million in R&D energy, but this is also an area for concern.

□ 1620

This is also an area for concern.

Ms. OAKAR. Would it be the gentleman from California, Mr. PANETTA's, intention to seek to achieve sufficient funding for Function 250 and NASA to maintain our leadership in space, science, technology, and industry when this budget resolution is taken to conference with the Senate? I always worry about the Senate, as the chairman of the committee knows.

Mr. PANETTA. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield, my intention is obviously to try to find sufficient funding for this whole area, in the total area of space, science, and technology based on requirements with other priorities.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on the Budget. I am proud to represent a NASA site at Lewis Research Center in Cleveland.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON].

Mr. Chairman, it is true that the President's budget proposal supports the high performance computing initiative and includes modest funding increases for important programs such as the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

However, President Bush's proposal fails to support other critical areas such as job training and vocational education that are vital to the world's transition from an era of military confrontation to one of economic competition.

SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

Some have argued that this budget resolution does not make explicit tough choices. Many of the same Members have then complained that this budget cuts space spending. Well, that is but one of the explicit tough choices that this budget resolution makes.

However, this budget does not provide less funding for science, space, and technology. It provides less funding than the President in space, but it provides more for science and technology here on Earth.

Mr. Chairman, the Budget Committee proposal is exceptional for the attention it devotes to enhancing international competitiveness.

The United States must promote such emerging technologies as semiconductors, x-ray lithography, and high definition systems that will form the backbone of every conceivable industry.

The committee resolution provides significantly more than the President for research in the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA], for DOD Manufacturing Technology, Science and Engineering Education, and Engineering Support Technology—Defense Department programs that work. The committee provides more for the Advanced Technology Program and the Competitiveness Council in the Commerce Department. The committee provides more for Department of Education math and science education and vocational education programs. And

the committee provides more for research at the National Institutes of Health, and for research in alternative fuels, fuel conservation, and environmental protection. These increases, coupled with increases equal to the President for the National Science Foundation and the important technology and manufacturing programs within the National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST], including increased funding and loan authority for the Advanced Technology Program within NIST, leaving the committee resolution way ahead of the President in science and technology.

Space spending gets a full increase for inflation—not a cut. If we had more money to spend, we might well choose to increase space spending even more. But space exploration can wait—our children can't.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio and to support the Budget Committee resolution. Despite the budgetary constrictions facing the Congress and the Nation, the Budget Committee has developed a proposal that will provide businesses with the atmosphere and confidence to make decisions for the future.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Indiana [Ms. LONG].

Ms. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the President's budget and in support of the committee's budget. I think that both the President's budget and the committee budget are thoughtful efforts, neither of which contain tax increases. However, the committee effort prevails as a fairer budget for most Americans, and I also believe for American businesses, in the long run.

First, the priorities contained in the committee resolution really make more sense and provide for a fairer treatment of this Nation's elderly, veterans, farmers, and average Americans. The resolution places a greater commitment to health programs, to education, to drug enforcement, energy, transportation, and competitiveness.

Second, it is better for American business because the committee resolution places a greater priority on improving our work force through job training which will increase U.S. competitiveness internationally and it places an emphasis on basic research in the education of the maths and sciences.

Finally, it will assist business because it places a strong emphasis on rebuilding the critically needed infrastructure and transportation systems of this Nation to prepare us for the 21st century.

The President's budget is a good effort but I have to conclude that the committee resolution makes more sense for our country.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to advise the Chair that I am reserving most of my time for the closing statement by our leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr MICHEL].

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, if the issue on this budget resolution is whether or not a Member should vote for it, I ask them to apply this criterion, this guideline. If the No. 1 issue in the minds of America today is health care, the yardstick to be applied to this budget offered by President Bush, as opposed to the Democratic alternative, makes a very clear choice. On the issue of health, the Democratic budget does the following: Where President Bush cuts $25 billion from Medicare over the next 5 years, the Democratic budget does not. The net impact of that means, for hundreds of thousands of senior citizens across America, they will continue to have access to quality, affordable health care. Furthermore, if a person lives in the part of rural America as I do, it means that those hospitals which are struggling to survive will have a chance. Under the President's budget, they will not. Under the Democratic budget, they will.

However, the assistance for health care does not end with senior citizens. The Democratic budget also puts money into the WIC Program. We have heard about it on the floor. The WIC Program is a nutrition program for children and young mothers, an effort to make certain that as the mothers are pregnant, and in the early years of the lives of the children, they receive appropriate nutrition so that they can grow up healthy. Our budget, of course, targets full funding for WIC by 1996. The President's budget does not.

Childhood immunizations: There is no more cost-effective way to improve the health of America today than to make certain that every child, every infant, is immunized against major diseases. Most middle American families take it for granted their children will get these shots. If a person happens to live in a poor family, or in a remote rural area, they may not have a chance to get the shots. When the child presents himself to kindergarten, it is the first time that they get a chance to be immunized. This bill introduced on the Democratic side puts $50 million more into child immunization. It means for 350,000 children in America, they will get this protection.

If the issue is health care, the vote is clear. Vote no on President Bush's budget, vote yes on the Democratic alternative.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that there have been a number of House budgets in the past, which this Member has not been able to warmly embrace. Back in my office, I have a drawer full of alternative budget proposals which I and other members of conservative Democrat forums have offered during the 1980's.

No such alternative emerged from the file drawer during this year's budget debate for one primary reason: The gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], chairman of the committee and the Committee on the Budget successfully crafted a document which begins to reaffirm what the entire Democratic Party is all about. We have created a budget which is both caring and responsible. In doing so, we have shown the inclusiveness of our party.

This year in the Committee on the Budget we learned a new word: "prioritization." We recognized that if we were able to achieve full funding for programs which have proven themselves as worthwhile and cost effective, we must decide at the same time which programs will receive smaller increases or be eliminated.

We are beginning to learn that we cannot do everything for everybody.

□ 1630

We must resolve to do even more and to do certain things as well as possible. For example, experts tell us that the earliest influences on a child's life makes some of the biggest differences in his or her successes. That is why I believe in targeting money for Head Start and WIC.

Furthermore, when it comes to fairness, there were two areas in which I felt it was particularly important to reject the President's budget.

First, I opposed the President's cut of $25.2 billion additional in Medicare. My colleague earlier stated that the Democratic budget does nothing for economic growth. In rural areas which depend fully on their hospitals for any economic growth, an additional cut of $25 billion without a plan would have been devastating.

Now, I agree we need to make cuts in this area, but we need a plan that cuts, not another cut with no plan.

The second area had to do with infant mortality. To his credit, the President proposed increased funding to address this issue, but focused that money on urban areas alone. In the Budget Committee, we affirmed that rural infants are just as precious as urban infants and we increased infant mortality programs without geographical or other prejudice. We also refused

to pay for this funding by cutting from effective programs such as community and migrant health centers or maternal and child health care.

I make this point specifically, because as you look around for solutions to the health care problems of this country, when we look around the country whether it is urban or rural, we find that one of the most successful programs are community and migrant health centers. They deliver the health care cost efficiently, and yet the President suggested taking money from that and moving it into another area, and I think that is a legitimate area of difference.

I urge rejection of the President's budget and support of the Democratic alternative package.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Harry Truman made famous the fact that "the buck stops here" on a President's desk—what President Truman did not say is that the buck starts here in Congress. And these days there are entirely too many bucks involved. I think most would agree that managing the national budget—or should I say bringing it under control—is the most important task that the American people sent us here to do. I take my hat off to the Budget Committee and its leadership for the job they are trying to do—provide for all the needs and wants while still balancing the budget and erasing the deficit. We all know this cannot be done unless Congress makes some fundamental changes. People in my district were not favorably impressed with our budget effort last year. They were even less impressed with the results. They know there is still tremendous waste in government—waste which the GAO estimates at $180 billion per annum. I am asked, "Is this Congress also going to dance to Lawrence Welk?" I fear that many think it does, and not many are ready to buy into the proposition that this year's Congress will really meet its challenges head on—that this year Congress will cut out the deficit, strip out the pork, stamp out the redundancies. There are not many believers—and rightly so—because nothing we are going to vote on today comes close to those goals. But at least the President's budget attempts to shift focus and prioritize spending within some limits. It begins to make some of the hard choices. I urge support for the President's budget because it is the safest port for the American economy in the fiscal storm that is blowing. But it is not enough. We cannot pass any of the budget choices available this year and go away satisfied that our work is well done. The taxpayers—the people we work for—are asking for less waste, less spending, and a balanced budget. Why can we not do better?

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume for a closing statement to be made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], our Republican leader.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I obviously rise in support of the President's budget. While this pin I hold which states "I voted for the President's budget," is in the past tense; we will vote for the President's budget and be mighty proud to wear it for the balance of the day and well into next week.

May I at the very outset pay my compliments and thanks and appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] who this year took over the reins as our ranking member on the Budget Committee from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] who left the Congress after serving with such distinction. And then, too, I would like to thank my leadership appointee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN]. I thank these gentlemen for the great job they have done, and all the Members, particularly on our side of the aisle, who serve on the Budget Committee.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] had his own substitute.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] had his own substitute.

They are very conscientious, hardworking Members, and frankly, probably there are several others who have some reservations about the President's budget because they are hardliners when it comes to spending. They have proposed spending levels less than what the President had proposed. The point is they do it in good sincerity because when the roll is called on appropriation bills, you are going to find those two gentlemen also voting against increased spending. They do it with good conscience and I respect those Members. I voted for one substitute, voted against the other, because I thought it was a bit too extreme.

I am most happy to rise at this time in support of the President's budget, because it possesses three cardinal virtues of a good budget: It is inclusive in scope, specific in detail, and honest in its assumptions.

The President's tax policy encourages competitiveness, encourages savings, although not as much as some of us would like because it is limited under our given set of circumstances, and then aids first-time homebuyers and stimulates economic growth.

In the work last year on that torturous budget trail when we had so much dissension within our ranks and so much controversy, we did at least establish specific budget caps.

The committee this year was under some wraps, no question about it, because we all wanted to hold fast to what we had agreed to last year. That was a 5-year agreement and I think we can conclude that 3 years of that agreement is solid; the other 2 may be open to conjecture. I applaud everyone for having held to the general principles of that agreement.

Now, the President's budget provides us with specifics, such as a permanent extension of the research and experimentation credit. Here is a proposal that some can say is inappropriate for these times. I happen to think the extension of the R&E credit is good even in a recessionary period so that we keep on the front edge of research and development. We never want to be second best.

I think having concluded, for example, the recent war in the Persian Gulf as expeditiously as we did is due in no small measure to the fact that we have been out on the cutting edge of scientific research and development. We do not want to lose that advantage. The R&E credit is one of the most effective tools in allowing U.S. companies to compete in the world market.

The President has the courage to confront the crucial and politically sensitive question of Medicare cost containment.

A recent report by the Advisory Council on Social Security states the hospital insurance fund will be out of funds by the year 2006.

We all know that Medicare is projected to grow by nearly 12 percent this coming year.

I am reminded of a recent conference in my home community with representatives from the Canadian plan, the American Medical Association, the Chrysler plan, and several other business plans and labor plans. The conference was held by an organization called the Peoria Area Labor-Management Group, in which we were all trying to come to grips with the crisis of rising medical costs.

If we do not make some adjustment Medicare costs will continue to skyrocket.

So we cannot put it off to another day or simply sweep it under the rug.

The President's proposal would save about $3 billion in this area. These cuts do not add to the burden of needy beneficiaries. Those earning more than $125,000 annually would be required under the President's budget to pay higher premiums.

I have to ask Members, those of us in that salary bracket, is there any good reason for the Federal Government to be subsidizing our Medicare premiums? Of course not. If we would just face up to this fact we could do so much more for those less fortunate.

The Medicare system is self-destructing before our very eyes. Unfortunately, the majority in its budget has chosen to ignore the clear danger signals about the health of Medicare.

Let us look at the Democrat budget for a moment. It is incomplete and very mysterious when it comes to telling us where money for new programs will come from. In fact, it deserves the title the "Agatha Christie Budget," since it contains so many mysteries about funding levels.

We hear of expanded unemployment benefits, of the Mickey Leland nutrition bill and an expanded Medicad Program. But how will all these new spending programs be paid for?

The majority's answer, a nice smile, a shrug, silence, giving the phrase "silent majority" quite frankly a richer, deeper meaning.

□ 1640

Defense spending and international affairs numbers are treated by the Democrats the same as in the President's budget.

But the Democrats tell us, as they always tell us, that they are more compassionate than all the rest of us. Do you want to know what their vaunted compassion amounts to in this budget? I think the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and others on our side have pointed out that of the $1.4 trillion budget they are moving around somewhere between $3 billion to $10 billion. That is big money, even back in Peoria, believe me, no question about that. But it is less than 1 percent of the total budget we are talking about here.

Now, if that is compassion, I would hate to see what neglect looks like.

And even here they fail. The Committee on Appropriations will reshuffle these priorities when they begin work on the annual appropriations bills. The committee is not bound by the priorities assumed in the budget resolution.

The Democrats' budget only gives us the good news, the programs which increase, telling everybody what we are going to do for them. Not what it is going to cost or what they might have to take away. These increases are paid for by freezes or across-the-board cuts in programs, frankly affecting the environment, the administration of justice, general Government functions, as well as large cuts in the area of space, science, and technology.

Mr. Chairman, the President's budget complies with last fall's budget enforcement procedures. I am grateful for that, because it was a tortuous trail with which we ended the session last year. Many of us were disillustioned because of the trauma that resulted from those negotiations.

But I will tell you the one thing that we did really preserve out of that experience was a set of meaningful spending caps. While some would say they are too high, nevertheless there ought to be a ceiling. If we can do less than that, well and good. But I want to be calling the roll on appropriations bills, the 13 general appropriations bills, and just see who antes up at that time on levels of spending below those spending caps.

There is increased funding in the President's budget for education, Head Start, the WIC Program, drug prevention programs, the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, aviation, highways, law enforcement programs.

You can always argue, "Oh, there ought to be more." Sure, shoot the moon. You know, there are no inhibitions on the part of some. But I say that the President's budget is a good budget.

It provides funding for space programs where the United States can seize the initiative in the race for the future.

These programs keep us on that sharp cutting edge and push out the frontiers of knowledge and science, and I think we all benefit from that.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote for the President's sensible, responsible, and, yes, responsive budget.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOLTER].

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Gradison amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the time has now come for tax fairness. For almost 11 years, working Americans have been cast aside as the wealthy and the powerful have been given greater means to accumulate wealth.

But now, as we prepare to vote on this budget, we must stand prepared to restore budget fairness to the American people: To American working people, senior citizens, our children, to our veterans, our farmers—to every American.

The administration's budget does not restore fairness. The President's budget cuts Medicare; it cuts veterans programs; it cuts guaranteed student loans, and foster care and maternal and child health care. It cuts community development block grants and community services block grants. The President's budget cuts low-income energy assistance and rural development, and cuts child nutrition and Pell grants for families with incomes as low as $23,500.

It is obvious then, that those of us here in the House of Representatives, the House of the people, must reject the President's budget because it is not fair. It does not help America.

We must reject the $25 billion in Medicare cuts the administration proposes and support increases for Social Security and Medicare.

We must reject the administration's call for veterans cuts and support a $1.1-billion increase for veterans medical care, veterans research, and claims processing.

Surely if we can fund war, if we can fund smart weapons, if we can fund foreign rebuilding efforts, then we can bear the financial burden to care for those men and women who put their lives on the line in the recent war in the Persian Gulf and in our past conflicts. Smart weapons will not operate without men and women operators. Smart tanks must be manned with smart personnel.

We must support our men and women coming home from the Persian Gulf. We must support our troops now with this budget.

We cannot turn our backs on our veterans any more than we can turn our backs on our farmers.

The spending plan of the House Budget Committee, which I support, includes $704 million more than the President's budget does for rural programs. This plan includes $239 million more than the President proposes for rural housing loans. If this country cannot help rural working families and farmers obtain housing, then what is it we can afford?

In addition, the Budget Committee has earmarked a $2-billion increase in low-income housing and homeless programs, with increases in low-income energy assistance and other community services.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, we must return fairness to the budget. We must end tax cuts for the rich. We must level the playing field in America. We must help those Americans who have not benefited from large inheritances or sweetheart deals.

To restore fairness we must end the economic aristocracy in America. If this is the people's House, then we must begin the 1990's with this budget. Vote here and now for fairness: Fairness to America's working families, farmers, seniors, and veterans. I ask my colleagues to support the House Budget Committee proposal and reject the administration's hurtful budget.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The distinguished majority leader is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, first I want to congratulate the chairman of our Budget Committee and all of the members of the committee for all of the hard work that was done to put this budget together. I want to congratulate them for their timely work. This is a budget that comes almost exactly on time, which is something that we have not always been able to do. For that I appreciate the efforts that everyone made.

I want to pay special homage to the chairman of the committee, who is one of my close friends and, I think, one of the most able Members of this House. He performed ably when we had the budget summit last fall, and he has continued to do that on behalf of the committee and on behalf of the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives. I do not think we could have a better chairman of the Committee on the Budget than the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

I think he has performed with excellence and with a real sensitivity toward the needs of our country. I congratulate him for the product that the committee produced.

Mr. Chairman, most of the time in the past we have not had a discussion between the merits of two plans. In some of the years past we just had one

plan and the Members only got to vote on one plan, maybe with some amendments, but essentially there was not a debate between the two parties, between two visions of where the country should go.

I understand that the differences in terms of dollars may not be as large as sometimes in the past, because we had a budget summit and we have caps and we have targets, and obviously the differences may not be that great in terms of dollars. But I submit that the difference between these two budgets, these two visions of where the country should go in the next year, is great and that Members will be casting in the next few minutes perhaps the most important vote that you will cast for the rest of this Congress because you will be voting on a blueprint, a roadmap that we will be following in the appropriations process for the next 3, 4, and 5 months.

To me there are two major differences between these proposals. The first major difference has to do with what the President's proposal does to middle-income Americans. There are three things that, if you vote for the President's proposal, you are voting to do to middle-income working families.

The first thing, of course, is Medicare. The President's proposal cuts an additional $25 billion out of the Medicare Program. It affects 34 million people. And, yes, it can be said, it is only cuts in hospitals and physicians. But everybody here knows that those cuts on hospitals and physicians wind up being borne by the Medicare recipients, the senior citizens who get the benefits of that program.

We had this debate last fall. The budget summit agreement that we came back with had heavier cuts in Medicare. Many of us voted for that budget summit agreement. It was the will of the Congress and ultimately the President last fall that we would not cut Medicare to that level; that was the decision we made. And now, a few short months later, the President and many Members on the other side are coming back with the proposal that goes back to the levels that the Congress and the country refused last fall. I think we should stick with the decision that we made. It was tough to make it; we made it. How can we justify to the Medicare recipients now that we want another $25 billion back and we are going to cut out of their reimbursement for hospitals and doctors?

Yesterday I talked to a senior citizen who said she has to worry every day whether she has enough money to eat. It seems to me those are not the people that we should be trying to cut.

Second, student loans; if you adopt the President's proposal, you are going to cut 200,000 student loans for families that are middle-income families. In fact, arguably they are even falling out of the middle-income category.

□ 1650

If there is anything we know, we need to educate our youngsters to compete in the world economy which we are going to be competing in. The last thing in the world we need to be doing is making it harder for middle-income kids to get a college education, but that is what the President's budget does.

Third and finally, there is the renewed call for a cut in the capital gains tax. I do not think we need to go back through this argument, but I am just going to take one more minute to do it.

We had this argument at the budget summit. We decided, as a Congress and as a people, we were not going to cut the taxes of the wealthiest of Americans, that, if we are going to have a tax cut in the future, and I hope someday we can, that it should be focused at middle-income families that are squeezed in this country that are experiencing economic pain and difficulty. But yet, in light of that, the President comes back with the proposal that says, "Let's give a tax cut, not to middle income America, but to the top one in five and 10 percent of taxpayers."

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, "If you vote for the President's proposal, you're voting to put that proposal in place. If you vote for the Democratic proposal, you're not voting to put that proposal in place."

Finally, I want to talk about the priorities that are in this budget. It may not be huge dollars, however, as my colleagues know; only in Washington would we say that $3 billion or $10 billion is not a lot of money. To everyone else in America, to everyone else in the world, it is a heck of a lot of money, and what the approach of the committee does, and the reason it is better, is that it recognizes what I think we have got to be recognizing in this country about where we want this country to go, and what we want it to be, and what we want it to do.

At every town hall meeting I have, someone in the back stands up and says, "Congressman, how am I going to compete against somebody in Mexico or Malaysia who is willing to work at a job like the one I'm doing for 50 cents an hour, and I'm being paid $12 or $15 an hour?" I call it the $64 question of the 1990's.

We are going to have a Mexican free trade issue in front of us in a few days, and the issue there will be: How do we compete against countries that have a much lower standard of living? The answer I give my constituents is, the only honest answer we can give is, "If you're going to be paid $15 an hour, you've really got to produce $15 an hour more than the person you're competing against."

How in the world, if that is what we want to do, and I think that is what we want to do as a people, we want a high-wage/high-skilled society, but we will never achieve it unless we are willing, in a budget like this as our Committee on the Budget did, to make a change in priorities, even if it is $10 billion or $5 billion, and say, "Yes, we're going to put more money in Head Start so that kids are ready to go to school to get the education, to be competitive with the Japanese and the Europeans instead of being competitive with Third World countries."

Yes, we are going to realize the President's national education goal. We are not just going to talk about it. We are going to do it. We are going to make it happen. Yes, we are going to put more money into job training. Yes, we are going to put money into nutrition programs and programs for women and infants so we can have the healthy people to compete. Yes, we want a high-wage/high-skilled society. That is the kind of country that we want it to be 10 and 20 years from now.

Mr. Chairman, that is what this decision is about, and so I come today to say, "Vote for a budget that helps average, ordinary, middle-income, working families and help the future citizens of this country have the ability to compete, not against people that are working for 50 cents and a dollar an hour, but are competing against people who work for $20, and $30, and $50 an hour. We can do it if we have the courage today to vote for a budget that will make it happen."

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, before us today is the President's budget proposal, which is being offered by the Republicans as a substitute for the resolution agreed to by the Budget Committee. I think it is significant that the Republicans are willing to offer the President's budget this year. It is significant, I believe, because it shows us how similar the two resolutions before us today are.

I will vote against the Republican substitute and for the Budget Committee resolution, but this is not a great test of wills and values. The budget agreement enacted last year does not allow us to make great decisions regarding spending priorities—whether to increase domestic spending and decrease defense expenditures. Those decisions were set for the next few years for us by the 1990 budget resolution.

As Members of Congress, we should step back and consider how we have come to be in this position. During the 1980's, Congress failed to live up to efforts to restrain Federal spending. We went through two incarnations of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings balanced budget law before we realized that threats of across-the-board cuts alone would not reduce the size of the deficit. Gramm-Rudman did not work. Every time it got tough, every time Congress was faced with choosing between priorities, we backed off.

Now we are faced with truly hard choices. Defense spending is coming down because the specter of international relations has changed. We are no longer concerned with building up arms to defeat the Soviet threat. As Members of Congress the decisions we must now make are not between guns and

butter, but rather how we will divide up the stick of butter. We must now decide whether the importance of funding infant mortality prevention outweighs the importance of building highways and bridges. We must choose between biomedical research that could save lives and space research. These are truly hard decisions, yet last year's budget resolution lets us largely abdicate the responsibility for making these decisions until 1993.

Many speakers over the last 2 days have exhorted us as to how these two resolutions differ. They do differ, but the margin of flexibility allowed by the 1990 budget resolution does not really allow us to develop a sweeping blueprint of national priorities. The Democratic budget resolution does target areas that I believe should receive funding priority, such as education, infant mortality prevention, medical research, and nutrition programs. And while there is a difference in how the Democrats and the Republicans have enunciated their priorities, there is not that much to distinguish these two proposals.

What stands out in the Democratic budget is that we have rejected the cuts in entitlement programs put forth by the President in his resolution. These cuts in Medicare, child welfare, and other programs would be devastating to both the integrity of the programs and those they serve. The President's recommendation for cuts of $25.2 billion in Medicare over 5 years would have had a catastrophic effect on a program that had seen dramatic cutbacks over the past 10 years.

I think the committee took the right step in rejecting the President's request to take money from programs such as the maternal and child health block grant and community and migrant health centers—programs that designed to stem the growth in infant mortality—and use those funds to pay for a new infant mortality initiative. Instead, the committee rightly restored funds for these two programs, and used funds from the President's request to supplement them.

I am pleased to see increases in programs that I view as priorities, such as Head Start, maternal and child health care, and education. But shifting these few funds from one domestic program to another does not solve the bigger problems that lie before us.

Mr. Chairman, choosing one budget resolution over another today will not solve these problems. We must stick to our resolve to observe the limits of last year's budget agreement and commit to making solid and lasting deficit reduction during the 1990's. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Gradison amendment and to support the budget resolution put forth by the House Budget Committee.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both the Gradison substitute and the budget resolution reported by the Budget Committee. Both alternatives are based upon last year's budget agreement, which was nothing more than a blueprint for higher taxes and higher Government spending.

I voted against the budget agreement last fall because I didn't believe it would in fact reduce the deficit, and we all know now it hasn't.

In its fiscal year 1991 budget submission, the administration projected total deficit spending over the next 5 years at $62.5 billion. By contrast, the administration's fiscal year 1992 budget submission, which was made after last fall's budget agreement, and which is embodied in the Gradison substitute, projects total deficit spending over the next 5 years at $865.2 billion. The budget agreement is no deficit reduction plan at all. Federal spending is soaring out of control.

If the Budget Committee and Gradison plans are adopted, and Federal spending is left unchecked, there will no doubt be another drive this fall to increase taxes under the guise of deficit reduction. That may well be the death knell for an economy already inrecession. The American people are already feeling the pinch of excessive taxation, and cannot bear any more.

This House had an opportunity to adopt effective deficit reduction plans earlier today when it took up the Dannemeyer and Kasich alternatives. I supported both of those plans. They were defeated.

I urge my colleagues to reject these two approaches so that we can go back and redraft an effective deficit reduction plan. We can do better. The American people deserve better.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the President's budget proposal that recognizes the critical need to preserve our national security while focusing on the most important domestic needs of our country.

Recent events in the Persian Gulf have forced Americans to realize the importance of continuing an effective long-term strategy for our national defense. While I was encouraged by last year's great reforms in Eastern Europe, I cautioned then, as I do now, against drastic reductions in defense spending. Saddam Hussein has reaffirmed our need for a strong and effective defense system to protect the interests and ideals of the United States, and I urge my colleagues to recognize this critical national need.

I am also strongly in support of the President's recognition of the importance of a strong, healthy American economy. The President's budget provides for the establishment of family savings accounts, encouraging all American families to open long-term, tax-free savings accounts. I also continue to support proposals that would lower the cost of capital for American businesses. A cut in the tax rate on capital gains means more capital available to businesses, and that means more jobs available to Americans.

I am especially pleased that the President's budget includes my proposal to permit first-time homebuyers to make penalty-free withdrawals from their individual retirement accounts [IRA's] to help cover the cost of a downpayment. This proposal, which I have introduced as H.R. 352 in this Congress, encourages increased IRA savings while helping to combat the skyrocketing cost of housing and the growing inability for many Americans to own their own piece of the American dream.

Keeping within the strict budget limitations needed to reduce the Federal deficit, the President's budget sets education, affordable housing, and the war on crime and drugs as domestic priorities for 1992. I support these priorities, along with the implementation of a comprehensive national energy strategy that focuses on all aspects of our Nation's energy needs, and our need to save energy.

I urge my colleagues to support President Bush's budget as it is contained in Mr. GRADISON's amendment.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, budget resolutions are more than sets of numbers; budget resolutions are statements of priority. The budget resolution presented by the House Budget Committee not only stays clearly within the budget caps established by last year's reconciliation act, it allows for increased spending for education, training, infrastructure, and energy security. It deserves our support.

The President's budget which is also before us today as the Gradison amendment provides for less than an inflation increase for education, zeroes out funding for important and needed energy conservation programs, and orders draconian reductions in Medicare—even though it was agreed in last year's budget agreement that Medicare would not be the subject of further reductions.

The President's budget this year also provides for an explosion of spending for space, even though the latest studies show the space station may not be feasible for several years, and orders the Ways and Means Committee to reduce capital gains and to increase taxes by $3 billion next year. The priorities in the Gradison budget neither reflect the budget agreement nor the needs of the Nation for repair of our education and physical infrastructure and should be rejected by the House.

The new budget process, with spending caps and a pay-as-you-go process for tax expenditures and entitlement spending is not a perfect process, but it is all we have. The committee has been diligent in balancing the requests for new spending with the requirements for fiscal restraint established by the new process, and I urge an aye vote on passage and a nay vote on the Gradison-Bush budget.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 89, noes 335, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

AYES—89

Archer	Franks (CT)	Hunter
Armey	Gallegly	Hyde
Baker	Gallo	Ireland
Barton	Gekas	Kasich
Bateman	Gilchrest	Klug
Bereuter	Gillmor	Kolbe
Bliley	Gingrich	Lagomarsino
Broomfield	Goss	Lent
Chandler	Gradison	Lewis (CA)
Clinger	Grandy	Lewis (FL)
Coble	Gunderson	Livingston
Coleman (MO)	Hammerschmidt	Lowery (CA)
Coughlin	Hastert	McCollum
Crane	Henry	McCrery
Dickinson	Hobson	McDade
Edwards (OK)	Holloway	McEwen
Fish	Houghton	McMillan (NC)

Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Moorhead
Myers
Oxley
Petri
Porter
Pursell
Quillen
Ramstad
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Ritter
Rogers
Roth
Schulze
Shaw
Shuster
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Sundquist
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weber
Wolf
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—335

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allard
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gray
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hutto
Inhofe
Jacobs
James
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McGrath
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Nussle
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Packard
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Poshard
Price
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Richardson
Riggs
Rinaldo
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yatron
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—7

Dornan (CA)
Dymally
Hughes
Lehman (FL)
Levine (CA)
Udall
Yates

□ 1716

Messrs. SKEEN, SENSENBRENNER, and SWETT changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 121, the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 1992. In particular, I am pleased to see that this legislation rejects President Bush's proposed 5-year, $25 billion Medicare reductions.

Last year, Congress approved a budget that cut Medicare by $43 billion over a 5-year period. These cuts were painful to both Medicare beneficiaries and providers, but were necessary to achieve the deficit reduction targets mandated by law.

Despite these reductions, the President's fiscal year 1992 budget calls for an additional $25 billion reduction for Medicare, over and above those mandated last year. While these proposed cuts would come mostly from providers, their impact upon our elderly population would be severe.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a district with a high proportion of elderly individuals, many of whom rely on Medicare to meet the rising costs of health care. Many of the hospitals in my district rely on Medicare reimbursements to provide these individuals with quality health care services. Like many urban hospitals across the Nation, these hospitals would be devastated by further reductions in these payments.

Nevertheless, the President has proposed reducing reimbursements to hospitals by an additional $15.9 billion over the next 5 years. The President claims that these cuts are designed to reduce waste in the Medicare hospital reimbursement system, and would not directly affect beneficiaries. But in the last 2 years, 500 of our Nation's hospitals have shut down, in part because of reduced reimbursements. The senior citizens in my district simply cannot afford to see any of the few hospitals in their community close their doors.

Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, the Budget Committee has drafted a budget resolution that rejects the President's Medicare cuts and instead focuses on improving the quality of Medicare services to the elderly. House Concurrent Resolution 121 assumes full funding for Medicare, as well as $177 million in additional funding to meet Medicare administrative expenses. This increase will allow faster and more accurate payment of Medicare claims, thereby reducing Medicare program costs in the long run.

Mr. Chairman, we should not unfairly and disproportionately single out older Americans for enormous domestic spending cuts. I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 121 because it reduces the deficit without jeopardizing the benefits and services that our Nation's 35 million Medicare beneficiaries rely on the most.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, I stated my strong concern that the administration's budget for fiscal year 1992 leaves our country unprepared for the future. Our quest for budget discipline has left us with a zero sum game where for someone to win, others must lose. We are playing this game at a time when our economy remains in recession and the world is experiencing great turmoil, from the Middle East to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

My concerns over our misplaced priorities has only grown as the full impact of the administration's budget, if enacted becomes more evident. With a majority of states facing budget deficits which must erased through program cuts or tax increases, the administration's budget would increase these States' fiscal woes by, for example, reducing funding for community development block grants and eliminating mass transit operating assistance for most large metropolitan areas.

Last week, the House Budget Committee reported an alternative to the administration's budget which far better meets the real needs of the American people. The House budget resolution stays within the spending caps enacted last year for discretionary spending and reaffirms the pay as you go principle for all new entitlement programs. At the same time, this resolution focuses limited resources on programs that affect most directly the quality of life for millions of Americans.

America's children definitely emerge as winners under the House budget resolution. This resolution calls for an increase of $2 billion over current levels—an increase three times greater than the administration's—for elementary and secondary education, Pell grants, and other basic educational programs.

We cannot compete in the future if our children are not prepared for the future programs like Head Start prepare children to succeed in school, and deserve our support. While the administration would wait 50 years before fully funding the Head Start Program, the House budget would achieve this goal by the end of the decade.

America's families and working men and women clearly benefit from the House priorities for the Federal budget. We all want to live safely in our homes and in our communities, and the House budget addresses this concern by increasing anticrime funding above the administration's request in a number of areas, including support for the FBI and the U.S. criminal justice system. The House budget rejects the administration's attempt to eliminate access to Pell grants and child nutrition programs for many middle-class families. The House budget protects job training benefits for workers who lose their job due to unfair foreign competition.

America's cities and States are dealt with more fairly. The House budget calls for new investments in highways, airports, and mass transit—with a $1 billion increase for highway obligations, a $1 billion increase for aviation and $281 million for mass transit. The House budget rejects the adminstration's attempt to cut community development block grants by $288 million and instead increases funding for this program by $100 million.

In addition, communities combating the growth of illegal drug activity will benefit from an increase of $1.3 billion in Federal antidrug spending, with increases for both law enforcement and drug treatment at levels above those included in the administration's budget request.

The House budget protects our Nation's senior citizens from being among the biggest losers under the administration's budget plan. The House budget rejects the administration's proposal to cut Medicare by $25 billion over the next 5 years, and contains increased funding for Social Security and Medicare administration to ensure that seniors receive the benefits they deserve.

There are simply limits to the levels of cuts that programs like Medicare can absorb. Last year's Budget Reconciliation Act provides for $42.5 billion in Medicare cuts over 5 years, but this is not enough for the administration. The administration shows its lack of concern over protecting the health of seniors by requesting an additional $25 billion in Medicare cuts.

Compared to the administration budget, the House budget plan makes the American people the overall big winners. Still, in today's zero sum game, there are still losers. Among the losers under both the administration budget and unfortunately the House budget resolution are those Americans whose needs will likely go unmet because national leaders seem afraid to confront the need for new revenues.

Among those losers in the budget are the approximately 35 million Americans who have no health insurance. The House budget points to the need but doesn't follow through by providing hope for millions of Americans who are afraid they can't afford to be ill. Neither the administration nor the House budget offers much hope for these Americans.

The House budget notes that the current recession will likely create a need for extended unemployment benefits. In the current economic climate, it is unfortunate but true that an unemployed worker will often exhaust his or her benefits before ever finding a new job. Still, American workers risk losing in both the job market and in the Federal budget process because neither the administration nor House budget provides a specific plan to provide extended benefits.

The House budget notes the possibility of acting to meet these needs and others under the pay as you go principle, but does not endorse any specific action toward that end. That decision is left for each Member to consider.

I support the principle of pay as you go. Under the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, pay as you go requires that new entitlements be funded either through budget cuts or new revenues. The administration has shown its interest in continuing to cut programs like Medicare which have already suffered serious cuts.

If the administration can revisit programs like Medicare for additional cuts, I believe Congress should be willing to revisit the question of additional revenues. There are a number of revenue options the House should consider to address the needs of the uninsured, the unemployed and other Americans who find themselves losers in the current budget debate.

Among these options that should be considered is a surtax on incomes above $1 million. During last year's debate over budget reconciliation, the Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that a 10 percent surtax on incomes above $1 million would raise $7.6 billion over 5 years.

Another revenue raising option with a large revenue potential is the value added tax [VAT]. Even a VAT which exempted food, housing, and medical care would generate $310 billion over the next 4 fiscal years, according to the Congressional Budget Office. CBO has estimated that adding a 38 percent bracket would provide $101 billion worth of deficit reduction over 5 years while levying a 5 percent surtax would shrink the deficit by $129 billion. Various energy taxes could raise substantial amounts of new revenue while also encouraging conservation and a decrease in foreign oil imports.

These and other revenue sources deserve serious debate in the House. While that debate will unfortunately not take place in the context of action on the House Budget Resolution, we should remember that the needs of our country will not be met until we confront our fears over the issue of new revenues. As long as we give into the urge to sidestep this issue, budget debates will continue to leave our Nation unprepared to face the future.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, by now, I hope my colleagues are familiar with the sting that Americans feel from the effects of the recession.

Housing starts are down. Unemployment is up to 6.8 percent and so are the claims for unemployment insurance. Industrial production has also fallen. Businesses are closing and credit is tightening.

These economic indicators bode ill for the country when one takes into account the Nation's chronic problems, like a failing education system, a poor national infrastructure and an increasingly expensive health care system. In short, the Federal Government's neglect in the 1980s of these domestic problems has come back to haunt us.

My constituents are asking what I and the rest of Congress are doing to ease the pain experienced by families across the country.

Today, by voting on a House budget resolution, we begin to establish what the Federal Government's priorities should be in the midst of a recession.

In general, I support the priorities set forth in the Democratic budget resolution.

Democrats are correct to oppose the $25 billion in additional cuts to Medicare that President Bush requested. Democrats are right to increase education spending above the rate of inflation and to support the Trade Adjustment Act, particularly at a time when workers face stiff overseas competition.

But I have reservations too.

In a strange twist of what President Nixon once proclaimed—"We are all Keynesians now"—Congress and the President are now saying, "We are only Keynesians in time of economic growth." In essence, that attitude abandons, even adulterates, Keynesian economic principles. Instead of increasing Federal spending during times of recessions, Congress and the President are bending over backwards to cut Federal spending.

In an economic recession, Federal spending should be used to spur further economic growth and to keep money in the pockets of consumers to maintain demand in the economy.

What's worse, the President wants not only to cut spending but to shift the financial burden of Federal programs to local and State government. Called the "States-as-lab" experiment, it is particularly detrimental to many local governments, whose budgets are already being stretched beyond their limits. This proposal is incredulous given the following: Two-thirds of the 50 States have revenue shortfalls, and dozens of cities, like New York, Philadelphia, and Hartford, are running huge budget deficits.

For instance in New York City, the government is running a record $1 billion budget deficit and, with further Federal cutbacks, it struggles to provide the basic services to New Yorkers, much less pay for extra financial burdens. What experiments does President Bush expect from New York City?

What's more, I suspect President Bush's "New Federalism" is a partisan attempt to embarrass Democratic legislatures and mayors across the country. By withdrawing Federal support for Federal programs, the President has put the burden on these elected officials, who are largely from urban Democratic areas, to pay more for Federal programs as well as pay for much-needed local services, like roads, fire safety, police protection, garbage collection and education.

I also am disappointed that Congress has not tried to alter the budget agreement that forbids the transfer of savings from defense spending to domestic programs. This effectively disposes of any so-called peace dividend, which could help cities and States cope with their budget problems, in spite of the fact that over $100 billion of the defense budget is intended to counter a now, non-existent Warsaw pact.

This aspect of the agreement is even more egregious and insensitive during a recession. No wonder the American people are becoming

disillusioned with government. We hesitate little to committing hundreds of billions of dollars for the S&L bailout and for the war in the Persian Gulf, but we balk at spending money to meet the desperate needs of the American people.

I raise these concerns in hopes that the Congress can act quickly to ease the pain of the recession and make the Federal Government more responsive to the immediate needs of Americans.

I will support the Democratic budget resolution, but I have an eerie feeling that this is the way it was in 1931 and 1932 under Herbert Hoover.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, for 8 years, the Congressional Black Caucus has brought before this body an alternative view of the fiscal priorities of this Nation, in most recent years in the form of the CBC quality of life budget. Perhaps the most extraordinary testimony to the value of this effort has come in the hundreds of inquiries that we have received regarding our position on the fiscal year 1992 budget resolution and many colleagues in the House and constituents around the country looking to support a CBC alternative.

Mr. Chairman, the members of this caucus believe that America has the capacity to provide for our national security, and to reduce the Federal deficit while supporting crucial social programs. In our view it is wholly possible to achieve these objectives without destroying the fabric of the Federal budget process.

We believe that any budget resolution must begin with an unyielding commitment to the preservation and enhancement of the human and physical resources of this Nation, particularly our children. We must advance priorities for spending which will expand available health care; increase resources for student aid and extend teacher training from preschool to professional. We must create an adequate supply of affordable housing and safe and accessible transportation. We must continue to expand our job training programs with skills upgrading initiatives and retaining incentives to increase workforce diversity and competitiveness. The Congressional Black Caucus believes that such a commitment will meet the moral test of Government and builds a fiscal foundation which would support those most in need of our help.

We have had to make very difficult decisions. Because of the limitations posed by the 5-year budget package in relation to spending caps and walls which restrict the transferral of savings between categories, we have sought to reach agreements with the House Budget Committee to pursue broad goals and increases over baseline for programs consistent with the historic positions taken by the caucus in previous alternative budgets. Because of the truncated nature of the present budget process, and the abbreviated timetable associated with these deliberations, we have elected to offer a statement of spending priorities to the House Budget Committee. By this action, we are placing a mandate before the Congress which demands that we mend the holes in the safety net for the poor, the elderly, the young, the physically disadvantaged and the jobless.

The House Budget Committee has embarked upon a course which makes "fairness" and "economic investment in the future of this Nation" the focal points of our fiscal agenda. There is much to be done. For those who assume our labors have ended, be on notice that the members of the Congressional Black Caucus have redefined their venue of battle. We shall engage in these deliberations over the long term, in every committee of jurisdiction. We ask only that you join in fulfilling our responsibilities to these goals by carrying forward our budgetary commitments through the appropriations process. The only ceilings and walls which will exist for those we serve will be created by our capacity to meet the needs of the American people through compassion.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, this is the fiscal year in which the Federal budget was supposed to be balanced under the initial Gramm-Rudman Act. Instead, what we have is a record-setting $378 billion deficit, if you inlcude the so-called off-budget items.

Last October, there was another agreement reached that was supposed to balance the budget by 1995. By December, it was clear to the people who had reached the agreement that their projected date was unrealistic.

I say we should get serious about balancing the Federal buget, and the way we do that is by making cuts that hurt a little bit.

I am voting for some reductions that I don't like, but I think we all have to share a little pain if we are to bring our spending in line with our revenues. And it isn't that unreasonable to accomplish. All we have to do is slow down the growth of spending.

I believe that the arguments between the two sides on the similarities between the administration budget bill and the Democrat's budget bill are moot. Neither side should be proud that their package looks like the other's. Both provide for a $290 billion deficit. We are already spending 20 cents of every Federal dollar to pay the interest on the national debt. There is no way that we are going to be able to dig ourselves out of this situation if we let that debt continue to grow and allow interest payments to continue to grow.

We need a balanced budget constitutional amendment; we need a line item veto; and we need to reform the congressional budgeting process; but what we need more than anything is for Members of Congress to say no to unnecessary spending, and the time to begin is now.

Ms. HORN. Mr. Chairman, we are addressing a topic that is part of every decision that we make here in Congress—the Federal budget.

Last year's budget agreement put Congress and the administration in a tough—yet responsible—spot with regard to spending policies. When a proposal is presented for a much-needed energy policy, we must first ask "How much will it cost?" When a proposal is presented for programs to fulfill basic needs for food, housing and health care for American families and the elderly, we must first ask "How much will it cost?" The costs, if we accept the proposal, must be offset by revenues or cuts in other programs. As the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. PANETTA, emphasized in his comments, these restrictions require us to make some tough spending choices.

In making these choices, the House Budget Committee worked with themes of fiscal discipline, fairness in spending, and investments in the future for families and the economy. These are important themes. The chairman should be commended for emphasizing a working families budget.

I think, more and more, we are finding ourselves at a crossroads, Mr. Chairman. President Bush talks about the need for a new world order. I clearly agree with the President that we must build a new international cooperation through competitiveness, trade, and diplomatic relations. We must, at the same time, strengthen our domestic competitiveness through education, worker training, infrastructure, and research and development. I hope that the Congress will work closely with the administration, in a bipartisan manner, to pursue these objectives in a fair and open process.

Mr. Chairman, the term "working family" in itself is a crossroads for this society. It is not beyond any of our memories to reincarnate a time when the family did not have to work two jobs to keep food on the table, a roof over their heads, and adequate health care for their children. My district is comprised of many such families. It is made up of communities that spread outward as population shifted. Families moved to these communities so they could afford a little bigger home, with a little more room for their children.

Good jobs and good education are primary concerns for these families. I strongly support the committee's focus on education that includes a shift of $2 billion to learning programs. The resolution provides direction in elementary, secondary, and higher education through increases in chapter 1 Compensatory Education Programs—which emphasize math and science—such as Head Start, and adult and vocational programs. Both programs are important to prepare workers for the technology-based jobs that are a growing part of the St. Louis economy.

We must recognize that the most vital component of a successful company is the quality of its work force. If our companies are expected to compete, and essentially regain our edge in high technology and biotechnology internationally, we must prepare our students and our workers as professionals and technicians in those areas. We must get our educators and businesses together.

I have met a number of times with Monsanto Corp. which is headquartered in my district, and these meetings emphasized the need for scientists and engineers to fill jobs. Monsanto works closely with schools in St. Louis on science fairs, scholarships, and research grants. These efforts help, but they are not enough.

The budget resolution matches the President's request for the National Science Foundation for basic research in universities, and exceeds the request for funding the Commerce Department's National Institute for Standards and Technology [NIST] and Advanced Technology Program. Basic research in manufacturing technology and technology transfer will be an important part of our ability to compete with Japan and Germany in the international high-technology market. This

commitment will help prepare our businesses for these challenges.

An additional $100 million for economic conversion is included in the resolution. The St. Louis Economic Council, comprised of government, industry, and community leaders, was organized last summer when Chrysler threatened to close one of two plants in Fenton—just outside my district. The council was again overwhelmed with more than 9,000 layoffs—since last June—by McDonnell Douglas because of work force shrinkage and then the A–12 contract cancellation. Economic conversion funds are necessary to retrain workers and provide community assistance as unemployment continues to rise.

Mr. Chairman, the resolution puts a priority on programs to combat the declining order of our domestic environment. The United States continues to rank 19th among industrialized nations in infant mortality. My own State of Missouri ranks 30th in the United States, which means that for every 1,000 babies born in Missouri in 1988, 10.1 died as infants. Twelve million American children live in households with incomes below the poverty line—268,000 of these children live in Missouri. More than 488,000 babies are born to teenagers annually. Of all the babies born in Missouri during 1988, 13.7 percent—10,456 babies—were born to teen mothers. Twenty-four percent of all mothers received no early prenatal care. These are astounding numbers for a country as wealthy as ours.

Mr. Chairman, our children deserve the chance to live and grow in a healthy family through investments in maternal and child health, WIC, Head Start, and veterans programs. It seeks a hopeful family through investments in education, child care, job training, and fairness for all Americans in nutrition and energy assistance programs.

Finally, I want to recognize that the resolution also supports investment in the environment, through sound programs for energy conservation, economic development, and infrastructure included in the committee budget. It rejects the administration's proposal to reduced spending for energy conservation, infrastructure, and mass transit. It accepts the administration's proposal to fund airport improvement projects through the aviation trust fund.

Businesses cannot be expected to operate efficiently without sound infrastructure. Both mass transit and airport improvement programs are vital to the economy in the St. Louis area. Last month I attended the groundbreaking for a new Metro-Link system for the metropolitan region. This system will ease traffic congestion and conserve energy consumption significantly. It will get workers to their jobs wisely. Decreases in infrastructure programs, proposed by the President, would negatively impact the growth potential of St. Louis. I am pleased the resolution rejects those cuts.

I urge my colleagues to consider the needs and future of the entire community as we work to balance expenditures with cuts required to meet them. Making cuts is not easy, but if we consider the burdens our Federal debt places on our children, they make sense for the future.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 121 as reported by the House Budget Committee.

Despite the renowned budget summit agreement, the choices we make here today are real and they are tough. They are reflective of differences in priorities between the Congress and the administration, and they are reflective of the differences that cross the vast interests of the membership of the House. This budget resolution, and the decisions we must make as a part of considering it, are not easy—and they were not meant to be.

As we are all so painfully aware, the budget summit agreement has locked in many of the parameters of the national budget and eliminated significant discretion in realigning our overall priorities for the next 2 fiscal years. We are not allowed to choose between guns and butter, but instead must pit domestic program against domestic program. As the debate has shown, this is a difficult process.

We have heard some Member's views during this debate. They have attempted to suggest little differences between the budget approved by the House Budget Committee and the budget presented by the President in February. I disagree with that assessment.

Try and sell that view of no difference to the people who would be cut from the Medicare Program or the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program or the Guaranteed Student Loan Program as a result of the Bush budget cuts and reductions of domestic programs. Contrast that to the product of the House Budget Committee: More children will be served by an additional increase of $127 million in our WIC budget, and more folks will be served by the real and currently functioning empowerment program of the community services block grant [CSBG] that is being rescued from the Bush budget doldrums, and more new kids will be provided a Head Start with an additional $250 million over the President's budget, and countless others, from the homeless, to people who need and use mass transit, who will have better lives as a result of the House budget resolution.

I would say to my colleagues who paint everything cloudy gray: You are $13 billion in reprioritization of the President's funding proposal incorrect.

Frankly, I do share the concerns of many of my colleagues regarding the limitations of the budget summit agreement in terms of really addressing domestic priorities. Yet, I also think that Chairman PANETTA and his committee have done a good job, despite the limited flexibility, at providing a clear blueprint for our spending in fiscal year 1992 and the following 4 years that better reflects domestic needs.

We must now take this blueprint and apply more than a dose of the rhetoric of Desert Storm to the domestic front. This budget, replete with the corrections made here, barely begins to allow us to put money where our promises to people are. Yes, defense spending is within the caps set by the agreement. But the resolution provides $290.8 billion in budget authority for defense spending in fiscal year 1992. Yes, international spending is within its cap. And the resolution provides $21.9 billion in international spending in fiscal year 1992. I remain unconvinced that we are appropriately weighing our true national security priorities with the compromise parameters of October 1990. I am skeptical that this budget process within which we work serves the American people fairly and equitably.

The bottom line of this budget resolution, and the programs that would be funded by it, is that it move the process forward on the basis of compromise with the October 1990 agreement, therefore promoting our national security through strengthening its people, our greatest resource, and through its support of our vital economic strengths. The resolution rejects the politically deep, and in many cases fatal, cuts to programs that serve the impoverished elderly, hungry children, and the working poor. I would add, those proposed cuts were a continuation of the Republican theme of the 1990's. The resolution would increase funding for housing programs, drug treatment programs, environmental cleanup programs, and education and nutrition programs. It will help reduce our reliance on foreign energy supplies, enhance our crumbling infrastructure, and promote equity in applying some of the necessary cuts we must make in Federal spending.

Mr. Chairman, this is the budget today that should achieve consensus agreement and should be supported. I thank Chairman PANETTA for his leadership and his committee for doing their job by bringing this forward to the House. I ask my colleagues to vote "aye."

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, this week the House began debating the budget resolution for fiscal year 1992. Last year's budget agreement set rigid parameters for this year's discussion. It is my understanding that all the proposed budget alternatives have met the required spending caps established by last year's agreement. It appears that there is little difference between the Democratic proposal and the President's budget and all we have to do now is decide on funding levels for some domestic spending accounts and decide if this body has the courage to place real restraints on spending for the next 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the substitute amendments offered by Congressmen DANNEMEYER and KASICH. In my judgment, reducing the deficit should be a top priority for the Congress. The substitute amendments offered by Congressmen DANNEMEYER and KASICH, while allowing for increases each year, would have made real progress in reducing the deficit. The Dannemeyer substitute amendment would have saved $45.8 billion in fiscal year 1992 alone. Over the course of 5 years it would have saved $472.2 billion. Congressman KASICH's substitute estimated savings at $16.5 billion over the Democrat's proposal and $172.2 billion over 5 years.

By holding annual increases to the rate of inflation, Congressman KASICH's proposal allows for modest increases in domestic discretionary spending which will provide real restraint and savings in Federal spending through fiscal year 1995. Congressman KASICH's proposal incorporates means-testing recommendations for certain high-income individuals receiving medicare and farm subsidies which I feel is necessary. As half the Federal budget is spent on entitlements, reduction in the deficit can only go so far without examining and reducing this area of the budget. The

Kasich substitute will also eliminate $500 million from international spending. The cuts will not be made from an individual country's account, but will be found in other areas.

The substitute amendments offered by Congressmen DANNEMEYER and KASICH were not passed today. Mr. Chairman, I will now support the President's budget which is being offered by Congressman GRADISON. I believe it contains the blueprint for a 5-year period growth and prosperity, which the Democrat's budget proposal does not. For a budget with a growth priority, the Democratic proposal is missing a plan of action. The President proposes a plan of action. This year there are several expiring tax incentives. While the President is supporting their extension, the Democrat's budget does not mention their existence. The President's growth proposals; such as capital gains, enterprise zone, family savings accounts, and penalty-free withdrawals from IRA's for first time home buyers, are quickly rejected by the Democrat's proposal.

Transportation infrastructure does well under the Gradison substitute. The Highway Trust Fund will receive an increase in funds. Over the next 5 years, the budgets for highway construction and rehabilitation, and mass-transit funds will be enlarged. The President has also committed in his proposal to several railroad, airport, and highway demonstration projects.

The media has recently been printing a number of articles indicating that global warming may be occurring faster than previously thought. Under the President's proposal, the Global Change Research Program is scheduled to receive a 34-percent increase over 1991 appropriations. This program is vital to further understanding the effects of global warming and deforestation to our planet.

Finally, the Gradison substitute will achieve $6.3 billion in savings in fiscal year 1992 alone through redirecting entitlement resources to where they are most needed. Again, in my judgment, without looking for savings in entitlement programs, the budget will not achieve real reduction unless entitlement resources are redirected.

Mr. Chairman, I will cast my vote for the Gradison substitute amendment which will promote a healthy, growing economy and make real progress toward deficit reduction.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, as we discuss the budget resolution, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Budget Committee and its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], for their commitment to the expansion of the Job Corps Program. The Job Corps is a program that provides many disadvantaged youth a glimmer of hope of a better future. By providing residential education, training, and job replacement for disadvantaged youth between the ages of 16 and 21, these youth receive comprehensive education and training services which offers them an alternative to the perils of the drug related crime and gang violence.

I would like to reiterate my commitment and that of the Congressional Black Caucus to the expansion of the Job Corps Program, and specifically in support of the 50–50 plan. This plan will result in the opening of 50 additional centers around the Nation, each offering 400 yearly training slots, in areas of need to serve 50 percent more of the youth.

The Job Corps 50–50 plan once authorized will seek to open 50 more centers while at the same time improving existing services. At the completion of the 10-year plan, it is estimated that more than 70 percent of the Nation's most disadvantaged youth will be educated and trained by Job Corps.

The costs of expanding this worthy program are minimal when we consider that the cost of building of a single prison is at $17,000 per bed to incarcerate those at-risk youth.

Mr. Speaker, the budget resolution complicated the defense of specific line item programs. However, the Congressional Black Caucus will lend its full support to the 50–50 plan.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 121, the fiscal year 1992 budget resolution. I commend the chairman of the Budget Committee, Congressman, LEON PANETTA, for his efforts on the budget, which addresses many of the critical needs of this Nation.

House Concurrent Resolution 121 rejects the misguided priorities contained in the President's budget by instead targeting the Nation's resources towards the needs of working families for programs that will contribute to the long-term economic strength of our Nation. It also protects and expands proven programs which support the disadvantaged and helps to ensure that all American children have enough to eat, a roof over their heads, access to health care, and the opportunity to learn.

Clearly, producing this year's budget resolution was not an easy task. While the parameters of this budget were established by last year's summit agreement, the committee did a commendable job of meeting the challenges of a strict spending ceiling with extremely limited resources. It is not a painless budget, but it is fair and fiscally responsible given the committee's constraints, and unlike the President's budget, it doesn't rely on "less is more" rhetoric without providing the funding to back up its priorities.

For example, in the area of health care, the budget rejects the President's inadequate plan to underfund a number of vital health programs, including infant mortality, community and migrant health centers, and the maternal and child health care block grant. The budget also targets AIDS-related programs for increased funding, to address one of the Nation's most important health concerns and one of our greatest domestic challenges. Consequently, House Concurrent Resolution 121 provides a $450 million increase for AIDS-related programs, including a $188 million increase in the Public Health Service [PHS] budget for AIDS, which is $123 million above the President's request. These health care programs are vital to my district and in a time of severe fiscal austerity, I applaud the committee for its exemplary actions with regard to funding for AIDS and other health care programs.

In the area of housing, the budget provides an increase of $2.014 billion for HUD low-income housing and McKinney Act homeless programs. This much-needed funding increase will allow for new initiatives, including funding for critical AIDS-related housing.

The budget also identifies education as a key priority. However, unlike our "Education President," this budget resolution provides the funding to back up the rhetoric—$2 billion, or 9 percent over the current funding level, is included for elementary, secondary, and higher education, which is triple that of the President's request. It also rejects the administration's attempt to exclude a number of working families from the Pell Grant Program. House Concurrent Resolution 121 also calls for a $350 million increase for Head Start, which would result in all Head Start eligible children being served by the year 2000, unlike the administration's budget, whereby full funding would take 50 years.

House Concurrent Resolution 121 also addresses critical nutritional needs by increasing funding for the special feeding program for women, infants, and children [WIC] by $350 million, representing the first installment toward full funding of this important program.

Finally, House Concurrent Resolution 121 contains $800 million above the current level to enhance the energy security of the United States through energy conservation research and development, solar and alternative fuel research and development, energy conservation loans, and other programs. Although energy-related economic concerns helped compel us to fight in the Persian Gulf, the President's budget request in this area was inadequate and shortsighted. In contrast, this budget realistically confronts our Nation's tremendous energy needs.

Mr. Chairman, again I commend my colleagues serving on the Budget Committee for their efforts on this budget and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting their effort.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, today the congressional budget resolution is before the House. Now that the budget process has been reformed by placing caps on spending categories, it will focus our attention on what is deserving of Federal funding. When compared to the President's budget proposal, this budget blueprint for fiscal year 1992 more accurately reflects the Nation's priorities.

This resolution continues the budget policy of investment in America's future: our families, our workers, and our competitiveness in the global economy.

Make no mistake, the budget process reforms enacted last year force Congress and the administration to work within the spending limits. If the lid is blown off a spending cap, across-the-board cuts will be ordered for the over-budgeted category until it is scaled back to its legal limit.

As a result, we need to make the most out of every dollar in a fair, responsible manner. For these reasons, House Concurrent Resolution 121 rejects the President's $25 billion Medicare cut proposal, as well as his proposed cuts for veterans and farmers, child nutrition, and energy assistance for low-income families. It also rejects the President's misguided capital gains tax break, which primarily benefits upper-income individuals while offering little or nothing to many families.

Mr. Chairman, not enough can be said about the vital importance of education and worker training. It has a direct impact on the

country's economic competitiveness and an individual's standard of living. Especially disturbing to me is the fact that elementary, secondary, and higher education all appear on the President's top 10 list for budget cuts, despite his pledge to be the education President.

The budget resolution shifts needed funds to education programs. It provides triple the amount of resources recommended by the President. It also supports the Head Start Program by adding 93,000 children to its enrollment.

Tough decisions lie ahead, but they need to be made. The budget resolution recognizes this reality and does the right thing by recommending reduced funding for some Federal programs and elimination of other nonpriority ones to increase efficiency.

Where should our funding priorities be? Clearly, we must respond to community development needs during this economic downturn. House Concurrent Resolution 121 calls for significant increases above the President's request for housing assistance and community development, nutrition for women, infants, and children, and health programs.

Veterans' health programs should also receive serious attention in our budget. Sufficient funding is essential to meet the needs of our newest veterans now returning from service in the Persian Gulf. Special attention must be given to health care programs for veterans.

As for Medicare, last year's Budget Reconciliation Act included nearly $44 billion in Medicare cuts over the next 5 years. Additional cuts, as proposed by the administration, would directly violate this hard-won compromise. The administration should look for reductions in other areas before asking for more Medicare cuts.

Economic growth depends on a strong infrastructure to help commerce flow freely and to enhance our quality of life. House Concurrent Resolution 121 invests in roads, transit, aviation, waste water treatment, and other aspects of our infrastructure which have been taken for granted for too long.

However, more attention needs to be given to environmental protection. The funding increases I have outlined do not apply to environmental programs. It is important that more resources, perhaps from the huge Bush proposal for a space station, be devoted to cleaning our air and water, so that the Earth continues to be a more desirable place to live than outer space.

This budget resolution promotes growth with fairness for working families. It is a step in the right direction to rebuild America's strength for the 21st century, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the House Concurrent Resolution 121, the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 1992. In particular, I am pleased to see that this legislation, as amended by Congressman FORD, substantially increases our investment in education and training programs.

Mr. Chairman, recent studies have shown that U.S. elementary and secondary school students perform poorly in areas of great importance for competitive skills. Compared with students in other industrialized countries, ours finished last or near-last in many comparisons of math and science skills and knowledge. Working Americans do not have the confidence they once did that our educational system will prepare their children to be competitive in the world economy.

Unfortunately, President Bush's proposed education budget does not go far enough to better prepare our children for school and motivate them to take advantage of educational opportunities. Under his proposal, education programs would be increased by only 3 percent, which represent a reduction after accounting for inflation. Proven, cost-effective compensatory programs like Head Start and Chapter 1 would still only serve half of all eligible children under the Bush budget.

Furthermore, the President's spending proposals for higher education programs would have a devastating impact on middle-income families. Under his proposal, only low-income individuals would be eligible to receive Pell Grants. If implemented, about 14,500 Pennsylvanians would lose their Pell Grants in 1992–93. As a result, middle-income families would have to borrow more than they can afford if they want to send their children to college.

Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, House Concurrent Resolution 121 provides a $2 billion, or 9 percent, increase for education programs—an amount three times higher than the increase proposed by the President. This includes substantial increases for compensatory education, math and science education, vocational and adult education, and student aid. House Concurrent Resolution 121 also quadruples the President's request for Head Start to $350 million, which will increase by 72,000 the number of children served by the program.

Furthermore, the Ford amendment provides an additional $400 million increase for Head Start, Chapter 1, vocational education, and student financial aid. This amendment, which I supported, further promotes cost-effective investment in proven education programs.

Mr. Chairman, if our Nation is to be competitive in the next century, we must have a productive and well-educated work force. I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 121 to equip the next generation of working Americans with the skills they require to prepare for our future challenges.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the House budget resolution. Given the tight fiscal situation we face, this is a time when priorities are more illustrative than dollars, and I am proud to say that in that respect, the Budget Committee resolution before us is far more consistent with the priorities of my Michigan constituents than the administration's budget. It is far more sensitive to the needs and concerns of middle-income taxpayers and of working families.

Today, our Nation is faced by a series of domestic crises which dwarf the threat of any external military power. We are losing our lead in the global economic race. Our crumbling infrastructure and failing educational system are unable to meet the needs of our economy. The cost of health care has skyrocketed, and today 40 million Americans cannot afford health insurance. And in most prosperous Nation in the world, one out of five children lives in poverty.

Despite the President's rhetorical commitment, his education budget does not even keep pace with inflation, and student financial aid would be cut so drastically that 200,000–400,000 middle-income students would no longer be able to receive aid. The enormously successful Head Start Program would not be able to provide services to all eligible children until 2040. The collapse of our transportation network notwithstanding, the Bush budget would shift the responsibility for rebuilding our roads and highways to the States, which are already having trouble making ends meet, and would dramatically reduce mass transit funding. Likewise, on the healthcare front, the Bush budget is remarkably insensitive. In spite of the huge Medicare cuts in last year's budget, the President has requested an additional $25 billion in cuts over the next 5 years. And, in the wake of the gulf war, which demonstrated the dangerous vulnerability of our energy dependence, the President proposes a $242 million cut in energy programs, and target conservation to receive only 8 percent of all energy R&D funds. Improvements in efficiency would be the quickest, cheapest, and most environmentally benign method of displacing our dependence on petroleum. Yet, the level of support for conservation programs would remain roughly 65 percent under the level of funding such programs received in 1979. Clearly, the Bush budget is out of sync with America's needs, and with the priorities of the American people.

In my view, the Budget Committee resolution would establish a new path for our Nation, a path that points to a more prosperous, secure future for America.

First, children and families are given the highest priority. They will receive much-needed relief in the form of a $2 billion, or 9 percent, increase in funding for elementary, secondary and higher education. Head Start, WIC, infant mortality and childhood immunization programs, and the war on drugs, will all receive substantial increases over the President's request. The committee proposes a $350 million increase over 1991 in the Head Start Program, 3½ times that of the President and enough to serve an additional 72,000 children, 50,000 more than the President. And the special funding program for pregnant women, infants, and children, WIC, is targeted for full funding by 1996, with a $350 million increase now, nearly triple that of the President. Equally important, the committee budget provides for 350,000 more child immunizations than last year, 70,000 more than the President's budget.

Second, our economic foundation will be bolstered by increased funding for basic R&D, for job training programs, for highway and mass transit programs, and for energy programs designed to reduce our Nation's dangerous dependence on foreign aid.

Third, by eliminating the $25 billion in Medicare cuts and the $3.5 billion in cuts in veterans health care programs requested in the Bush budget, Congress will reaffirm its commitment to our most vulnerable Americans. A program of particular importance to Michigan, Low Income Home Energy Assistance, would also be spared a 37-percent cut proposed in the administration budget, and instead would receive a modest increase.

Finally, it is important to note that in spite of the increases in these important programs,

this resolution strictly conforms to the parameters of last year's budget agreement. This means that to meet the highest priority needs, it has been necessary to freeze or reduce spending in many important areas. Some programs have been frozen, others have been funded at levels lower than the President has requested. For example, where the President called for a 13-percent increase in space programs, the Budget Committee has asked for a far more modest increase. Also, the President's request for a 120-percent increase in funding for the superconducting super collider has been scaled back. A variety of other domestic programs would, out of necessity, also face a budgetary freeze, or slight reductions. Some programs even face outright elimination. My colleagues, there is no question that this budget does not address all of the problems we face here at home. But in these tight budgetary times, the issue here is balance. Priorities must be reordered. And that means the need to accept some painful tradeoffs. This budget charts a new and more hopeful course for our Nation, a course that will begin the task of rebuilding America.

I urge support of the House Report Committee resolution.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 121, the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 1992. I congratulate Chairman PANETTA and all of the members of the Budget Committee for their work in bringing this resolution to the floor.

I voted for the final budget agreement last year because it made the best of a bad situation. The first alternatives we were presented with were not acceptable, for my district or the country, and I had no trouble voting against them. But in the end we agreed on a budget that was relatively fair, balanced, and made progress on the deficit.

That alone would not bind me to this resolution if I thought it was not a good one, but because it observes the spending caps set in the 5-year agreement by continuing the pay-as-you-go policy, and invests in the domestic priorities of our Nation, I support it.

When I look at this document I see progress on the single most important issue in Congress, the one which impacts all of the other initiatives we consider, and that is the budget deficit. It confirms the wisdom of the budget agreement from last year. And I am pleased to see the first product of that venture roll off the assembly line in such good working order.

But this is not simply a document containing the formulas to reach specific mathematical targets in various functions known only to the people who study Federal budgets. No, this document must also be judged for its comfort, and the committee has rightly exercised its option to make adjustments in the administration's budget and redirect our spending priorities, again, I empahsize, within the spending limits.

In my district there is a crying need for education, health care, and services for low income families and single parents. This is truly a land of plenty, but there is a tremendous underclass in this country unable to fully participate in the American dream.

There is no reason why people should have to do without health care. In a Nation of promise and opportunity there is no reason why hunger should keep a child from learning or making the most of his or her abilities. But it happens, and people in my district are engulfed by the poverty and despair it produces. In this resolution we make a commitment to help them.

This resolution proposes full funding in the near future for two of the most successful Federal programs in history, WIC and Head Start. This is a strong one-two punch on the insidious danger of children who are malnourished or without proper supervision and instruction. If we are going to invest in our human capital in proven, effective ways, then we can't go wrong with these two programs. The committee is wise to shift the administration's priorities in this area to more fully meet the tremendous need in America's communities. I also support the readjusted priorities in fighting another national tragedy, the level of infant mortality in this modern Nation, in rural and urban neighborhoods alike.

Health care in rural areas is in critical condition. I have seen too many hospitals close, babies born in helicopters and ambulances, people wither away from lack of proper medical attention to support further cuts in medical services. The very fact that the committee resolution protects Medicare from the kind of cuts the adminsitration proposed makes it worthy of my support. But, fortunately, it does more.

I have just returned from 2 weeks of meeting with students and educators in my district, not to mention young people just starting families, who are extremely concerned with the rising cost of education. I hear a lot of talk about making America No. 1 in education, and competing with the Japanese and others in test scores and ability, but then we are presented a budget that attacks the Pell grant and Student Loan Program. The committee resolution wisely restores those cuts.

I hate to say it, but it seems as if some of the budget writers are saying, "If you're poor, don't get sick. If your parents can't afford private school, don't worry about competing. If you're a single mother and want to make something of your life, don't come here looking for help." That's not the America I know. That's not what I envision for a budget that invests in improving the quality of life for people who need some help.

And an equally strong case can be made in areas such as transportation, antidumping programs, veterans, and energy research, all places where the committee correctly adjusts the priorities of the administration blueprint.

But no budget could address all of these concerns without coming back to the guiding principle for any such agreement, budget discipline. This resolution does not arbitrarily spend more than we have or fudge the numbers to make them say what we want. Instead it makes hard choices about where we spend the precious taxpayer dollar.

It says that as wonderful as a new space mission is it doesn't quite match the need of hungry families, and in a perfect world a capital gains tax cut might be nice but we can't afford that kind of break for the wealthiest of Americans and still have a fair system.

I was serious when I voted for the final budget agreement last year because I wanted $500 billion in deficit reduction over the next 5 years. In the most complicated part of the congressional process the goal is really very simple. It all boils down to how you want to get from point A to point B. You have a spending cap and a pay-as-you-go mandate, and now all you have to do is decide what's most important. And for me, the committee is right on the priorities and right on the price.

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Chairman, there is much in this budget that represents excellent work by the Budget Committee Chairman LEON PANETTA, and others. It reflects a priority for programs like Head Start, WIC, education, health care, and much, much more. It reflects a desire to keep our promise to senior citizens in the area of Medicare. It reflects a priority for veterans' health care.

All of that and much, much more I support as representing the right choices for the right investments in human potential in this country.

But, once again, I am struck by the willingness of the President, and the Congress to ignore the presence of a crippling debt that has the potential of strangling this country's economy.

The deficit in this budget for the record is over $360 billion. That is just the operating budget deficit that is disclosed in this budget. But, if one looks at one of the back pages of the President's budget submission to Congress, one discovers that because some spending is considered off budget the amount of money we are going to be required to borrow will increase the country's gross indebtedness by $404 billion during this coming fiscal year.

I think this country is seriously off track. It is spending money it doesn't have on many things if doesn't need. It is unwilling to confront in a real way the wrenching problem of either significant cuts in expenditures, or increases in taxes, but is content rather to continue to charge much of the cost of government to our children and the grandchildren.

Every day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year, we will spend a billion dollars a day more than we have, and that billion dollars is represented by this group of politicians and this group of Americans to be a billion dollars we want someone else, our kids, our grandkids to pay for.

It represents, in my judgment, the most irresponsible period of fiscal policy in this country's history. It represents a gridlock between a President unwilling to lead, and a Congress incapable of leading and unwilling to follow. And it represents an American people that want the benefits of the spending programs, but resist the burden of the taxes to pay for them.

I fear that one day soon, the country with $3.4 trillion in debt, and $400 billion a year in deficits, will find its leaders looking back scratching their heads, and wondering how things could have collapsed, and asking themselves how could we not have seen that we couldn't keep doing this without an economic collapse. I think it is better to answer those questions now, than allow the economic collapse that could force them to be answered later under much more difficult circumstances.

I would like to have voted for this budget, but I simply have to continue to raise my voice

against the practice of spending a billion dollars a day that we don't have. It is fundamentally irresponsible fiscal policy. Some way, some day, it must be stopped.

Mr. BACCHUS. Mr. Chairman, I am voting for this budget resolution today because I believe it is a necessary first step that will allow us to write a fiscal year 1992 budget in a responsible, deliberative manner.

However, I am far from satisfied with some of its provisions, especially in the areas of space exploration and scientific research. I believe there is unanimous agreement in this House that we must increase our competitiveness in the international marketplace. But how in the world can we profess a commitment to competitiveness when we fail to invest in one of the few technology areas in which the United States remains the clear international leader? Instead of cutting the President's proposed NASA budget by $1.2 billion, we should be spending more on space research and exploration. I also question the decision to cut Energy Department general science programs by $80 million. I will be working throughout the budget process, from the authorization committee to the appropriations committee to the floor, to obtain the largest possible increase for NASA and to ensure that we invest in scientific research.

On a more positive note, Mr. Chairman, I applaud the budget resolution's commitment to meeting the needs of our children. The increased spending on health and nutrition programs, Head Start, and education will save us much more later. But such a wise investment in preventive government further underscores the shortsightedness of not investing adequately in space exploration and science. Not only must we prepare our children to be productive members of society, but we must also provide them with the value-added jobs that will make them leaders in the international marketplace.

I hope we will have many opportunities to debate these vital issues during this budget process. I am voting for this resolution today to get this process started so we can confront our challenges with the time to do so responsibly.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the House concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1992.

This budget does not address the needs of America's future, and would slash badly needed funds from programs that are critical for maintaining American competitiveness in the global arena.

Mr. Chairman, America has long dominated the field of high-energy physics, thanks to the diligent research efforts of our top scientists working to make new discoveries about the fundamental makeup of the universe.

Scientists, working at the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory in Batavia, IL, have dedicated themselves to investigating the nature of matter and pioneering ways to approach the challenges our country faces in the fields of medical research, manufacturing technology, and educational enhancement.

The work being done at Fermilab simply deserves the continued support of the Government, because it is so vital to our Nation's future. The funds earmarked by the President for Fermilab are for improvements to Fermilab's technological capacity, which is absolutely vital to the continuing work of its scientists and our Nation's high energy physics program.

Improvements to the existing accelerator at the laboratory, collectively called Fermilab III, will significantly extend the reach of the Tevatron, the world's first superconducting accelerator and the highest energy proton-antiproton collider.

The budget resolution has classified these important improvements as new starts, and by doing so has targeted them for deep reductions in funding. Mr. Chairman, it is for this reason I must oppose the budget resolution.

Fermilab III should not be part of an overall effort to reject new starts. Fermilab III consists of a series of improvements to the existing 20-year-old accelerator. These improvements differ from new starts in that the overall accelerator is fully operational and only components of it are being replaced to increase its efficiency of operation. The construction of these improvements has been underway for 2 years with full funding.

Fermilab has developed a cost-effective plan for increasing the luminosity of the Tevatron by more than a factor of 50 above its design. Fermilab III consists of an upgrade of the Linac—linear accelerator—from 200 MeV to 400 MeV, the replacement of the 20-year-old main ring with the main injector and substantial improvements of the two large, general purpose detectors.

The present focus at Fermilab has been the search for the top quark, the last unobserved fundamental building block of matter. Scientists working at Fermilab expect that Fermilab III will enable them to discover the top quark.

Fermilab III will make it possible to realize the full scientific potential of the Tevatron at a small fraction of the cost required to build the Tevatron accelerator complex and its detectors. The Linac upgrade and the main injector are the components of Fermilab III that require line-item approval in the congressional budget. Congress has appropriated a total of $16.6 million in fiscal year 1990 and fiscal year 1991. The Linac upgrade is slated for completion in fiscal year 1992 at a total cost of $22.8 million. The final $6.2 is included in the Department of Energy fiscal year 1992 budget request.

The DOE fiscal year 1992 budget request contains the initial $43.5 million for construction of the main injector. The main injector could be completed within 4 years at a total estimated cost of $177.8 million. Funding for the first year of construction of the main injector is crucial.

The Department of Energy's own High Energy Physics Advisory Panel strongly recommended the "immediate commencement and speedy completion of construction of the main injector." This was determined to be the highest priority recommendation for the 1990s. Under the constant budget scenario, it was the only initiative to be recommended for new construction. The advisory panel further recommended the need to take full advantages of existing high energy physics facilities prior to the construction of the SSC to take advantage of the many physics opportunities available.

Throughout the 1990's Fermilab will be the only opportunity for the U.S. high-energy physics community to carry out the research at the forefront of the field.

There are three primary reasons that funding for Fermilab III is essential. First, prior to the intended completion of the SSC at the turn of the century, Fermilab will continue to be the largest and most powerful accelerator in the country. We desperately need this operating facility to stay competitive internationally. Second, if the start of the construction of the main injector is postponed, we may lose some of our best scientists to foreign accelerator laboratories. Third, a comprehensive high energy physics plan and the existence of experienced physicists depends on the implementation of Fermilab III.

Fermilab and the SSC's futures are intertwined. Fermilab III's full implementation in the 1990's is the only opportunity for U.S. physicists to gain experience in the design, construction, and operation of the equipment that is essential to operate the SSC. Fermilab will continue to provide the training and instruction necessary to receive Ph.D's in high-energy physics and accelerator physics. That valuable experience will not only ensure that the SSC is constructed in a timely fashion, but that it has the trained personnel needed to operate.

In addition, I fear that failure to fund Fermilab III will result in a flight of human capital to foreign laboratories competing with Fermilab in its efforts to detect the top quark. Some of our Nation's top physicists conduct research at Fermilab precisely because of its powerful Tevatron accelerator.

All indicators lead us to believe that the SSC will not be completed until after the year 2000. The U.S. high-energy physics program needs to be healthy and competitive in the interim in order to ensure it can provide the scientific and technological base necessary to use it to its best advantage when it becomes operable. To assure this, we need to provide for the full utilization of existing facilities, including cost effective upgrades. Full funding for Fermilab III can give the United States this firm base in high energy physics while the SSC is being built.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MURTHA] having assumed the chair, Mr. MAZZOLI, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 121) revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1991 and setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996, pursuant to House Resolution 123, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution, as amended.

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 261, nays 163, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—261

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Barnard
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Clay
Clement
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gray
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Hertel
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Horton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hutto
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Panetta
Parker
Patterson
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Poshard
Price
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rinaldo
Roe
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sangmeister
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vento
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yatron

NAYS—163

Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Broomfield
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
DeLay
Dickinson
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Fawell
Fields
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodling
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Green
Hall (TX)
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hobson
Holloway
Hopkins
Houghton
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Johnson (CT)
Kasich
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Leach
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lowery (CA)
Machtley
Marlenee
Martin
McCandless
McCollum
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Nichols
Nussle
Orton
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Paxon
Petri
Porter
Pursell
Quillen
Ramstad
Ravenel
Rhodes
Ridge
Riggs
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Sanders
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (IA)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Vander Jagt
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weber
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—7

Dornan (CA)
Dymally
Hughes
Lehman (FL)
Levine (CA)
Udall
Yates

□ 1755

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Hughes for, with Mr. Dornan of California against.

Mr. HOPKINS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 121, the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 121, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, 1992

Mr. PANETTA. I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of House Concurrent Resolution 121, the concurrent resolution on the budget, 1991, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in passing the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 598. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the capability of the Department of Veterans Affairs to recruit and retain physicians and dentists through increases in special pay authorities, to authorize collective bargaining over conditions of employment for health-care employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 248. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Niobrara River in Nebraska and a segment of the Missouri River in Nebraska and South Dakota as components of the wild and scenic rivers system, and for other purposes.

REQUEST TO MAKE IN ORDER TONIGHT CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE RAIL STRIKE

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order tonight to consider in the House a joint

resolution to be introduced by Representatives DINGELL and LENT relating to the rail strike, that the joint resolution be debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I will not object, but would the majority leaders give us some idea of timing for this evening? What is going to happen?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman to yield also to the chairman of the committee, but I believe it is planned that there will be a meeting of the subcommittee and the committee within the next hour, and that we will try to be back on the floor with the bill around 8:30. If there is an hour of debate taken and all the time is taken, we would probably have a vote about 9:30 this evening. That will be the only vote, and if this bill is passed in the same form by the Senate tonight or tomorrow morning, which we would hope, it would mean we would not have to have votes tomorrow; but of course, we do not know that until we know what the Senate has done.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, to withdraw his request until say 7 o'clock. We are frankly and candidly trying to talk with the Secretary of Transportation, and we cannot find him right at this minute. We would like to have time to sort this out.

We believe we could have unanimous consent say at 7 to take this bill up at 8:30, and we would not have lost anything.

We would recommend the staff to proceed on that presumption, but if we could go to special orders or do whatever is appropriate and then ask the question at 7 o'clock, we think at that point we could say yes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of that, I withdraw the unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws his request.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time simply to inform Members that if we get a bill and if we get it through the House this evening, it may be necessary to go to conference with the Senate if there is a difference, and we do not know that that will happen, but Members should be on the alert that this could happen and you may be needed to stay in the area this evening.

Further, that if we have a conference this evening, we would want to finish it this evening and bring back that product tonight.

□ 1800

But again, we do not know that a conference would be needed, and we hope one will not be needed.

Members should also be advised that there will be no votes expected before 9:30 this evening on this or any other matter.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES TODAY SUBJECT TO A CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare recesses today subject to a call of the Chair.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1292

Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] be deleted as a cosponsor of H.R. 1292. His name was listed on that bill by accident.

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

There was no objection.

EXPLANATION OF LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman, the majority leader, is recognized.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted Members to know that when I said before that there will not be a vote until 9:30, that if we come back to the floor at 7 o'clock and ask for unanimous consent at that time and unanimous consent is not obtained, there is the possibility that prior to 9:30, there could be an effort to come back to the floor to ask for the voting on a rule which would require a vote possibly prior to 9:30.

I simply put Members on notice. We will, obviously, contact offices. We hope that that will not happen, but I want you to be on notice that it might happen.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER REPRESENTATIVE ALBERT RAINS

(Mr. BEVILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the greatest Alabama Congressmen to ever serve my State and our Nation. Albert Rains, who died on March 22, was elected to Congress in 1944, representing North Alabama's old Fifth District. He served as the State's Congressman-at-Large for 2 years before retiring in 1965 to return to his home in Gadsden.

Albert Rains was a good friend of mine and when he left Congress, he became one of my constituents. We stayed in very close touch over the years and I always valued his insights. I am going to miss him very much.

Very few people achieve as much as Albert Rains did. He left a legacy for our Nation which will always be remembered.

He is best known for his outstanding work in developing the housing programs which have benefited thousands of people over the years. In fact, Albert Rains was known in Congress as "Mr. Housing."

Albert achieved greatness from humble beginnings. He was a blacksmith's son who worked his way through school. He was largely self-taught and obtained a license to practice law by reading at night. He was considered a brilliant orator.

When he came to Congress, he drew on his experiences as a schoolteacher and principal as well as a steelworker. Albert Rains cared deeply about people and the legislation he wrote reflects his concern that the American people should have decent housing. He went to bat for the needy, the elderly, the military, and for rural programs.

Much has been written about Albert Rains, but I feel that the Gadsden Times captured his essence the best in an editorial on March 26. I request that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Gadsden Times, Mar. 26, 1991]

ALBERT RAINS WAS A POLITICAL GIANT

Albert Rains would have served as a good model for anyone wishing to preserve the image of the quintessential congressman.

This man was symbolic of just about everything associated with the giants of any political era. The requirements for such stature are basic but hard to achieve, and he had them all. Safe from any real re-election challenge, he was entrenched by seniority, sat at the head of the table on three major legislative committees, helped guide the partisan political establishment to which he belonged and was a friend of presidents.

The death of Mr. Rains marks the passing of yet another of the Southern Democrat stalwarts whose feats and reputation in Washington was legendary. Hardly any key

legislation was passed during his time without the guidance of one or more of this handful of Democrats. It is unlikely this kind of coalition will be seen again now that seniority no longer is the overriding criteria for legislative assignment and advancement.

Mr. Rains had been away from Washington for many years, thus his name doesn't generate the immediate recognition among the younger generation as it does with their parents and grandparents. But all three are affected by legislation he helped draft. And future generations will be, too.

Foremost among them are laws which created or expanded federal housing programs. He was generally referred to in Washington as "Mr. Housing." He also was instrumental in legislation affecting banking and transportation. He authored the first major transit bill and was a ranking member of the committee dealing with banking. His friendship with Presidents Kennedy and Johnson made his influence even greater.

Background adds to the Rains' story. He was a school teacher while still a teenager. He went back to college and became a lawyer. Setting up practice in Gadsden in the late 1920s, he was the city's attorney and the county's district attorney. He got his first political experience as a state legislator, where he continued to put his speaking skills to use.

Mr. Rains was away from Gadsden much of the time for 20 years while he served in the House, but he maintained an unbroken and close friendship with the community and the rest of his congressional district. In Gadsden where he made his home for 60 years, he was associated with various community causes, particularly the Lions Club of which he was a charter member.

Albert Rains was recognized nationwide for his political strength. He sponsored and wrote legislation that will endure. But he always kept the down home atmosphere of Gadsden and his native DeKalb County, never forgetting the people he was sent to represent.

ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Wednesday, April 17, 1991.)

EARTH DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 119) to designate April 22, 1991, as "Earth Day" to promote the preservation of the global environment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to acknowledge the work of our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], who is the chief sponsor.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to support House Joint Resolution 144, designating April 22, 1991 as "Earth Day" and I would like to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for his efforts on behalf of our environment.

April 22, 1990, will mark the 21st anniversary of our Nation's first Earth Day. On that first Earth Day, the United States saw the beginning of the environmental movement, as well as the largest organized demonstration in history.

Now, Earth Day, 1991, will come in a few short days, and we have the opportunity once again to enact landmark environmental legislation to address new environmental problems which we are only beginning to understand.

As we all know, the problems we face in our country are different, however, our problems are also those of our neighbors. And their problems, if not addressed, become ours. Therefore, it is vital that we offer our assistance to those countries that need our help. The United States, despite our problems, is the leader in environmental technology, and we have the opportunity to lead the world into a better future.

There are many steps we can take each day to protect our environment. Turning down the thermostat, insulating our houses, using energy efficient cars, and light bulbs are all ways in which we can protect the environment and save money at the same time.

In Congress, it is hoped that the debate on the national energy strategy will yield productive solutions to our energy dilemma.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this measure and I hope that everyone will join in and enjoy the celebration of Earth Day and learn a little more about our environment.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing on my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to have had the opportunity to introduce the resolution to declare Earth Day, 1991 with my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Much of the success of last year's 20th anniversary celebration was the tangible effect that the process had on individual Members of Congress. Collectively, the events surrounding Earth Day have resulted in a Congress more personally aware of environmental affairs, their severity and their consequences, than ever before in history.

But, let's be honest, there are a few things missing from this year's 21st celebration of Earth Day. There's no huge rally on The Mall, no Tom Cruise, no John Denver, no Richard Gere. Yet here we are, expected to continue our work to help heal and protect the Earth—after the hype has died and the fanfare has withered leaving the typical lobbyists.

Now, now is the time when we must do our best work.

This Congress, our list of legislative challenges and responsibilities is long: RCRA, clean water, wetlands, endangered species, an energy strategy, and more. And in the area of foreign assistance, we have to be positive that our scarce dollars do not in any way contribute to destruciton of the natural resources of the countries we are seeking to help and in fact work positively to protect them.

Mr. Speaker, resources to address our concerns are not easy to come by. Efficiencies and creative new approaches will be needed. Efforts to work more closely with the States, many of which have more stringent environmental standards than the Federal Government, should be a high priority.

From the oil fires in Kuwait to interstate transport of waste, from pollution in Eastern Europe to the growing hole in the ozone layer, there is a great deal that should be, must be addressed, and addressed forcefully.

When this country gathers its will, its expertise, and its resources, there is little that we cannot accomplish.

Earth Day is a good time to remember this. I hope you will all join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, before we conclude this matter, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE], my colleague, for yielding, and I do want to address briefly the question of Earth Day.

Mr. Speaker, I was here in the Congress 21 years ago when we had the first Earth Day, and it was an exhilarating and inspiring experience. It galvanized especially young people all over the land.

In addition, last year we had a similarly really truly encouraging and worthwhile celebration of Earth Day, and one hopes that we are educating the public. I think we are.

There is one segment of that great big wide public out there that we have not seemed to reach in terms of educating them for Earth Day, and that seems to be that narrow constituency, that small constituency of decision-makers, down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. Speaker, I think countries around the world are coming to a grim realization that the problems of greenhouse gases and global warming are real. There is some controversy at the margin as to how soon, how fast, how much with it they are, but the fact of global warming is there. The effect of the accumulation of greenhouse gases is real. No serious scientist debates, and decision makers, and scientists and top government people all over the developed world are cudgling their brains to figure out how they can reduce their impact on the global environment, how they can reduce especially the consumption of fossile fuels that seems to be the engine propelling the accumulation of greenhouse gases, and the destruction of the ozone and the seemingly irreversible, inevitable process moving us toward global warming.

They are trying to reverse the seemingly irreversible, and they are giving it great attention and concern.

Mr. Speaker, I find it truly ironic that at this time, when there is an emergent consensus around the world that global warming and greenhouse gases are bad for us, this administration chose to announce a national energy policy that has as its underpinnings not conservation, not energy efficiency, not renewable sources of fuel, but a greater and greater and greater reliance on more development, more transportation from abroad, and more consumption here at home of—you guessed it—more fossil fuel.

Imagine the irony that this administration received from the Secretary of Energy, Jim Watkins, a thoughtful, a courageous draft of a national energy plan that has as its intellectual underpinnings a rational balance between energy production and energy savings, a rational role for energy conservation, for energy efficiency, for development of alternate fuels. And it is a source of great disppointment to me and great concern that the administration, and I take it from published reports with he architect of this trashing of Admiral Watkins' program being the gentleman from New England, Mr. Sununu, it is a source of great chagrin and embarrassment to me that this administration has given a straightarm to concepts that have been rationally developed and thoughtfully put in forms that would lead us to more rational use of energy, more creative application of research and investment to alternative fuels, and more concern for energy efficiency.

This myopic, irrational reliance that this administration places on greater and greater and greater production of fossil fuels, and greater and greater and greater consumption of fossil fuels, more than half of them that will be imported from abroad, most of that from the Persian Gulf, vastly increasing our energy security problems, is a source of great chagrin and embarrassment to me.

Mr. Speaker, I helped organize several years ago an organization called GLOBE. [Global Legislators Organization for a Balanced Environment]. I served as its first chairman. The organization now has a 15-member delegation from the European parliaments, including the chairman of their Environment Committee; a 15-member delegation from the Japanese Diet, including Noboru Takeshita, the former Prime Minister of Japan; and a 15-member delegation from the United States, including all of the leadership of the House and the Senate. It is a prestigious and highly, formidably able group.

Yesterday we had a dozen legislators from Brazil and they asked me, "How could you do it? With the consensus around the world driving governments, driving legislatures to adopt more thoughtful energy policies, how could you trash concepts of energy efficiency, energy conservation, and development of alternative fuels?"

Of course they are very proud of the development of alternative fuels in Brazil, and they very subtly and gently enunciated the feeling that it was somewhat anomalous that we would be trashing Brazil, criticizing Brazil for her destruction of tropical rain forests, which do produce a great amount of fossil fuels, which do contribute to global warming, while at the same time out of the other side of our mouth we are relying almost exclusively on continued production of fossil fuel energy abroad, continued transportation of fossil fuel energy from abroad to our shores, and continued consumption of fossil fuels in this country.

Legislators in parliaments around the world have been in touch with me in recent weeks, as chairman of GLOBE, asking for an explanation. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I have none. My term as chairman expired, and our organization is honored to have Senator AL GORE as the new chairman of GLOBE and Congressman GERRY SIKORSKI will shortly be moving into position as chairman of the American delegation to GLOBE U.S.A.

I hope they will come up with an answer to thoughtful, conscientious legislators around the world, especially in the developed world, to give them some understanding, some perception of how this administration could have turned its back on sanity, could have turned its back on rationality, and retreated into this utterly destructive posture of more and more and more fossil fuels which will continue to degrade our environment and expose us to global warming, holes in the ozone, and more acid rain and all manner of sad environmental defects.

I thank my colleagues.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I, along with Congressman PORTER and 225 other cosponsors, support House Joint Resolution 144 and its companion, Senate Joint Resolution 119, which designate April 22, 1991, as Earth Day.

The purpose of this legislation is simple—to promote a conservation ethic and awareness in our society regarding the need to protect our environment. It is clear that if our children and our children's children are to grow up in an environment which is wholesome, we must instill in each new generation the awareness that is necessary to meet the challenges that confront us. In this regard, it is refreshing that this year, 21 years after the first Earth Day, schools and communities across the Nation are planning events to celebrate this important event, with the goal of making every day Earth Day.

In 1969, Senator Gaylord Nelson realized the value that a nationally organized series of events like the powerful campus teach-ins directed at the Vietnam war could have in placing the issue of the environment on the national agenda. He announced his proposal for a national Earth Day to be held the following year and he drew together talented young people to organize the event. The result was Earth Day. I remember the first Earth Day fondly, as it was just after my first year in Congress. Earth Day 1970 was important enough to many Members of Congress that they left Washington and participated in teach-ins all across the country.

April 22, 1970, was a day that sensitized an entire generation. Approximately 20 million American citizens joined together in celebrating the Earth. Their main objective was to enlighten the world about our environmental mismanagement. Unfortunately, after 20 years and increased participation by over 200 million people, our society is still environmentally lethargic.

This resolution will designate April 22, 1991, as Earth Day and will reemphasize the fact that this year's events are part of a 21-year tradition. We can only hope that, whereas Earth Day 1990 focused on environmental awareness. Earth Day 1991 will focus on environmental action by highlighting people who have made personal changes in their lifestyles for the betterment of the Earth. Earth Day 1991 will mark another step toward a society guided by a conservation ethic.

I have a special message for interest groups which are supportive of this resolution: I hope you are tough minded enough not to be fooled by some Members of this institution whose only indication of support for environmental protection is to pose for political holy pictures by supporting this resolution. My feeling is that Members of Congress who signed on and supported this resolution today ought to be willing to cast the tough votes tomorrow to make this Earth Day more than just a passing fancy.

As the next generation enters the working world, the burden of environmental reconciliation will be magnified. With strong leadership now, perhaps our great-grandchildren will be able to enjoy nature as we now know it. I'm happy to say that over 315 communities and cities have already committed themselves to Earth Day 1991. However, we must not stop striving towards our goal to make every day Earth Day.

I am hopeful that Monday, April 22, will be only the beginning of a week in which every citizen of the world takes stock of where we are and where we are going. Wouldn't it be wonderful if environmental education were provided in every school kindergarten through high school, as in Wisconsin? In this way, we could cultivate a deeply ingrained conservation ethic in our children to assure that we will not continue to mortgage our planet's future for momentary gain.

I am optimistic that our children and their children will grow up knowing that, as individuals, they have it in their power to make lifestyle decisions and to insist on governmental policies which will create a cleaner, healthier environment and a more livable planet for all of humanity.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Earth Day, I rise today to talk about the future of our world.

Today, all of us will be more conscious about the need to protect our environment. We'll discuss the dangers of worldwide deforestation, offshore oil drilling, air and water pollution, and global warming.

All of these are certainly important environmental initiatives. They are issues that must be seriously addressed.

An equally important part of Earth Day, however, is for each and everyone of us to examine our daily lives and discover how we can personally take steps that will help protect the environment.

Whether it be taking reusable bags to the grocery store; recycling newspapers, glass, aluminum, and motor oil; or, building our homes to be energy efficient; all of us can do our part.

In the past year, more Americans have become concerned about the environment.

Without any fanfare, Americans in thousands of communities are tackling serious environmental problems by just doing it.

Local schools annually conduct newspaper recycling drives, community-service organizations dispose of Christmas trees, customers work with local businesses to reduce the use of nonbiodegradable products, and community leaders purchase land for precious wildlife.

Even Washington is joining in.

Since last Earth Day, Congress has enacted the Clean Air Act, the Pollution Prevention Act, and the National Environment Education Act. Deliberations on important environmental initiatives such as the future of our forests and global warming have begun.

And in my home State of Florida, we're working to preserve valuable wetlands, endangered wildlife, and our fragile coastlines.

One of our top concerns is offshore oil drilling. I'm proud to work with my colleagues in the Florida delegation to ensure that our beaches are never covered with oil. To reaffirm my support, I'm signing a letter today written by my colleague and friend, the Honorable ANDY IRELAND.

Mr. IRELAND is helping to lead an effort to stop oil drilling in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico. I'm proud to support his effort.

All of these initiatives are being undertaken by Americans who want to leave a better world for our children. To me, that's the importance of Earth Day. It's more than just a yearly celebration, it's a time for all of us to reaffirm our resolve to leave something very valuable for our children—a cleaner world.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. RES. 119

Whereas the world faces an international environmental crisis which demands the attention of citizens of every nation of the world, including the United States, so that alliances can be built that transcend the boundaries dividing countries, continents, and cultures;

Whereas there is a need to confront environmental problems of increasing severity, including climate change, depletion of the stratospheric ozone layer, loss of forests, wetlands, and other wildlife habitats, acid rain, air pollution, ocean pollution, and hazardous and solid waste buildup;

Whereas it is important that the next generation be guided by a conservation ethic in all of its relations with nature;

Whereas education and understanding is necessary for individuals to recognize the environmental impact of daily living and to become environmentally responsible consumers by conserving energy, increasing recycling efforts, and promoting environmental responsibility in communities;

Whereas major public policy initiatives are necessary to cure the causes of environmental degradation, such as eliminating the manufacture and use of chlorofluorocarbons, minimizing and recyling solid wastes, improving energy efficiency, protecting biodiversity, promoting reforestation, and initiating sustainable development throughout the world;

Whereas nearly 21 years ago, millions of individuals in the United States joined together on Earth Day to express an unprecedented concern for the environment, and such collective action resulted in the passage of sweeping laws to protect the air, water, and land;

Whereas the 1990's should be observed as the "International Environmental Decade" in order to forge an international alliance in response to global environmental problems; and

Whereas to inaugurate the new environmental decade, individuals should again stand together in cities, towns, and villages around the world for a day of collective action to declare a shared resolve: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 22, 1991 is designated as "Earth Day", and the people of the United States are called upon to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities in our grade schools, high schools, colleges and local communities with the objective of making every day Earth Day.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 16) designating the week of April 21-27, 1991, as "National Crime Victims' Rights Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order to yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], who is the chief sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. GEKAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I say to the Members, to all who are within listening and viewing distance from this podium, that the adoption of this resolution will result in the establishment of next week, April 21 through April 27, as "National Crime Victims' Rights Week." This is not the first time that we will have done this particular deed as Members of the Congress and it will follow a pattern in which increasingly the public, as represented in the Congress, is being made aware of the rights of crime victims and to try to strike a balance between what everyone seems to be pushing for, the rights of the defendants in cases where we feel that some recognition, overwhelming recognition, ought to be given to those who suffer the consequences of a violent crime.

Every day, and I repeat so that the full focus of this can be made clear, every day in our country there are 16,000 burglaries committed.

I said, "every day."

□ 1810

There are 13,000 assaults every day, 3,000 robberies, which is a violent crime. A robbery is to steal from someone's person through violence. Three thousand a day. There are 350 rapes a day in our country, 60 murders a day, 62 deaths by motor vehicle every single day.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, the toll that that is taking then in the form of lives, and property, and cost, and so forth is almost immeasurable.

The particular fact that has to be brought to light as well here is that women are increasingly becoming the victims of crime. As the number of crimes go up, proportionately the victimization of women goes even higher in those statistics. It is calculated that because of this trend that three out of every four women in our country will face and be a target of some violent crime at one point or another through their lifetime. Now that is an appalling figure.

Mr. Speaker, we know the recent emphasis that we have put on this legislative body, as well as in the States, on the victims of rape, and we have done some great reforming legislation with respect to the victims of rape, and how testimony can be proffered, and some safeguards that have been put in for a rape victim so that we make sure that she is not the person on trial, but rather the defendant who perpetrated the crime. But still we need to recognize that there is more.

The cost of these burglaries, property damage, as great as it is, is, as best as can be said, serious, and there are thousands of injuries and deaths that occur as a result of violent crime, and then on top of that those who do survive go through a period of grief, frustration, lingering pain, and psychological damage. We are talking about people who are families and friends of the person who has become a victim of a homicide or even of an assault. So, all of this mounts up into a society that is pretty well stunned by the crimes that are committed in our country.

The President of the United States, through his initial campaign for the Presidency, and later in his inaugural address, and since then, has become a champion of victims of crimes, and he has set up a White House ceremony next week in order to properly focus on this particular problem. He is following along a pattern that was set by his predecessor, President Reagan, who not only established such a week as we are replicating here next week, but also created a task force on victims' rights, which, in turn, made certain recommendations which turned into legislation that we, as a Congress, were able to enact and place into law which compensates crime victims through a system of collection of fines by the very people who committed those crimes. So, there is a kind of ironic justice there that we are putting on record, and it will continue through the years to come.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members and everyone else to help, not only in supporting the resolution, but in the support of the actual commemoration where we stop and think about what crime is doing to our people and that this war on drugs and war on crime that we have all declared shall indeed continue until we can see positive results and a peaceful, nonviolent future somewhere down the line in the history of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE] for yielding the time and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] who heads the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I would like to thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], who has been a moving force in support of this kind of initiative and defender and promoter of victim crime legislation. On the Committee on the Judiciary he is an outspoken proponent and supporter of the President's crime bill initiative.

Mr. Speaker, under my continuing reservation of objection, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleaded to rise in strong support for House Joint Resolution 171 designating the week beginning April 21, 1991, as "National Crime Victims' Rights Week," and I command my colleague Mr. GEKAS, from Pennsylvania for his efforts to honor those who are victims of crime.

Recently, Representative BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL was on his way to his Capitol Hill home, when a man tried to mug him. Mr. CAMPBELL was fortunate to be strong enough to fight off his attacker and he can consider himself lucky that he only injured his ankle while fighting off the mugger. However, there are millions of Americans who cannot fend off their attacker or attackers.

Mr. Speaker, by supporting National Crime Victims' Rights Week, the victims of crime can become aware of the various support organizations and how they can help the victims. The victims need to know they have rights.

The Bureau of Justice estimates that there are 35 million American victims of crime each year. Six million victims fall prey to violent crimes such as rape, assault, murder, child abuse, and drunken driven casualties. These crimes can leave the victim physically, psychologically, and financially paralyzed for numerous years following the incident. Victims need to be educated of their rights.

The victims of crime and the advocates who support and assist the rights of victims need to be honored with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The advocates who serve the rights of victims have the difficult job of constantly taking on the criminal justice system. They are continuously stressing the point that all victims have equal rights no matter what their race, religion, or ethnic background may be.

By designating the week beginning April 21, 1991, as "National Crime Victims' Rights Week" we have the opportunity to enlighten the American people that victims of crime have rights and those rights are protected from criminal activity.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important resolution.

□ 1820

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 16

Whereas thirty-five million individuals in the United States are victimized by crime each year, with six million falling prey to violence;

Whereas the Department of Justice estimates that five out of six individuals will be the victim or intended victim of crime during their lifetimes;

Whereas many victims suffer severe psychological, physical, and emotional hardships as a result of victimizations;

Whereas the Nation must commit its collective energies to improving the criminal justice and social services response to victims; and

Whereas, as a Nation committed to justice and liberty for all, efforts must be continued to remove the inequities victims face and to protect and restore individual rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 21 through April 27, 1991, is designated as "National Crime Victims' Rights Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities:

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ORGAN AND TISSUE DONOR AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 218) to designate the week beginning April 21, 1991, and the week beginning April 19, 1992, each as "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so, to acknowledge the work and sponsorship of this measure by our colleague and friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank the committee for their expeditious processing of this measure. I thank the majority of the House for joining in the cosponsorship, particularly the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON], who helped in acquiring the cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, by this resolution we ask America to join us in Tissue and Organ Donor Awareness Week. It has been almost a decade now that this House has come together and has advocated this concept. We have asked America to give of themselves by signing up as organ donors.

It has been a dramatic success, and we could tell a lot of stories here, as we pointed out the lives that have been saved over this time. Maybe partially because some of you have given of your extra time in dealing with these commemoratives on the floor, but what happens, springing into action during this week, a number of voluntary organizations waiting for this opportunity to get the word out to America.

Unfortunately, in the organ donor arena, even with all the success we have had, demand grows faster than supply. So through this process today we are asking Americans to help America to live on by giving to others, and to sign up as organ donors. We make it very, very easy to do so, but you have to plan ahead.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I simply want to acknowledge the work of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON]. I can recall being with him on the floor as he embarked on a similar effort over the past couple of years, and I know of his interest in this effort, not only with the resolution but in making tissue and organ donations available and familiarizing people with the necessity and value of the program. The moral imperative has been one of his special commitments that he has brought to the House of Representatives. So I commend him today, not only for his leadership on this initiative during this year, but for his continuing leadership in activities of this kind throughout his congressional career.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I pause just briefly to thank both the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania in turn for their tenacity and patience in bringing this matter before us in this way.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 218

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning April 21, 1991, and the week beginning April 19, 1992, are each designated "National Organ or Tissue Donor Awareness Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such weeks with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1830

NATIONAL ARBOR DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 64) to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April 1991, as "National Arbor Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, under my reservation I do so simply to acknowledge the work of the sponsorship of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE], who is the chief cosponsor of this resolution.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to thank Chairman CLAY, Mr. SAWYER, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on the Census and Population and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE], for their support on the expedient passage of Senate Joint Resolution 64, "National Arbor Day 1991." I would also like to commend my fellow sponsors on the House bill, House Joint Resolution 66, for their assistance and attention to this matter.

It was over 100 years ago that the State of Nebraska established the first official Arbor Day observance in America. Today, there are less than a handful of states that do not have an Arbor Day which is observed by schools, service clubs, and civic groups, as well as Arboricultural, Horticultural, and Agricultural groups.

The importance of trees to the environment has been recognized throughout history. In the ancient world, trees were worshiped as deities, and in some civilizations, a festival celebrating trees was an important part of culture. Every day we are reminded that this resource like any other is finite. Man's encroachment on the environment can have serious consequences, through carelessness or accident it can be destroyed. I believe it is very appropriate to honor those who work to make us aware and educate all of us to the vital need to protect and preserve our arboreal resources.

Just a few weeks ago, we joined together to celebrate the National Cherry Blossom Festival in our Nation's Capital. This event which celebrated the magnificent display of blossoms was possibly one of the most spectacular presentations in the history of these arbors. These wonders are just additional evidence of our Nation's devotion to this national resource.

Speaker, I would like to commend the Committee for National Arbor Day, and the Honorable Harry J. Banker who publishes the National Arbor Day Review and all the organizations which lent their support for their work to bring this legislation to life and ensure that Friday, April 26, National Arbor Day will more than enhance public awareness in name only.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 64

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the last Friday of April 1991, as "National Arbor Day" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such a day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on the joint resolutions that we just considered and passed, namely, Senate Joint Resolution 119, Senate Joint Resolution 16, Senate Joint Resolution 64, and House Joint Resolution 218.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, which was adopted earlier today.

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

There was no objection.

CREATING JOBS FOR AMERICANS SHOULD BE HIGH BUDGET PRIORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I had the occasion to host a meeting in my district at which several hundred unemployed construction workers from my First District in New Jersey turned up at the local Carpenters Union Hall in hopes of hearing some information about their prospect of getting a job in the rebuilding of Kuwait.

The news that we were able to give them that day was not particularly the news that they wanted to hear. We had to tell them there were very few jobs in Kuwait that are presently available, and that the prospects for American workers to receive those jobs are, frankly, not particularly good, unless we take some action at this time.

What I thought was particularly poignant about that is that this is a country with more amassed wealth than anywhere in the world, a country that is capable, as we have seen very recently of achieving virtually anything, anywhere in the world, on a military and technological basis, but we have permitted our economy to deteriorate to the point where hundreds of people, skilled people, hard working, motivated people living in this country, are willing to pick up and move halfway around the world because there is not a sufficient job for them here in the United States.

That is why I cast a "no" vote today on both of the budget resolutions before the House of Representatives. Let me hasten to say that I am very proud that my party took a stand in its budget resolution in favor of a lot of priorities that I know my constituents also stand for.

We took a stand for good benefits for senior citizens; we took a stand for increased educational opportunities for all of our people; we took a stand for cleaning up the environment; and when the time comes in the appropriations process to make sure that the dollars are delivered to make those promises a reality, I will be there to support the delivery of those dollars.

But in the two budget resolutions that we had before us today, we really had a broader question about where we are going as an economy, where we are going as a country, and what our economic strategy is and is not.

I voted against the President's proposal and the proposal of our Democratic Party for three reasons. The first reason is that in the midst of the worst recession we have had in over a decade, I did not see an antirecession, progrowth, proindustrial base proposal in either one of those budgets.

The President wants us to believe his capital gains tax cut proposal will produce jobs. He wants us to believe if we give a massive tax benefit to the wealthiest 2 or 3 percent of people of our economy, that they will do the right thing with it. It will trickle down, and those unemployed workers I talked to Monday will benefit from it.

I do not believe that, they do not believe that, and anyone who studied the economic history of this country in the 1980's knows that the objective record does not support that.

My own party needs to come up with a program for economic growth that leaves more dollars in people's pockets and makes people have an incentive to invest more of those dollars in the diminishing industrial base of this country, so people can have the kind of jobs where they can support their family and move on and improve their standard of living, and not just stand still the way they are today.

The second reason I voted against both proposals is that, as the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] said, there is a 1-percent difference between the two. One percent.

Now, the fundamental question here, and I know there are others who would disagree with the way I come at this question, is that a budget of $1.45 trillion is just too much. That is too many dollars going out of the pockets of working men and women in this country and coming to Washington.

I would argue that there is very little difference between the Republican proposal and the Democratic proposal. They share in common one basic economic point, and that is that the proper economic policy is to take money away from people who earned it, and use the Federal Government in Washington to redistribute it.

The only thing they differ on is to whom to redistribute that money. The Republicans in the White House want to redistribute the money to noncompetitive defense contractors, to our foreign creditors, and to their favorite clients served by the Federal bureaucracy.

Some Members in the Democratic Party want to use the Government to redistribute that money to bureaucracies which claim to be helping people move ahead, but the objective record says they just are not. They just are not moving ahead.

The third reason that I opposed this budget is that I do not think it engages in the same kind of analysis we need to have when we look at spending. We ought to ask ourselves three questions whenever we are asked to spend one of the taxpayers' dollars.

□ 1840

The first question is does this spending induce or retard economic growth.

The second question that we ought to ask is if the Government did not provide this service, would somebody else, or is it really necessary to provide nutrition for young children or housing for senior citizens or environmental protection, and if it is, we should do it, and we should do it at a greater level and with greater quality then we are doing today.

Finally, we ought to ask ourselves the question whether it is the best way to deliver that service. Does it really make sense? Is this appropriation going to build more houses or add to the housing bureaucracy? Is this appropriation going to provide higher income for senior citizens or more bureaucrats in the Federal Government?

Those are the kinds of questions we ought to be asking ourselves. The 300 or 500 workers I talked to on Monday were not included in this budget today. There was not a sufficient proposal to put them back to work building America, not selling each other insurance policies or doing word processing for each other, although we need those service industries and they are good. But there was no proposal to face the inexorable deterioration of the industrial base of this country.

I do not want to be in a position in this country 10 years or 20 years from now where if I want to build a house or manufacture steel or buy a car that I cannot buy a product made in the United States. That is the path that we are on. That is the direction we are in, and each of the two budget proposals taxed our people, led us further down that road and did not deal with the fundamental problems of the American economy.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION TO REPLACE IRAQI GOVERNMENT WITH UNITED NATIONS ADMINISTERED GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACCHUS. Mr. Speaker, my first vote as a Member of this House was a vote for a new world order.

In January, I voted to authorize the President of the United States to use military force to end the occupation of Kuwait by Saddam Hussein.

I did so because I seek a new world in which our American dream of freedom and democracy can one day become a reality for everyone, everywhere.

I did so because I believed our President when he said that he believed in that same new world.

But today that new world we sought in January looks very much like the same old world. Today, when I listen to our President, I am not sure what he believes.

The new world I envisioned is not one where armies are allowed to slaughter their own people with helicopter

gunships and chemical weapons. It is not one where starving, freezing children are allowed to die on remote mountains. It certainly is not one where the United States of America turns away from its responsibility to a brave and helpless people, offering only the hollow excuse that we cannot interfere in the internal affairs of another nation.

There is a word from the old world order to describe what is happening in Iraq. That word is genocide. The mountains of Iraq are the new death camps, the new killing fields. One thousand precious lives are lost every day.

I'm far more interested in saving real lives than I am in the heartless nuances of heedless realpolitik. If the new world order is to mean anything at all, we must use all reasonable diplomatic, economic, and military means to end the mass murder of the Kurds, prevent the mass sacrifice of the Shiites, and remove Saddam Hussein from power. We must send a message once and for all that we value the fundamental human rights of oppressed people more than we value the territorial rights of oppressive governments.

President Bush did a superb job in bringing the world community together to drive Saddam Hussein from Kuwait.

Rarely has the moral and military might of the United States been so effectively and properly applied.

Why has the President not shown the same leadership in bringing the world community together to help the innocent people of Iraq? Can we truly celebrate victory amid reports of mass starvation and mass execution? Can we truly treasure the homecoming of our troops while children are tortured before the eyes of the world? Are the yellow ribbons we have worn so proudly beginning to fray?

I applaud the actions the President took yesterday to protect the Kurdish refugees. I wish that those and other urgently needed actions had come sooner. In recent weeks, I've been deeply disappointed in the President. He called on the people of Iraq to rise up against Saddam Hussein. I heard him. The whole world heard him. America must not abandon them now.

So today I have joined my distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. SOLARZ, in a letter to the President urging him to seek a Security Council resolution calling for the resignation of the brutal government of Saddam Hussein and its replacement by a government administered by the United Nations that would hold free and fair elections. We believe that this resolution must authorize the use of whatever means are necessary to enforce this demand.

In concert with other members of the allied coalition, we must do all we can to stop the slaughter in Iraq. We should destroy Iraqi helicopters, warplanes, and artillery when used against civilians. We should arm and finance what remains of the resistance against Saddam Hussein.

Building on the belated efforts of recent days, we should expand our relief efforts to feed, clothe, and shelter the vast refugee populations fleeing oppression. We should work through the United Nations to create safe havens for refugees inside Iraq. We should move quickly to provide American troops to protect the Kurds in northern Iraq, and we should not remove our remaining troops from southern Iraq at this time, for that would allow Saddam to slaughter the Shiite refugees we left behind, even as he has slaughtered the Kurds.

I am not advocating solely unilateral action by the United States. I am not advocating that we march on Baghdad and impose a government on the people of Iraq.

I am advocating that we help give the Iraqi people the means to accomplish what President Bush encouraged them to do: Overthrow Saddam Hussein, and establish a new government that will live in peace with its own people and with the rest of the world. I am advocating that we live up to the principles that our brave men and women have been defending in the Persian Gulf.

America must continue to stand for what America is supposed to stand for. Only then will we have a victory truly worth celebrating. Only then will we have real hope for the new world we seek.

BUILDING A NEW MACEDONIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday the Macedonia Baptist Church in Mount Vernon, NY, is breaking ground for a new church building. This is not a new experience for Macedonia, which has had a number of homes in the 78 years of its existence. Instead, it is yet another milestone on a path of growth and service that has made major contributions not only to thousands of individual lives, but also to the entire Mount Vernon community.

When Macedonia was founded in 1913, by 11 men and women under the leadership of the Reverend James D. Morris, it met in a small mission at 111 West Third Street. Little more than a year later, it moved to South Eighth Avenue. In the years that followed, a succession of locations on South Ninth Avenue were the home for this growing congregation, until the completion in 1925 of the church building that the Reverend Rinico Nelson called a "Christian bulwark in our city * * * an edifice that would serve as a beacon light to all who came within the vicinity of the community."

That magnificent structure has served Macedonia well for over half a century. It has been expanded and redecorated, and has seen the congregation flourish and prosper. Now, the time has come for the church to begin construction of a new home. The task is one to which this congregation is well suited, for the people of Macedonia are builders. They have built a senior citizens' home that ensures decent care for the elderly, built up scholarship funds that provide college opportunities to young members of the congregation, and established a day care center that builds children into responsible members of the community. Under the inspired leadership of the Reverend Richard H. Dixon, who has served since 1958, Macedonia has built a congregation that is a model of dedication and involvement, and in the process has helped in many ways to build a better Mount Vernon.

I look forward to joining the friends and members of Macedonia as they begin construction of what will no doubt be an impressive new building. It will be a reflection of the congregation's continued growth, strength, and vitality. More importantly, it will reflect the spirit and commitment of the people of Macedonia. It is that spirit that has enriched the lives of so many and which has reached out to others throughout Mount Vernon. I know my colleagues join me in congratulating Reverend Dixon and the Macedonia congregation for all they have done and wish them every success in future endeavors.

NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, once each year we celebrate National Library Week. It gives us an opportunity to take a look at our most taken-for-granted institution. Libraries are taken for granted at every level. Libraries are an endangered species of institutions. More and more of them are being closed on a daily basis and many of them are facing tremendous budget cuts which threaten their survival over the next few years.

It is ironic that at a time like this the administration in the White House chooses to place zero in the budget for one act which offers some aid to libraries across the country. The Library Services and Construction Act was proposed to be zeroed out by this administration. It is ironic also because this administration supported a White House Conference on Libraries which is to take place this year between July 9 and July 13, a White House conference to consider the future of libraries and how libraries can be more effective in our society, and certainly how libraries can contribute to educational reform, which is very much on the minds of people these days.

We are told that tomorrow the President will announce a major new initiative for education.

□ 1850

When he was elected, he said he wanted to be known as the education President, and one great step toward the achievement of that goal, one great step toward being worthy of that label will be taken tomorrow with the unveiling of the next step in the President's education reform plan.

There are some serious contradictions that we face from an administration that places zero in the budget for library aid, which is already quite small; $135 million is all we are talking about. It has been at that level for the last 10 years almost. You know, $135 million is ridiculous for a basic institution undergirding all learning processes.

To allow our libraries to close is about as ridiculous as saying that we are going to fight a major war and shut down the ammunition dump. Are we going to fight a major war and the warehouse where all the spare parts are kept for the military vehicles will be closed? Libraries are that basic to the learning process. It is a great contradiction.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to use stronger language because I think everything related to education, we ought to make an attempt to lift it above partisan deliberations and try to proceed on education in this country on a nonpartisan plane rather than hurl accusations at each other. Let us plead with each other to be rational, to be logical, to apply scientific methods as we proceed to try to improve education in America.

Certainly libraries are part of the process of improvement of education. I applaud the President's speechwriter or the President himself. He signed this letter, which he does every year for National Library Week, which has all of the right language. It is quite informed about the role of libraries and the importance of libraries.

I would like to begin my statement by placing in the RECORD the President's letter designating National Library Week. I will now just read a few quotes from this letter from the President. It begins:

There is at the center of virtually every American town a library, a repository of history and of our recorded hopes, dreams, and plans for tomorrow. Libraries require only that we have the desire to learn and to explore the fascinating world of knowledge and ideas. For those with the desire to read but lacking the ability, libraries hold a key to literacy as well, offering special educational programs for everyone. Libraries provide access to all of these treasures through both electronic and conventional retrieval services. Libraries also serve as favorite sanctuaries for our children. For students engaged in the lifelong process of learning, these institutions serve as a valuable point of reference. Indeed, for every citizen, from the serious researcher to the individual reading for pleasure, libraries refresh the spirit and enrich the intellect for every citizen. This year National Library Week is a celebration of the fact that those who read succeed. Libraries enable us to enjoy more fully the benefits of learning and opportunity and by promoting literacy for all Americans we can share those benefits with many of our fellow citizens.

Always we get an excellent letter from the White House. I agree with the basic reasoning, the basic statement in the letter, but there is a great contradiction between what the President states in his letters for National Library Week and what the administration consistently has been doing for the last 2 years, and before that the Reagan administration for the last 8 years.

We are embarked on a series of ridiculous kinds of contradictions when we move to restrict libraries at the same time we are calling for a new effort to improve education.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York very much for yielding, because his concerns are my concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to make a statement this evening, having met with several librarians from the State of Vermont yesterday, and they educated me as to what the President has in mind not only for the libraries in the State of Vermont but for the libraries throughout this country.

I agree very much with the gentleman from New York as to the horrendous impact that these proposed cuts are going to have.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the President's proposal to decimate the Department of Education's funding for libraries. Shortly after the First Lady launched the "Year of the Lifetime Reader" campaign, the man who would have the American public think of him as the education President cut Federal support for the Library Services and Construction Act by 75 percent.

Ironically, at the same time the White House has announced a conference on library and information services. President Bush is quoted as saying that "improving the Nation's library and information services may be one of the best investments we make in our campaign to end illiteracy," that we need to "ensure that our Nation's libraries continue to serve as a valuable source of knowledge and training," that we "must meet the information needs of all of our citizens—especially minorities, the elderly, disadvantaged young people, and persons living in rural areas."

This, at the same time as he is cutting Federal aid for libraries through LSCA from $143 million to $35 million in his budget proposal. The impact of a cut of this magnitude would be enormous on the public library system.

In my State of Vermont, a rural State, we are very dependent on the small amount of Federal aid we receive for libraries. Let me give you just a few examples. LSCA title I provides $211,000 for regional libraries which provide services to the 42 towns which have no local library, as well as supplemental book collections to 196 small, rural libraries and consulting services, continuing education across the State. LSCA title II provides $136,000 in matching funds for renovation, construction, and technology enhancement. In Vermont none of these funds are used for administration. LSCA title III provides an 800 line connecting libraries around the State to a computerized data base, itself funded by the State. Our State librarian, Patricia Klinck, summed up the effect of the proposed cuts quite clearly: "In a rural environment, LSCA funding means the difference between access and isolation."

Not only is the 75-percent cut devastating to our public libraries. The fact is that the remaining $35 million for literacy is not specifically designated and would become part of the State Block Grant Program, which includes funds for welfare, human services, and education. Library services would, in all likelihood, not fare well in competition with more immediately obvious pressing needs such as hunger and housing, especially in these difficult economic times.

We must not allow these cuts to go through. We must speak out on the specific impacts of these and the many other cuts being quietly implemented while nonconsequential actions are used in a shell game to divert media attention from the real issues. In his letter accompanying the announcement of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services, President Bush writes, "Our ability to stay ahead depends, in large part, on our ability to stay informed." I could not agree more. The problem is that when the U.S. Government says one thing and does another, it is difficult for the American people to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for allowing me to speak.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to proceed with my theme that we have illogic prevailing. We have contributions that are hard to bear.

I would like to make a plea to the new Secretary of Education, Mr. Alexander, and his overseers in the White House to reexamine this attitude and their posture on libraries. It contradicts so much of what they are proposing with respect to education.

Libraries are very high cost/benefit operations. For the amount of money we put into them, we get a tremendous benefit. There is probably no other educational enterprise that we engage in which yields such a high benefit for the low cost.

The Federal Government has never been a great supporter of libraries. The library aid at this point being proposed by Congress is $143 million. If we take the whole history of the Library Services and Constitution Act over a period of about 25 years, all of that money that has been used for aid to libraries would not equal the cost of one single aircraft carrier. One aircraft carrier costs $3.3 billion, $3.5 billion. Federal aid to libraries has not even added up to one aircraft carrier all the years that it has been available. So we are talking about a very small amount of money.

We do have a White House Conference on Library and Information Services going forward. It was initiated by Congress, signed by the President, and our total Government is behind this conference that will be held in July.

□ 1900

Of course, the preamble to that law—Public Law 100-382—the preamble to that law includes in it statements like the following: "The future"—I am quoting from the preamble—"The future of our society depends on developing the learning potential inherent in all children and youth, especially literary, reading, research, and retrieval skills." It goes on with many other statements which are very much on target in terms of the role and the need of libraries.

Mr. Speaker, instead of reading this summary by the American Library Association, I will submit the summary in its entirety for the RECORD.

SUMMARY OF AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION APPROPRIATIONS RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

Library program	Fiscal year—		Fiscal year 1992—		
	1990 appropriation	1991 appropriation	Authorization	Administration request	ALA recommendations
Library Services and Construction Act	126,321	132,163	(1)	35,000	207,500
Title I, public library services	82,505	83,898	(1)	[3] 35,000	100,000
Title II, public library construction	18,900	19,218	(1)	0	55,000
Title III, interlibrary cooperation	19,551	19,908	(1)	0	35,000
Title IV, Indian libraries	.....	(4)	(4)	(4)	.....
Title V, foreign language materials	0	976	(1)	0	1,000
Title VI, library literacy	5,365	8,163	(1)	0	10,000
Title VII evaluation and assessment,	0	0	(1)	0	500
Title VIII, library learning center programs [5]	0	0	(1)	0	6,000
Higher Education Act Library Programs	10,325	10,735	(1)	0	[6] 21,000
Title II-B, training and research	855	976	(1)	[7] 0	5,000
Title II-C, research libraries	5,738	5,855	(1)	0	10,000
Title II-D, technology	3,732	3,904	(1)	0	5,000
Title VI, section 607 foreign periodicals	0	0	(1)	0	1,000
Hawkins/Stafford Elementary/Secondary School Improvement Act, ESEA chapter 2 [8]	487,894	469,408	672,000	462,577	500,000
National Commission on Libraries and Info. Science	750	732	750,000	911	911

SUMMARY OF AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION APPROPRIATIONS RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Library program	Fiscal year—		Fiscal year 1992—		
	1990 appropriation	1991 appropriation	Authorization	Administration request	ALA recommendations
National Center for Education statistics (including library surveys)	39,739	63,524	(1)	80,060	80,060
National Library of Medicine (including Medical Library Assistance Act)	81,861	91,408	(9)	100,554	100,554

[1] Such sums.
[2] For LSCA, ALA recommends amounts authorized for fiscal year 1990 in Public Law 101-254, signed March 15, 1990.
[3] Proposed to be used for adult literacy activities.
[4] Funded at 2 percent of appropriations for LSCA, II, and III.
[5] Under Public Law 101-254, no appropriation may be made for LSCA VIII unless the total for LSCA I, II, and III is at least equal to the previous year's total plus 4 percent. (ALA's first priority for LSCA funding is restoration of LSCA programs currently funded.)
[6] For HEA II, ALA recommends amounts authorized for fiscal year 1987.
[7] Part of a proposed consolidation of several graduate fellowship programs will Secretary setting priorities for each year.
[8] The six targeted uses of chapter 2 funds include school library resources and training of librarians.
[9] 42 USC 275.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to note a few other items that I would like to submit for the RECORD, including a summary of recommended level of appropriations for items which relate to libraries.

The President, as I said before, placed in the budget zero for the Library Services and Construction Act, but the American Library Association recommends a rather conservative figure, $207,500,000. For the Higher Education Act Library Programs, a total of $21 million is recommended. For the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary, Secondary Improvement Act, which contains chapter 2 which relates to libraries, $500 million is recommended. The Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, everything that relates to libraries, there are recommendations here which I agree with. They are far from the sums that have been requested by the administration, and of course, unfortunately, they are far from the sums that have been recommended in the budget resolution which was passed today. I placed the summary of the recommended appropriations into the RECORD.

I will insert the letter from the White House at this point:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 28, 1991.

There is at the center of virtually every American town a library, a repository of history and of our recorded hopes, dreams, and plans for tomorrow. Libraries hold the acquired wisdom of the ages, as well as contemporary ideas and information, providing access to these treasures through both electronic and conventional retrieval services.

Libraries require only that we have the desire to learn and to explore the fascinating world of knowledge and ideas. For those with the desire to read, but lacking the ability, libraries hold a key to literacy as well, offering special educational programs for everyone.

Libraries also serve as favorite sanctuaries for our children, revealing in their quiet rooms new worlds to entertain and to challenge growing young minds. For students engaged in the lifelong process of learning, these institutions serve as valuable points of reference. Indeed, for every citizen—from the serious researcher to the individual reading for pleasure—libraries refresh the spirit and enrich the intellect.

This year, National Library Week is a celebration of the fact that those who read succeed. Libraries enable us to enjoy more fully the benefits of learning and opportunity; and by promoting literacy for all Americans, we can share those benefits with millions of our fellow citizens.

GEORGE BUSH.

One of the items which will be discussed at the White House Conference on Libraries is a brandnew proposal that will require considerable funding from the Federal Government. Only the Federal Government can make it happen. It is called NREN, the proposed National Research and Education Network. It is a high-capacity, high-quality computer network which supports a broad set of applications and network services for the research and education community. The NREN will be an expansion and an upgrading of the existing interconnected array of mostly research networks such as the national NSFNET and the regional networks, NYSERNET and SURANET, and local area networks on campuses known collectively as Internet. The aim is to reach gigabit per capacity over several years. This has been described as a national highway for information. It will be for the average American, placed at their disposal kind of an electronic retrieval system already available to corporations and scientists doing high-level research. It will be a very efficient, efficient system since it will research everybody, and kind of a hope for the future, dream for the future, which I hope will be discussed extensively at the White House Conference on Libraries. It will require funding. It will require considerable new funding. It will be in accordance with the kind of proposals that are being made by the President and the Governors in their six recommended goals for education.

Those six goals cannot be realized unless there is more support via libraries and new kinds of information systems. An electronic retrieval system would be a vital necessity in order to upgrade our entire educational system, especially the parts which talk about increasing our students' abilities in the areas of math and science. Mr. Speaker, I will include a summary of the National Research and Education Network factsheet in the RECORD at this point.

NATIONAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION NETWORK FACTSHEET, APRIL 1991

What is the NREN? The proposed National Research and Education Network (or NREN, pronounced en-ren) is a high-capacity, high-quality computer network which supports a broad set of applications and network services for the research and education community. The NREN will be an expansion and upgrading of the existing interconnected array

of mostly scientific research networks, such as the nationwide NSFNET (the backbone) and regional networks such as NYSERNET and SURANET, and local area networks on campuses and elsewhere, known collectively as the Internet. The aim is to reach gigabit (a gigabit is one billion bits) per second capacity over several years.

The concept of the NREN originated as a means to connect supercomputer centers and to accommodate the massive amounts of data produced by high-performance computer projects. Reports over the past several years by a number of organizations—the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy and its Federal Coordinating Council for Science, Engineering, and Technology (FCCSET), the National Research Council, the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, EDUCOM and others—have shaped the concept and moved it forward.

Supercomputers and super networks are needed to address "grand challenges" such as global climate change and the mapping of the human genome, but such advanced computing and communications capacity also makes possible the transmission of unprecedented volumes of other kinds of electronic data and information—from electronic mail to electronic journals to entire digital library collections including audio and visual components. Educational needs are now part of the NREN plan although it is undecided how wide the range of users and institutions will be. However, the ability of a researcher to connect to computerized tools is becoming a necessity for scholars in all fields, students at all levels, and information seekers wherever located.

Administration Plan. Development of the NREN is part of a Presidential initiative described in a 1991 report from the Office of Science and Technology Policy, "Grand Challenges: High-Performance Computing and Communications." This multiagency initiative calls for $638 million in President Bush's FY 1992 budget, an increase of about 30 percent over similar activities in FY91. These funds would support activities in four program areas; high-performance computing systems, advanced software technology and algorithms, the NREN, and basic research and human resources. The OSTP report calls the FY92 network under this plan the "Interagency Interim NREN."

Legislation. Legislation to establish the NREN was first introduced by Sen. Albert Gore Jr. (D-TN) in 1988. He introduced the bill again in the 101st Congress, and a revised version of S. 1067 passed the Senate in October 1990, but the House did not act on HR 3131, the companion bill.

Sen. Gore has again introduced legislation this year (S. 272, the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991) on which his Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee held a hearing on March 5. A revised version of S. 272 was approved by the parent Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee on March 19.

A companion bill (H.R. 656) has been introduced by Rep. George Brown (D-CA), Chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. Two subcommittees held a hearing March 7 on H.R. 656. Rep. Rick Boucher (D-VA) presided as Chairman of the Science Subcommittee at the hearing cosponsored by the Technology and Competitiveness Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Tim Valentine (D-NC). H.R. 656 is expected to be marked up this spring.

A third bill is also pending (S. 343), the Department of Energy High-Performance Computing Act of 1991), introduced by Sen. J. Bennett Johnston (D-LA), Chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. S. 343 would have the Energy Department establish a Federal High-Performance Computer Network to serve many of the same purposes envisioned for the NREN.

Provisions of Bills. S. 272 and H.R. 656 assign a lead role to FCCSET, which is to develop a National High-Performance Computing Plan involving multiagency collaboration. The long list of agencies includes the Library of Congress, the National Agricultural Library, the National Library of Medicine, and the Department of Education. The National Science Foundation is designated the lead agency to coordinate NREN development among the various agencies.

In the Committee-approved version of S. 272, the NREN is to link research and educational institutions, government, and industry in every state. Federal agencies are to work with state and local agencies, libraries, educational institutions and organizations, and private network service providers in order to ensure that researchers, educators, and students have access to the network. Within the federal government, NSF is to have primary responsibility for connecting colleges, universities, and libraries to the network. To the extent practicable, the network is to provide access to electronic information resources maintained by libraries, research facilities, publishers, and affiliated organizations.

The bills call for various agency activities and/or FCCSET reports to address such issues as standards to provide interoperability, common user interfaces, network security and user privacy, protection of copyrights, pricing policies and plans for eventual commercialization of the network.

Library Interest. The Senate bill as ordered reported includes some improvements suggested by the American Library Association and the Association of Research Libraries in testimony and recommended amendments, as well as some elements suggested by a Partnership for the NREN (20 education, library, and computing organizations, including ALA, ARL, the American Association of Law Libraries, the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies, the Coalition for Networked Information, EDUCOM, and the Special Libraries Association).

These improvements include the idea of NREN connections to all 50 states, additional references to education as a whole and to libraries, collaboration with potential users, the possibility of using the network as a dissemination vehicle for federal databases and information, and specifying library and information science in research, education, and training components.

S. 272 and H.R. 656 call for development of a mechanism to coordinate and manage the network, but are not very specific about the governance structure. This is probably the most important unresolved issue as far as Partnership for the NREN organizations are concerned. Also of concern to library and education organizations is the issue of how S. 272 and S. 343 may be reconciled, particularly with regard to governance issues and the ability of the network to serve education, broadly defined.

EDUCOM estimates that federal funding of the current internet amounts to only about 10 percent of the total investment, with the remainder coming from universities, states, and industry. The bills should provide more explicitly for a governance structure with balanced participation by users of the network (including government, the private sector, education and libraries) in establishing policy and in developing standards. Among all the reports and studies should be one on progress in connecting the broad education and library communities to the network, and on possible mechanisms for ensuring long-term, low-cost communications for educational institutions and libraries.

ALA has endorsed the concept of a National Research and Education Network with library participation for the following reasons listed in ALA testimony in March 1991 on S. 272 and H.R. 656:

The NREN has the potential to revolutionize the conduct of research, education, and information transfer.

Current Internet users want library-like services, and libraries have responded with everything from online catalogs to electronic journals.

Libraries provide access points for users without an institutional base.

With libraries and their networks, the support structure to make good use of the NREN already exists.

NREN development should build on existing federal investments in the sharing of library and information resources and the dissemination of government information.

The NREN's higher capacity will enable the sharing of full text and nontextual library and archival resources.

Libraries provide a useful laboratory for exploration of what services and what user interfaces might stimulate a mass marketplace.

Public, school, and college libraries are appropriate institutions to bridge the growing gap between the information poor and the information rich.

Libraries of all types linked to the NREN would enhance the national investment in the network, spread its benefits more widely, and increase access to the resources available over it through an institution already established to assist users with information needs.

Another set of issues called Government information policy issues relating to matters of grave concern to libraries and involve libraries. The Government information policy issues include issues related to depository libraries, issues related to the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-130. A-130 is a circular that has been in existence for some time, promulgated for the Office of Management and Budget under Freedom of Information and is of intense interest. It was announced that they will provide guidance to the Federal agencies to provide electronic information products to depository libraries, but not both products and services. Such a number of Government publications are being distributed through on-line services such as electronic billboards, and moves to eliminate products alone would restrict public access to Government information.

Currently, depository libraries are participating in pilot projects which would provide for the dissemination of electronic services throughout the Government Printing Office. These are like the national highway of information. They are new systems of disseminating information, electronic format, which require the coordination and the

support of Government. This is one of the many Government information policy issues which is of concern to the library community. It is also concerned about the Paperwork Reduction Act Reauthorization. We are concerned about the Freedom of Information Act, and a number of other acts of considerable importance. Mr. Speaker, I ask to place the summary of Government information policy issues in the RECORD in its entirety at this point, and it is as follows:

GOVERNMENT INFORMATION POLICY ISSUES FACTSHEET, APRIL 1991

GPO Appropriations: For the Superintendent of Documents operation, the Government Printing Office is requesting $27,371,000 for FY92. Together with $755,000 in funding from FY91 which Congress withheld from obligation until FY92, this would give SuDocs $28,126,000, compared with $25,745,000 in FY91. Of the total, $22,616,000 would be for distribution to depository libraries. In appropriations testimony in February, Public Printer Robert Houk provided a status report on the original five pilot electronic projects, efforts which GPO expects to complete in 1991.

On cost sharing, a controversial issue with cost implications for libraries, Houk said that all participants in online electronic dissemination services, including depository libraries, "may be required to pay a portion of the cost of such services to the extent allowed by law. Adequate controls are essential and limitations on free service access must be considered early in any arrangement to make databases available to the public through the depository library network."

Katherine Mawdsley, University of California, Davis, testifying about GPO appropriations on behalf of ALA and the Association of Research Libraries, urged GPO SuDocs funding at a level which would support distribution of electronic information through the Depository Library Program, and sustain the current distribution of paper and microfiche.

Depository Libraries. Rep. Charles Rose (D-NC), Chair of the Joint Committee on Printing, plans hearings on April 25 regarding public access to government information through depository libraries and other means. Three depository librarians have been invited as witnesses.

Revision of OMB Circular A-130. In a move of intense interest to the library community, the Office of Management and Budget announced that it will revise guidance to federal agencies to provide electronic information products to depositories—but not both products and services. Since a number of government publications are being distributed through online services, such as electronic bulletin boards, moves to limit agency compliance with depository requirements to products alone would restrict public access to government information. Currently, depository libraries are participating in pilot projects for the dissemination of electronic services through the Government Printing Office.

The announcement regarding depository libraries appears in OMB's plans to revise its controversial OMB Circular No. A-130, Management of Federal Information Resources, published in the March FEDERAL REGISTER (56 FR 9026-28). This is an advance notice, not a draft of the revised circular. OMB invites comments on the issues most requiring revision, on new formulation of policy, and on the directions that formulation should take. Comments are due by May 3; OMB is likely to issue a draft circular for public comment soon after the date.

Paperwork Reduction Act Reauthorization. The reauthorization of the Paperwork Reduction Act failed to pass before the 101st Congress adjourned. Prospects for this controversial legislation are uncertain at this time. OMB cites the Paperwork Reduction Act as its authority for Circular A-130, and plan to revise the circular despite the lack of an authorization since September 1989.

Freedom of Information Act. Congress is considering explicitly including computer and electronic records under the Freedom of Information Act in the same manner as documents printed on paper. Rep. Gerald Kleczka (D-WI), joined by Rep. Bob Wise (D-WV), introduced HR 1423, the Freedom of Information Public Access Improvement Act of 1991, on March 13. The Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Technology and the Law, chaired by Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-VT), is in the process of drafting proposed amendments to the FOIA.

One last item I would like to place in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, relates to an article which was placed in the Wall Street Journal on February 13, 1991. In this article they talk about many public libraries being forced to close their doors for months. There are towns in West Virginia where libraries have closed, and they are not sure when they will reopen. We know of West Virginia, but I submit that there are probably many others across the country that are closing and have not been noted by the Wall Street Journal.

Forty States have major problems in terms of budget for the entire States. The recession has hit very hard. The mismanagement of the Reagan years, and the mismanagement of the Bush years is coming home. We are pouring more money into savings and loan associations than we are into maintaining the educational infrastructure or the physical infrastructure of the Nation. All of this is hitting all of our institutions. Libraries are very small. They have very little political clout, so they are just a preview, just a preview of coming attractions in terms of institutions which will be wiped out in their entirety if we do not change our policies, and turn the management of our Government around.

In this article, the Wall Street Journal has done a great service by listing all the States of the Union and the amount of money spent on libraries in each one of those States per capita. For the number of people, for each person in the State, the following amounts are spent. I will give a few examples from the article. New York leads the list, and we are proud in New York of the great amount of assistance that comes from the State, and the tradition of maintaining libraries at the local level, but even with this great effort we are so proud. We are only spending $29.48 per person for libraries in New York. The District of Columbia is to be congratulated, because the District of Columbia has resources which are quite meager compared to the State of New York, and they rank second, with an expenditure of $29.46 per person. And so it goes until we get down to Mississippi, which spends $6.58 per person; Arkansas spends $5.98 per person.

I will insert the article here:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 13, 1991]

MANY PUBLIC LIBRARIES SUFFER MAJOR BLOWS IN LOCAL BUDGET CRISES

(By James S. Hirsch)

POCA, W.VA.—When the one-room library closed down here in June, it was like a death in the family.

On the library's last day, children brought stuffed bears and flowers for the librarian. Later, residents who hadn't heard the news pounded on the locked wooden door of the building.

"They couldn't believe we were really closing," says Betty Hamilton, the librarian. "To a child, the library was always there. Then suddenly something is missing from their life. It's like when someone dies, there's a little empty space there."

The Poca library was one of three small branches closed last year in Putnam County, a bedroom community for Charleston and Huntington. Why? Each branch cost about $15,000 a year to operate—more than the county could afford.

TROUBLING TREND

Finally, the small libraries begged enough money to reopen part-time this week. But after making do for eight months, the people of the three communities offer a dark glimpse of life without libraries—and a warning to other areas of the country, both urban and rural, where many of the nation's 15,000 public libraries are struggling to survive.

Libraries face soaring costs for books, periodicals and computers just as their budgets are being squeezed by cash-strapped local governments. Few libraries have been closed completely, but officials are cutting hours, trimming staffs, slashing book and periodical budgets and leaving broken boilers and other problems unfixed.

The New York City library system has cut hours by 10% since 1988 and faces a new 8% budget cut. In Brooklyn last week, demonstrators draped library doors with black cloth to protest layoffs and service cuts, including programs affecting children. The Los Angeles system has been under a hiring freeze since last year that has left the libraries with about 110 positions unfilled, or 10% of the staff. In Dade County, Fla., library officials have to cut back by 3%, and that "may mean shutting smaller branches," a spokesman says.

In Philadelphia, the public library has canceled orders for 20,000 new books and has delayed reopening three branches that are undergoing capital improvements. "I just got a report that says we still have toilet paper but don't have paper towels," says Elliot Shelkrot, president and director of the Free Library of Philadelphia. "It gets down to basics."

Throughout the U.S., libraries are pleading for money. In a special election, residents in Rockland County, N.Y., went to the polls last week to vote on one issue: Whether to increase property taxes to raise $245,000 annually for public libraries in Suffern and Sloatsburg. The tax passed, 336 to 142.

GROWING ILLITERACY

The cutbacks come despite growing concern that illiteracy rates are rising and that workers don't have sufficient reading skills. The retrenchment is particularly painful

now beause library use traditionally goes up during recessions, when people flock to branches to seek out newspaper want-ads and books become an important source of free entertainment.

Public libraries are especially vulnerable in a slumping economy. Libraries usually don't charge fees and instead get most of their money from local governments. But today, may cities and counties, struggling with budget problems, are cutting services across the board. Libraries, considered less essential than services such as police and fire protection, often get the crumbs of a shrinking economic pie.

No help is coming from Washington. The Department of Education increased its allotment for public libraries to $132 million in 1990 from $74.5 million in 1981, an increase that library advocates say fails to keep up with inflation. And President Bush's new budget recommends a 73% cut, to $35 million.

A LARGE CIVIC ROLE

The library cutbacks have hit especially hard in rural America, where branches play a larger civic role than their urban counterparts. They often serve as cultural centers, social dens and auxiliaries to local grade schools. Yet public support is difficult to muster in the hardscrabble counties, where anti-tax fever runs high and where, according to Peggy Bias, director of the Putnam County, W.Va., library system, many adults "think a library's a luxury." She adds, "They didn't have it when they were growing up and don't see why they need it."

Few states need healthy libraries more than West Virginia, which is ranked 49th in the nation in state literacy ratings, according to U.S. Census figures. In fact, West Virginia has one of the nation's most innovative public library systems, thanks to the flamboyant state library commissioner, Frederic J. Glazer. During his 19-year tenure, Mr. Glazer has more than doubled the number of public libraries and installed a model computer network system with the help of shrewd marketing and irrepressible showmanship.

Testifying before a committee of state legislators in 1972, Mr. Glazer gave each member a five-cent pack of Life Savers. Because West Virginia was spending four cents per capita on library services at the time, Mr. Glazer told the lawmakers, "This pack costs more than we're spending for library service, and that's shameful."

His efforts paid off. West Virginia now spends $2.96 of state money per person on library service, compared with the national average of $1.37—but when spending from local governments is included, West Virginia is ranked near the bottom among states. Under Mr. Glazer's stewardship, the number of libraries in the state has risen to 185 from 90. In the early 1980s, a computer network was installed in 120 libraries, connecting remote mountainous communities with phone and microwave links, to tell library users where they can find books in the system. Satellite dishes are being put up in about 100 libraries this year, paid for by a private donation.

State funding, however, has been stagnant for several years, and makes up only 38% of the money needed to run the libraries. For all his progress, Mr. Glazer can't overcome economic reality. "Uncle Sam can bail out all these businesses, but he can't bail out a library," Mr. Glazer laments. "Libraries are just as important as Chrysler, and if they're uncertain, let them build cars with workers who can't read."

A 1979 WORLD BOOK

Even his best efforts couldn't prevent five branches from closing last year, including those in the small towns of Poca, Eleanor and Buffalo in Putnam County, which has a total population of 42,597. Holding 5,000 books each, these so-called "outpost" branches are squat prefabricated wooden structures that had been rolled into town. The buildings came without windows, but now each has one—only because the libraries used part of a small grant for books to do the construction.

When the Poca branch was in full swing, a financial adviser helped residents with tax forms. Copier and fax machines drew crowds. Rhododendrons bloomed in front, and Ms. Hamilton, the librarian, notarized wills, read stories to preschool children and allowed overdue book borrowers to pay fines with cans of food, which were donated to a soup kitchen. But the problems were obvious, too: The library's World Book is dated 1979.

Before the libraries got their reprieve, Putnam officials tried to keep the branches open with three proposed tax levies, but all failed. The most recent, in November, received 58.4% of the vote, just shy of the 60% needed for passage.

READING LESS

The closings cut deep wounds, not all of which will be healed by the limited reopenings. At Buffalo High School, entire classes depended on the library for research projects; after the building closed, students had to be bused to libraries in other towns. "It hurts, particularly with the better students," says Bill Sanders, the principal. "In a small town, anytime you lose something, you lose part of your life."

In Eleanor, six-year-old Traci Flynn would walk to the library and check out Garfield books. In the summer, she went for story hours, when the librarian read poems and fairy tales, led sing-alongs and served cookies and Kool-Aid. But all that ended last June when the library closed. The main county library is 10 miles away in Hurricane, and Traci's parents, who both work, rarely had time to take her there. Traci's school doesn't have a library, so she read few books. "We have books, but she doesn't like to read the same ones over again," says her mother, Carla Flynn.

In Poca, it used to take Carol Carroll three minutes to drive to the library, where her two children would check out Judy Blume books. With the library closed, it took 20 minutes to reach the main library, so trips were reduced. "I was so naive, I never thought a library could close," she says. "It's like a church packing up and hitting the road. It's just supposed to be there."

In January, the county library commission asked for $40,000 from the Putnam County Commission and the Putnam County School Board to reopen the branches. The school board, which already gives $40,000 a year, turned down the request, suggesting the branches use volunteers instead of paid librarians.

"We have a lot of justifiable causes, and we can't fund all of them," says Sam Sentelle, the school superintendent. Noting that all of Putman's high schools and middle schools have libraries, he adds, "We need more books for our own libraries." In addition, he says, "The electorate has turned down tax money for the library, and if the schools gave their money to the library, it would circumvent popular will."

The county, however, agreed to put up $20,000, in addition to the $71,000 it already spends. That was enough to reopen the branches for 30 hours a week starting this week. On Monday, Putnam library officials cut a red ribbon on the staircase leading to the front door and children from a local elementary school brought Ms. Hamilton flowers and a heart-shaped balloon inscribed with the message, "You're special." But the joy could be short-lived: If more money isn't found, even the parttime hours will be cut in half.

THE $11,000 LIBRARIAN

Other libraries, like the one in Peterstown (pop 640), a poor tobacco-farming community on the Virginia border, get by on a shoestring and a prayer. Nestled amid oak and maple trees in the Appalachian Mountain Range, the carousel-shaped wooden library has been used for wedding receptions, slumber parties, scout meetings and political forums.

Students at the local grade school, which lacks a book collection of its own, come frequently. On a recent day, the doors fly open and 25 fourth graders noisily drop off books, then rush for the stacks to find Hardy Boys, the Black Stallion, and Nancy Drew. When the children leave, librarian Annette Rule-Place and her three volunteers grab the returned volumes and scurry to the shelves. They have a half-hour to replace about 100 books before the next class arrives.

The library almost closed in the mid-1980s. Monroe County had cut back its funding after money from federal revenue sharing dried up (a problem that also hit Putnam, where federal revenue sharing once accounted for 16% of the county's budget). Ms. Rule-Place laid off her one paid assistant, cut magazine subscriptions and opened the library only three days a week. Even though the county had no book stores, support for its two public libraries has been difficult to gain. The libraries twice asked voters to approve a property tax levy, but lost both times.

So. Ms. Rule-Place's library has hung on through private donations and grants, which, together with public money, make up its $24,240 budget. Two years ago, it landed an additional $25,000 state grant, which has allowed the library to stay open six days a week.

Ms. Rule-Place and her volunteers also scrape up nickels and dimes. On the checkout desk sits a large tin can for contributions. So far today: 37 cents. The library once raised a few dollars when Ms. Rule-Place dressed up some children as Little Bo Peep, gave them a tin cup and sent them to a mall. "I went as Mother Goose," she says proudly.

A native West Virginian, Ms. Rule-Place has used her own money for crayons, glue, pencils and other supplies. She is also the judge for the grade school spelling bee and coordinator for the county's Girl Scouts. Her annual salary is $11,000. "I want these kids to have the same educational opportunities as kids from New York or Pennsylvania, and I'm going to do my damnedest to make sure they do," she says.

Her 14-year career as a librarian has a storybook twist. She met her third husband here. He was standing in adult nonfiction and it was love at first sight. They married two years later. "All good things," Ms. Rule-Place says, "happen in a library."

Libraries' Lament—States ranked by all money spent per capita for public libraries in 1989, preliminary data in dollars

New York	$29.48
District of Columbia	29.46
Maryland	24.45

Alaska	23.64
Ohio	23.34
Connecticut	22.10
New Jersey	21.16
Wyoming	19.83
Washington	19.81
Illinois	19.25
Massachusetts	19.18
Minnesota	18.62
Colorado	18.01
Indiana	17.95
Hawaii	17.23
Wisconsin	16.53
Virginia	16.29
California	15.89
Kansas	15.85
Oregon	14.74
Arizona	14.53
New Hampshire	14.46
Michigan	13.83
Utah	16.64
Missouri	13.37
Nebraska	13.16
South Dakota	13.09
Maine	12.66
Vermont	12.37
Florida	11.93
Iowa	11.85
Rhode Island	11.71
Louisiana	11.53
New Mexico	11.34
Pennsylvania	10.99
North Carolina	10.55
Oklahoma	10.24
Georgia	10.06
Idaho	9.84
Nevada	9.65
Texas	8.94
South Carolina	8.72
Delaware	8.22
Alabama	8.13
North Dakota	8.01
Tennessee	7.70
Montana	7.56
West Virginia	7.46
Kentucky	7.04
Mississippi	6.58
Arkansas	5.98

Source: National Center for Education Statistics.

These statistics come from the National Center for Education Statistics.

All over, we are spending a very paltry sum for libraries. Again, in a serious contradiction, if we want to improve education, then it is important that everyone take a close look at what we are doing with our libraries. The analogy is not far-fetched when they say that to close libraries at a time when we want to reform and improve education, it is similar to trying to fight a major war at the same time we close down the ammunition dump, or the warehouse for spare parts. These contradictions are particularly strange at a time when the President has galvanized and mobilized the entire leadership of the country, corporations, and Governors, around a set of education goals. The President has six goals he has proposed. The Governors have endorsed the six goals. All education policy is going to be very much affected by these goals that have been set forth in the next few years. Probably what the President will be saying tomorrow, part of what the President will be saying tomorrow when he announces the new initiatives on education will relate to these goals.

Goal 1, in summary form, by the year 2000, all children in America will start school, ready to learn. That is a very ambitious goal. Underneath that goal they have the objective of trying to educate parents, so parents can nurture their children better, and enable their children to be better prepared when they start school. Education research continues to emphasize the importance of exposing children to literature at an early age, in order to promote the development of language among children, and other reading readiness skills they will need when they enter school.

□ 1910

A 1978 study by William Teal, for example, found that the children who were most successful in acquiring reading skills were those who had been exposed to a wide variety of printed materials, and had been read to regularly by parents and other care givers. For a variety of reasons, and most of these reasons are financial, this kind of regular and intensive exposure to literature is not provided to many young children in family day care and even in some center-based care arrangements.

In recent years public libraries in many communities have been trying to fill the gap for our day care centers and parents. For example, the Howard County Public Library's Baby-Wise Program has developed a series of teaching kits which they regularly deliver along with books, toys, and educational games to the family day care providers in their community.

Another example, the Hennepin County Public Library conducts workshops for family day care providers on the selection and use of children's literature which the county social service agency has made a part of its in-service training requirement for providers.

A special preschool bookmobile makes scheduled stops at family day care homes and child care centers throughout the area. That is done in Hennepin County in Minnesota.

The Brooklyn Public Library has a Child Place Program, and it serves 45,000 preschool children and their caretakers each year. The staff of the Brooklyn Public Library teaches parents, day care providers and others how to prepare their children to read and learn.

The New York Public Library which covers Manhattan, Staten Island and the Bronx in New York, maintains deposit collections of books and materials on the premises of many Head Start and child care facilities and conducts regular workshops for child care providers on the selection of materials for use for preschool children.

In Florida, the Jacksonville Public Library conducts regular reading workshops for functionally iliterate parents and their children. While the children attend a story hour program, their parents are taught how to read using the same books their children are listening to. Later the parents then read the story to their children.

In Oregon, the Rouge River Public Library has an outreach program in which volunteers visit the families of the newborn to give them a library card, to deliver a presentation on the services of the library for parents of young children and to instruct them in how to read to children.

These are only a few examples of how goal number one of the President and the Governors, preparing young children so that they are ready to learn when they enter school, is facilitated by libraries, already being facilitated by libraries, and so much more could be done if the Federal Government would understand the kinds of supportive services and the kind of supportive role that libraries can play in the realization of a goal number one.

Goal No. 2 of the President, by the year 2000 the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent. At this point 25 percent of our students are dropping out of high school. In concentrated areas like Chicago and New York, 50 percent of the high school students are dropping out before they graduate.

Libraries have helped a great deal, but it is my understanding that research indicates that youth who are the most likely to drop out are those who are the least prepared academically and are the least involved in school activities.

Libraries have been playing a major role in targeting special services to this category of students in order to help improve their academic performance and keep them from dropping out of school.

There are numerous summer programs that are conducted by libraries. In the Shawnee Mission in Kansas, in South Carolina and Illinois, all have extensive summer reading programs serving thousands of children.

Many of them also have after-school programs targeted for the same category of young people in order to help them to learn to read and be able to prepare themselves better for their classroom work.

Such youngsters will not drop out of high school because they are acclimated and able to cope with the environment and reap great benefits from the experience. That is goal No. 2.

Goal No. 3 is by the year 2000, American students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12. They will have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including English, mathematics, science, history, and geography.

Report after report on educational reform in recent years has proclaimed the importance of reorienting our current curricula and our current methods

of instruction so that we can better develop what is called information literacy. Literacy means many things, and one of the new forms of literacy that we have to consider is information literacy, the new set of skills which are required in a knowledge-based economy.

Information literacy means a person knows how to use information to solve problems and to obtain the objectives that they want to obtain.

For example, in its 1986 report, "A Nation Prepared," which was published by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, they declared that—

> The skills needed now in our society are not routine skills. Our economy will be increasingly dependent on people who have a good intuitive grasp of the ways in which all kinds of physical and social systems work. Such people will have the need and the ability to learn all the time, as the knowledge required to do their work twists and turns with new challenges and the progress of science and technology. They will not come to the workplace knowing all they have to know, but knowing how to figure out what they need to know, where to get it, and how to make meaning out of it. We are describing people who have the tools they need to think for themselves, people who can act independently and with others, who can render critical judgment and contribute constructively to many enterprises, whose knowledge is wide ranging and whose understanding runs deep.

Information literacy is the foundation for all other skills in a knowledge-based economy, the one skill through which all other skills and competencies can be acquired and maintained. It is, in short, knowing how to learn. Information literacy is knowing how to learn. Information literacy is the great contribution that libraries alone can make.

Inevitably, libraries must be central to developing these new information-access skills and facilitating the lifelong learning that has become an economic imperative. As one library educator has put it:

> If the challenge is to learn how to learn and how to place one's learning within a broader societal and information environment, then libraries and resources become the logical center for such learning.

Goal No. 4 of the President and the Governors—by the year 2000 U.S. students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement. By the year 2000, our students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement.

All of the recent reports concerning the crisis in math and science education have focused on the need to reconfigure our current authoritarian instructional approach to one in which there is a greater participation and more hands-on learning by students. Public and school libraries have shown themselves to be effective partners in this more interactive instructional method. These libraries provide multimedia materials to supplement classroom instruction and they offer a noncompetitive environment in which independent self-directed learning is facilitated. The Whitehall, MT, High School Library, for example, worked with the school's science department to develop a Videotaping Through Microscopes Program to enhance student participation in difficult microbiology experiments and in learning how to use the microscope.

Public and school libraries also promote math and science education by using new technologies to give teachers, students, and parents greater access to science and math information and resources. The Radnor High School Library in Pennsylvania, for example, instructs science students in the use of electronic data bases like Dialog for performing science research. Automated bibliographic networks allow users to identify, locate, and obtain highly specialized information from libraries throughout the Nation.

A number of libraries also sponsor instructional television networks which provide instructional programming to the classroom and to the community at large. In Leon County, FL, for example, the library-sponsored instructional television network offered a series of after-school programs designed to help students with their homework and to familiarize and involve parents with what their children are learning in the classroom.

Libraries also provide students and their families with free access to microcomputers and other expensive information technologies which they may not be able to purchase on their own. Last year, 44,000 people used the free Apple microcomputers offered by the New York Public Library at 54 different locations.

□ 1920

Many of the people who use them are students working on classroom assignments. The library is the only place in all of New York where microcomputers can be used for free.

Goal No. 5 of the President and Governors reads as follows:

> Goal No. 5: By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

Libraries continue to play an instrumental role in the battle against illiteracy. They have proven to be particularly effective in reaching and educating adults with the lowest literacy levels. Frequently, adults with low literacy skills have had humiliating experiences in school classrooms and are more comfortable with literacy programs provided at their neighborhood library.

There have been some effective outreach programs conducted by libraries in this area.

Mr. Speaker, because they do not have the same stigma as schools and other public institutions, libraries are an important way to reach people who are functionally illiterate. The Onodaga County, NY, Public Library conducts outreach for its literacy program at the waiting rooms of social service agencies; libraries in South Carolina target outreach to persons at substance abuse treatment centers; the Missoula Public Library in Montana offers a literacy program at a local mall; and the Lane County Library in Oregon uses a bookmobile to deliver literacy materials and instruction to rural residents.

They provide services to special populations all the time. Libraries have also been effective in delivering literacy instruction to members of special populations who are often overlooked by other providers. In Colorado, a library-sponsored bookmobile provides low-literacy reading materials and literacy and English-as-a-Second-Language instruction to migrant farmworkers throughout the State. The Chicago Public Library offers library services and peer tutoring to inmates at the Cook County jail. The New York Public Library has provided English-as-a-Second-Language instruction to 11,000 adults and literacy instruction to another 3,500 since 1984.

Lifelong learning is a part of this goal. As the "peoples' university", the public library is also an essential resource for the pursuit of lifelong learning by adults. Last year in New York State alone, over 428,000 people obtained job, career, and education information and counseling services through their local library. These users received career counseling and advice on developing a résumé, information on job and educational opportunities, and participated in programs on how to start small- and home-based businesses.

Goal No. 6 reads as follows: By the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conductive to learning.

Violence in our schools is a major problem. But part of that violence is due to the fact that they are confronted with children who have difficulties in coping with the processes of schooling because they got off on the wrong foot, they did not have any nurturing parents, they did not start school with a readiness to learn, they were not helped in any way to master the one important skill that precedes all other skills, and that is the skill of reading.

This cycle of hopelessness often leads to dropouts, drug abuse, alcoholism, and begins in the early grades and can be counteracted only by a massive infusion of Federal aid to make certain that this goal, goal No. 6, as well as all of the other goals that have been set

forth by the Governors and the President are realized in a meaningful manner.

To talk alone is not enough; I have tried to put out the fact that we have many contradictions. I hope that we can persuade the administration. I hope that the new Secretary of Education can be persuaded to begin a more systematic, a more logical and a more scientifically based approach to the improvement and reform of education in America.

If such an approach is begun, then I think there would be no need to make the argument that at the center of any learning enterprise there are always libraries, if that learning enterprise is to be successful.

Libraries are analogous to the ammunition dumps in war or the spare parts warehouses where the equipment for fighting vehicles is provided. If you do not have an ammunition dump, if you do not have the spare parts, the war effort will certainly falter and not succeed.

As we go forward and we see the President's initiatives on education, the new initiatives, tomorrow, I hope that the contradictions that are so apparent between the President's letter concerning National Library Week and his praise of libraries and his placement of zero in the budget for libraries, that kind of contradiction we will not have to live with much longer.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join in the special order to celebrate National Library Week.

As a U.S. Representative from Sacramento, CA, I can take great pride in the library services of Sacramento. My good friend Gary Strong, California State librarian, works hard to being quality library service to the people of California. Working in concert, the Sacramento Public Library and the libraries of our elementary and secondary schools do much to enrich the educational lives of our young, our old, the blind and disabled, as well as the curious reader of fiction, history, biography, science, or religion.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, I have along with my California colleague and the ranking minority member, JERRY LEWIS, had to become closely involved in library and information science as we have reviewed the activities of the Library of Congress and the depository library program of the Government Printing Office. One of the pleasures of this chairmanship has been an opportunity to work with librarians from across the country to assure that the information needs of the American people are met by these two institutions.

Our Founding Fathers were men of letters who had a vision of the Nation which they wanted to build. One of their first acts in providing for the move of the seat of government from Philadelphia to Washington was to establish a library for the Congress and to appropriate $5,000 for the purchase of books. This small appropriation and this large vision brought into being what is now the greatest library in the world, the Library of Congress—a national base of knowledge for the American people.

After the British burned the Capitol in 1814, using library books as kindling, it was Thomas Jefferson himself, then in retirement at Monticello, who offered for sale his personal library as a replacement. In offering his library to Congress he said:

> I do not know that it contains any branch of science which Congress would wish to exclude * * * there is, in fact, no subject to which a Member of Congress may not have occasion to refer.

In 1897, the Library was moved to the original building across the street, the Thomas Jefferson Building. This building is one of the grandest architectural monuments in the United States. I am pleased to report to my colleagues that phase one of the renovation/restoration of this building is now complete. The main reading room, which has been closed for over 3 years, will reopen on June 3. I urge my colleagues to attend one of the special previews of this grand symbol of liberty and learning the Librarian of Congress has arranged for Members of Congress. Not only is the past preserved for our grandchildren, but future access to knowledge is insured. Modern technology has been installed to allow for ready access to the Library's computers and to provide for a national information base in the upcoming century.

Let me recite a few facts about our Library which we have so wisely deemed the library of the American people.

Today the Library of Congress has 97 million items in all formats—manuscripts, prints, photographs, motion pictures, maps, atlases, music, sound recordings, computer programs, and so forth. Some 470 languages are represented in the collections. The Library receives 31,000 items a day from all over the world of which 7,000 are selected for the collections. The Library has personal papers of 23 Presidents of the United States and over 535 miles of books shelves.

The Library has six overseas offices to collect materials in countries without a developed book trade—in some of these overseas offices books and other materials are collected for other major libraries as well as our own.

The Library of Congress, since 1902, has provided cataloging information to libraries throughout the United States—saving them in excess of $370 million annually. This information, now electronically stored, has become the foundation for the national information base.

As a pilot project, the Library has offered on-line access to its data bases to 50 State libraries. Thirty-three States are now on-line with the Library of Congress.

The Congressional Research Service provides scholarly research and information to the Congress on public policy issues and answers over 500,000 research and reference requests a year.

Through the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, the Library circulates over 20 million talking books and books in braille to over 700,000 readers in all 50 States and in U.S. territories. There is a network of 160 regional and subregional libraries across the country.

The Library administers the U.S. copyright laws as well as taking the lead in insuring international protection of intellectual property for U.S. citizens—over 600,000 claims to copyright each year are registered. Copyright also contributes to development of the Library of Congress collections through a mandatory deposit provision of the act.

The Library's Center for the Book promotes reading and literacy, using commercial and cable television, and coordinating activities with 23 State Centers for the Book, including the one in Sacramento.

Currently, the Library is developing more and more programs to share its resources with the American people. This is done through interlibrary loan, through traveling exhibits, answering over 2 million reference questions each year, and through a new initiative, the American memory project in which our subcommittee has taken a personal interest. Using laser technology and interactive video and audio disks the Library collections can be made more readily available on a large scale through libraries across the country. A pilot program from this new technology, locating equipment and disks in high school, public, and university libraries, has been developed and will be expanded to 30 more test sites this fall.

The Library of Congress is also reaching out to the world. As a result of the plunder and devastation of the Central Library in Kuwait and the Kuwait University Library, the Library of Congress will be extending a hand to the Kuwaitis to help them replace what is lost. The Library of Congress has almost all of the Kuwaiti newspapers on microfilm as well as many of their government publications. In fact, the Library has holdings that the Kuwaitis are unlikely to find anywhere else in the Middle East. The replacement of much of the Kuwaiti heritage is only possible because of the universality of our Library of Congress.

The Library of Congress is also a center for cultural programs, including concerts, poetry and literature readings, motion picture showings, seminars, folklore workshops, and so forth. I believe it most appropriate that the people's representatives in Congress can take credit for developing and nurturing the finest intellectual resources known to civilization. It was Thomas Jefferson, the virtual godfather of the Library of Congress, who said: "Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppression of body and mind will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of the day."

Another program, dear to the heart of librarians, and one for which the Congress of the United States provides special jurisdiction through the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations and the Joint Committee on Printing, is the Government Depository Library Program administered by the U.S. Government Printing Office.

To help fulfill its responsibility to inform the public on the policies and programs of the Federal Government, Congress established the Depository Library Program. This program is based upon three principles: First, with certain exceptions, all Government publications shall be made available to depository libraries; second, depository libraries shall be located in each State and congressional district in order

to make Government publications widely available; and third, these Government publications shall be available for the free use of the general public.

Publications are supplied to libraries in both paper and microform formats and in some cases in electronic format.

It is interesting to note that before the establishment of designated depositories, or any systematic method for the distribution of public documents, special acts of Congress were passed at various times providing for the printing of a sufficient number of copies of the public journals of the Senate and House of Representatives for distribution to the executives of the several States and each branch of the State and territorial legislations.

I have learned the importance of Government depository libraries to the American people as well as the dedication of libraries in making their Government's information available to the citizenry. I have visited the depository library of the University of California at Davis to observe firsthand the usefulness of these publications to our university students.

Mr. Speaker during National Library Week I think that each of us should reflect on the role that the U.S. Congress has played in providing vital information and knowledge resources for our constituents. What better role could we as the people's representatives have? I salute America's librarians who do so much for our country.

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, the glory and soul of freedom and democracy is intelligence. Mr. Speaker, it is with this in mind, that I salute National Library Week, April 14 through April 20, 1991.

This special week is an appropriate time to commence preparation for the White House Conference on Library and Information Services scheduled for this July in the Washington Convention Center.

The goals of this convention accurately reflect a sense of transition and potential at this moment in the continuum of history. The goals focus on systems for enhancing access to information, cultivating literacy, increasing productivity and perpetuating our liberties in their pristine forms. It is ultimately to this latter objective that I address my remarks.

There is so much information in existence, that every level of business, industry and government is practically buried under an avalanche of knowledge. But this is mostly wasted, unless the specifically pertinent information is efficiently united with the person or organization that needs it. This capacity is well exemplified by the Library of Congress, which I commend.

But this capacity must be available at all levels of American life as an essential element of our infrastructure. Improved library and information systems have the potential for combating illiteracy as well. To teach Americans to read, particularly adults, will avoid wasting human resources, and recycle talent and skill into the American work force.

Learning to read comes full circle when it becomes an intrinsic pleasure for those who discover new vision, adventure and autonomy.

And finally, synthesizing the seemingly unwieldy universe of information, and making it efficiently accessible will preserve the most cherished elements of our American heritage—our freedoms and liberties.

During my life of public service, I have all too often seen proposed legislation and policies which have failed in the past, or which lose value under the light of germane information. An informed public is much less likely to repeat past failures. Indeed, as we have seen in Eastern Europe and briefly in China, once the free flow of information is uninhibited, freedoms and liberties flourish.

The relationship is inseparable; the level of efficient access to information is directly linked to every aspect of the quality of life. Consequently, I ask my colleagues and constituents alike to support the future of our heritage by supporting the goals of National Library Week and the White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, "Kids Who Read Succeed" is more than a slogan for National Library Week. It should be the rallying call to action on behalf of our Nation's children, for reading is the most important discipline in education and the basis of success in almost every endeavor. Exposure to books and reading at an early age is the key to creating a desire to read. That desire leads to eventual success in learning to read and to achievement in every aspect of life.

The public library plays a vital role in our country's effort to become a Nation of readers. Millions of preschoolers are introduced to the pleasures of reading by a skilled children's librarian. In South Carolina alone in 1990, over 5,000 preschool programs were held in public libraries and 2,500 visits were made outside the library to child care centers and other agencies to bring books and children together. Public libraries support and assist parents in reading aloud to young children and in encouraging reading throughout the years of childhood and adolescence.

Library Services and Construction Act funds are used to employ trained children's librarians, to provide continuing education opportunities for librarians, to purchase books and other materials, and to establish demonstration programs for reaching children and parents with books and services. Programs begun with LSCA funds have been a catalyst for the establishment of similar programs in other libraries as information about these successful programs has been disseminated to other libraries around the country.

Our children are our most valuable resource. Public libraries are in the mainstream to insure that we have literate, informed and productive citizens today and in the future. We must make it possible for libraries to place increased emphasis on the service to children and youth and continued LSCA funding is vital to this effort.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, resources as varied as braille, children's masks, encyclopedias, periodicals and travel guides can all be found in libraries across the country. This is proof that libraries are not made but grow and expand to meet the needs of the communities they serve. Here in Washington, we can take great pride that the money the Federal Government has allocated in the Library Services and Construction Act and the Higher Education Act has been utilized in such beneficial and diverse ways.

Community initiatives such as "Community Reads 91" in my home district, appeals to businesses to sponsor publicity for literacy awareness. The library is no longer for the elite or those who can read. Its shelves are open to everyone, and the wealth available on those pages can belong to anyone, with some assistance. I am proud that we can boast of a very strong volunteer start on literacy programs, evidence of community commitment to the library system.

Libraries can not be lost in this year's budget shuffle. Our "Education President" must acknowledge the community resource we have in libraries. They preserve our history, tickle our imaginations and broaden our horizons. They are indeed a national treasure.

Mr. RAVENEL. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting these remarks on behalf of the South Carolina State Library on this day, April 17, 1991.

We have all read and heard a great deal about the problems of America's educational system. In order for our public schools and institutions of higher learning to be able to provide the educational foundation our young people need, the libraries at the heart of these institutions must have the resources they need.

In January 1988, Congress recognized the importance of libraries by authorizing the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services. This White House Conference will explore such topics as how libraries can more effectively support literacy and adult education programs, how to provide business and industry with improved access to needed information, and how to best meet the needs of special groups such as children, senior citizens, and the disabled. The conference will be held here in Washington this summer and will bring together a cross section of librarians, library trustees, civic leaders, and library users. The three delegates from my district illustrate the diversity of the participants; one is a public television station manager, one a college professor, and one a best-selling author.

Delegates to the White House Conference will establish this Nation's agenda for libraries and library services into the next century. America's libraries must be able to rise to the challenges of satisfying the diverse needs of our diverse society. The White House Conference on Library and Information Services is a worthwhile endeavor which deserves the wholehearted support of the Members of Congress.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, one of the indicators of the quality of life in a community is the quality of its public library. As South Carolina's population increases along with library usage, our public library facilities are experiencing growing pains. In one recent survey, nearly 1 million more square feet of space is needed in order for public libraries in South Carolina to provide adequate facilities.

An LSCA title II construction grant provides an incentive to a community to raise matching funds for construction or renovation of its library facilities. Because Federal funds must be matched with equal or larger amounts of State or local funds, construction grants are an inducement to lower levels of government to enter into a partnership with the Federal

Government and to share responsibility for providing adequate library facilities. In my home county of Lexington, a title II grant of $100,000 will be matched with more than $700,000 in local funds to convert a former department store into a library.

In 1990, title II construction planning involved 23 projects in 20 South Carolina counties. Continued support of LSCA title II construction funding can make a real difference in the excellence of library facilities in South Carolina and across our Nation.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] for sponsoring this special order on libraries.

Libraries are the intellectual, the social, and the economic underpinnings of any community. And, although libraries are mainly administered by local government, they merit attention at the Federal level, especially now when libraries across the Nation in large cities and small towns are financially strapped.

Mr. Speaker, through the course of history, we have read and been taught about the ice age, stone age, the iron age, and the bronze age, just to name a few. Today, we are in the midst of the information age. And, libraries are the only institutions dedicated to amassing, collating, and cataloging this vast and diverse body of knowledge so we, the users, can apply it to the betterment of our fellow humans and of the planet we inhabit together.

To address the challenges which the information explosion poses and to capitalize on the promise this knowledge explosion offers, libraries must become stronger and healthier and this strength and health depends heavily on adequate local, State, and Federal funding.

It is propitious, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services will take place in July. White House conferences over the years have served to increase public awareness of issues of national importance. This one, I devotedly hope, will follow this pattern because our libraries—our precious national treasures—will only be able to survive their economic woes if the people of the United States are alerted to their problems and are energized to solve those selfsame problems.

I have worked with Ms. Harriet Henderson, who came to my community from the Newport News, VA, library system, since she took over the reins of the Louisville Free Public Library system. I have found her to be a most thoroughgoing professional and a person determined to upgrade and improve the Louisville and Jefferson County library system.

I have nominated Ms. Henderson to be an at-large delegate to the White House Conference on Library and Information Services which will take place this July. Since she has extensive experience on the ground, as we term it, as director in Newport News and now Louisville, and since Harriet has exhibited the traits of leadership and stamina which will be required to develop the communitywide consensus and the requisite resources—human and financial—the job of restoring our library system takes, I am certain Ms. Henderson would make a solid contribution to the White House Conference.

Library support will always be a largely local function, and, if our libraries are to remain equal to the challenge of the information age, local citizens and local governments will have to do the bulk of the work and provide the bulk of the money. But that does not mean there is no role for the Federal Government. There is a role and it is vital. The role involves financial grants, such as those provided under the Library Services and Construction Act, which among other things, helps local library systems defray the cost of construction and renovation of library facilities and link-up with other information services to provide a range of resources to users, and supports communities which have particularly serious library problems.

The President's fiscal year 1992 budget—in another case of misplaced priorities—recommended a 75-percent cut in our funding for libraries to only $35 million. Fortunately, our Democratic budget resolution, before the House today, would restore the funds cut by the President. Our budget blueprint would provide total library funding for fiscal year 1992 of $148 million, a $5 million increase from the $143 million provided by the Congress in fiscal year 1991. I applaud the Budget Committee on its recognition of the need for Federal assistance for libraries, and I hope we can do even better by our Nation's libraries in the years ahead.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by again thanking the gentleman from New York for taking this special order and asking permission to extend at this point material about my father and me which appeared in Whitney North Seymour and Elizabeth N. Layne's book on libraries titled, "For the People: Fighting for Public Libraries," and an article from the April 19 Washington Post by Haynes Johnson which supports our Nation's public library system:

FOR THE PEOPLE: FIGHTING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

(By Whitney North Seymour, Jr. and Elizabeth N. Layne)

THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

Romano Mazzoli grew up in the little mountain village of Maniago in northern Italy. When he was a small child, the family home caught fire and he suffered extensive burns which left his face badly scarred. In 1914, shortly after he turned eleven, Romano's father moved his wife and children to the United States, so he could join a family-owned tile, terrazzo, and marble business in Louisville, Kentucky. Three months after they arrived in Louisville, the boy's father died. Romano was sent to live with relatives.

He went to the local public school where, because he could speak no English, he was placed in the first grade. His embarrassment at being a large boy among small children was compounded by his disfiguring facial scar. He felt himself a misfit, and even though he began to advance rapidly in school as he learned to read and speak English, his relatives took him out of school when he reached seventh grade and apprenticed him in the family business.

Romano Mazzoli had a strong native intelligence. He was dextrous, imaginative, ingenious, intuitive, and a tremendously hard worker. He soon mastered the difficult craft of laying tile, setting terrazzo and mosaics, erecting marble, and doing decorative plasterwork. Before long he was a master mechanic, and soon a job foreman. As the business expanded, Romano was sent out of town to run jobs in distant cities, where he stayed at the branch YMCA or a local rooming house. The time after work hours was spent reading whatever he could lay his hands on. He haunted the public library every place he went. he developed an interest in music. Simultaneously he began to develop self-confidence and a love for his adopted country.

Eventually Romano Mazzoli went into business for himself. By hard work and the support of a devoted wife, the business flourished. He earned enough to send his three children to school for the education he never had. He personally taught them to respect and love books and music.

Today one of those children is a member of the United States Congress, who proudly carries on his father's name—Representative Romano L. Mazzoli of the Third District of Kentucky. Congressman Mazzoli speaks feeling of the impact of the public library on three generations of his family:

Many times over the years, Dad told me that, in his judgment, he was "Americanized" by the free pubic library system in the city of Louisville. What Dad meant by this, of course, was that the libraries enabled him to gain the knowledge and the understanding and the appreciation of things around him which he did not acquire in the formal setting of a classroom. The acquisition of this body of knowledge—in the countless hours he spent in libraries around the country—gave Dad the confidence to open up to the world around him and to open up to himself. The free public library system enabled him—a man of few means—to grow socially and intellectually.

I am sure that because of my dad's great love of books and of the printed word, I acquired a love of books: a love affair which continues to the present day.

And, as I look around my son's room, I see that this respect for and love of the written word has been transferred from my father through me to my son. He is only a junior in high school, yet he subscribes to four classical book clubs and is acquiring valuable book sets which he will have use of all the days of his life.

When Thomas Jefferson wrote his poetic introduction to the Declaration of Independence, he singled out three "unalienable" rights with which we have been endowed: "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness." As the experience of the Mazzoli family so graphically shows, probably no institution contributes more to the citizen's Pursuit of Happiness than the nation's public libraries.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 19, 1991]

PUTTING THE SQUEEZE ON LIBRARIES

(By Haynes Johnson)

In affluent, pleasantly suburban Potomac, a community blessed with good schools and public-spirited citizens, residents have learned through the Potomac Gazette that their admirable public library faces a problem. Soaring Montgomery County deficits are forcing cuts in staff and curtailment of popular programs. Further trims may be needed as county officials wrestle with proposals to reduce library hours and eliminate full and part-time staff positions to meet budgetary shortfalls.

"It's sad not to be able to do as much," says Larry Dickter, who heads Potomac Library's adult services. He adds that "we're experiencing a sense of loss" not only because of valued colleagues affected but also because of the prospect of further reduction of programs and services.

It is not an isolated problem. Even as he spoke this week, public library representatives from around the nation were cornering their representatives and senators on Capitol Hill. They had come to lobby for restoration of proposed Bush administration budget cuts that represent, as the American Library Association puts it, "yet another attempt to eliminate federal library programs."

The Bush proposals, requesting a cut of more than 75 percent in Education Department library programs—from the $143 million appropriated last year to $35 million—comes after the "zeroing-out" Reagan-era slashes in federal funds provided states and local governments. The now-familiar Reagan rationale was that the federally assisted library programs had been well established and that states and localities were more than able to maintain them.

That may have been true during the boom of the 1980s. But that bubble has burst. Like the federal government, state and local governments are battling increasing record deficits. Caught in the vice are such crucial institutions as public libraries that no longer can turn so confidently or easily to federal or local governments for help.

Across the nation, public library systems large and small are in the midst of hard times. As in Potomac, big-city libraries are being forced to slash staffs, freeze hiring levels, cancel purchases of new book orders and computers, delay opening new branch systems and cut programs and services affecting adults and children.

The reasons for this dismaying situation are not obscure or even that complicated. They are part of the legacy bequeathed Americans from the freebooters who had full reign over the nation's destinies in the last decade. Evidence of that reckless, spendthrift decade's disasters continues to accumulate, and not only in the obvious growing problems of debt and deficits. News this week of the federal seizure of First Executive Corp.'s California life-insurance unit—the nation's single largest insurance failure—comes after the collapse of the junk-bond market, the savings and loan debacle, the real estate market Waterloo and increasing strains on the national banking system. All are consequences of the policies and attitudes of the '80s.

In the context of the present, with so much dramatic news of war and starvation and recession and unrest beating on people daily, the plight of America's public libraries is, not surprisingly, largely ignored. That doesn't mean that ordinary citizens are uncaring. On the contrary, they care greatly as was evidenced by demonstrators who hung black cloth across library doors in Brooklyn recently to protest new layoffs and service cuts.

To its credit, the Wall Street Journal devoted Page One "leader" space to a major article about the woes of public libraries during the decisive Persian Gulf ground-war assaults. The article began by focusing on the closing of a one-room library in Poca, W. Va., an event that reporter James S. Hirsch likened to a death in the family.

"On the library's last day," he wrote, "children brought stuffed bears and flowers for the librarian. Later, residents who hadn't heard the news pounded on the locked wooden door of the building."

He quoted the librarian, Betty Hamilton, as saying: "They couldn't believe we were really closing. To a child, the library was always there. Then something is missing from their life. It's like when someone dies, there's a little empty space there."

That, in essence, is what's happening with the nation's libraries. They are not in danger of dying, but they are being diminished. As they decline, they take America down with them.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the special orders today in recognition of National Library Week. During this week, we take time to pay tribute to the many services that our libraries provide.

Older Americans are the fastest growing segment of our Nation's population. Older Americans presently comprise 13 percent of South Carolina's population, and this number is increasing every year. Because of its mild climate and comparatively low cost of living, South Carolina has been ranked as the third most desirable State for retirement, and retirees are choosing to live in South Carolina in ever increasing numbers.

Many of our older citizens have special needs which the libraries of our State are attempting to address. Library Services and Construction Act [LSCA] funds have enabled our public libraries to develop innovative programs to reach these senior citizens. These programs include personal delivery of library books for homebound patrons, armchair traveler programs in nursing homes, and providing magnification equipment to patrons with vision problems. The York County Library in my district recently coordinated a senior citizens fair, in which elderly residents could obtain information about all the services that are available to them from different local and State agencies. This library also published a directory of these agencies and services and distributed it to the public.

These valuable services need to be made available to our senior citizens. Continued LSCA funding is vital for public libraries to be able to continue this work.

STRENGTHENING U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE BALTIC STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, today, I join my good friend from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, in introducing a bill which strengthens U.S. policy toward the blossoming democracies in the Baltics.

The courageous Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania need our help. Soviet forces have ruled the Baltic States ruthlessly since World War II, with only erratic support from the United States. While United States policy up to now has been nonrecognition of the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States, the time is right to help these brave people break the shackles of Soviet domination once and for all, by supporting their desires for freedom and independence.

Since Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait last August 2, most of us in Congress have focused on events in the Persian Gulf, and for good reason. In January, the Soviet Union took advantage of our gulf war preoccupation by undertaking an act of brutal aggression in Lithuania. Recalling Stalin's action in Hungary in 1956, Mr. Gorbachev called in the tanks against the Lithuanian people.

Soviet troops forcibly seized communications systems, a printing plant, a television tower, and government buildings. This belligerant act was a total departure from Mr. Gorbachev's highly proclaimed and much-publicized ideals of perestroika and glasnost, which are the foundation of our improved United States-Soviet relationship. As a result, at least 140 Lithuanians were wounded and at least 15 lost their lives, some of whom were crushed by tanks.

Although the attention of the world now centers on the plight of the Kurdish and Shiite refugees in Iraq, Turkey, and Iran, it is time to support the principle of popular sovereignty, and act on behalf of our friends in the Baltic States. The people of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia have chosen to follow a democratic path. Their leaders were freely and openly elected. They bravely boycotted the recent referendum imposed by the Soviet Union. They embody the democratic ideals of our forefathers and they deserve our support.

Our bill will strengthen United States policy toward the Baltic States. The legislation is similar to S. 670, which was introduced last month by our distinguished colleague, Senator PAUL SIMON. It calls for the appointment of cultural representatives by the Secretary of State and permanent commercial representatives by the Foreign Commercial Service to each of the three Baltic States. These representatives would be located in the Baltics.

The legislation also urges the President to appoint a special envoy to assist in Baltic-Soviet independence negotiations and to raise the issue of Baltic independence at the September 1991 U.S. General Assembly session. Finally, the bill makes the Baltic States eligible for United State assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join us in supporting a stronger United States policy toward the Baltic States by cosponsoring this bill.

THE ANTI-STRIKE-REPLACEMENT LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time this evening so that I might discuss, and I think several of my colleagues may be here also, to discuss H.R. 5, which is referred to as the antistriker replacement law, which is legislation now pending before the Committee on Education and Labor, in regard to which I think many people in this body are not fully aware of all of

its aspects, as well as I think the Nation in general is not aware that such legislation as that is pending.

Basically, what the legislation does is alter 50 years, more than 50 years of labor law in this Nation by creating two new unfair labor practices. One is a prohibition in regard to the employer being able to hire permanent replacement workers during a labor dispute. That is, where labor exercises the undoubted right that it does have to withhold labor and individuals under the NLRA have the perfect right, of course, to go on strike and to remain on strike until such time as they believe their demands have been met.

Always during the last 50 or 55 years, ever since the Wagner Act came into being in this Nation, the employers have had the concomitant right also, if they wish—and it is a difficult right for employers to exercise just as it is a difficult right for the employees to go on strike—it is difficult for the employer to exercise this right to hire permanent replacement workers. Although over the years this right of the employer has not been used greatly, it is a right which is there and in those situations where there are egregious economic demands. In effect, the employer states, "I can't in good conscience accept those economic demands. If I did, I would be out of business or I wouldn't be able to compete in this global economy."

Thus, he would say to those who have gone on strike, "The only thing that I can do, the only alternative I have, is to hire permanent replacement workers."

This has been standard law. It is standard law right now. That would be taken away from the employers of America. I think it is an awfully important item for us to recognize today that 88 percent of the workers of America are not members of labor unions and that, therefore, the fact that, as I see it, the people of this Nation are not really aware of this type of legislation, we ought to be, as Members of Congress, aware of that lack of awareness before we consider adopting legislation such as this. But it does not stop there. It also declares that there is another new unfair labor practice, and that new unfair labor practice is in effect to say to any employee that elects to stick with the employer during a strike, this legislation would say, "Well, you can do that, you can exercise the right," which is granted by the National Labor Relations Act for over 50 years, to not strike, and that is a right of labor in this country just as is the right to withhold one's labor, the right not to strike.

□ 1930

However, Mr. Speaker, under this bill, if an employee decides, "Well, I will not strike for any number of reasons," exercises that statutory right, guess what happens to that employee when the strike is over.

The returning members of the labor union who were on strike can bump him from his job.

Now heretofore the courts have been very clear that one has the right, if there are vacancies, that the returning strikers have the right, to be first considered for any vacancies. But the courts have made it very clear that for those employees who elected not to strike there is no vacancy there, and the person who remains with the employer cannot be bumped. That goes out the window, too, and, as a result, we trivialize, if not as a practical matter just eliminate, all meaning to the right of the workers of America to not go on strike.

Now the bill also, as a practical matter, and many people were not aware of this, but it also covers all employees who are employed in a non-union setting. A number of people are not aware of the fact that under the National Labor Relations Act all employees, whether a member of a labor union or not, have a right to go on strike and, therefore, under those circumstances, if this bill were to pass, even in a nonunion setting where, say, two or three people engage in concerted activity because they are objecting to, for instance, the wages or any of the terms and conditions of employment, they have a right, though not a member of a labor union, to walk off the job, and the employer has the obligation to enter into bargaining with them.

But the employer has had for the last 55 years, under those circumstances of course, to also hire permanent replacement workers. He does not have to necessarily accept the fact in that instance that he just has to wait for those people to return and only to hire temporary replacement workers. So, as a practical matter, over the years that right of the employer to be able to hire permanent replacement workers is something that is utilized, though not too often, in the nonunion setting, as well as it is utilized, although not too often even in the union settting where a strike takes place.

Mr. Speaker, all of this would change now, and this is something that from my viewpoint would mean that we are removing the balance of risks and the balance of rights that one might say exists between employee and labor unions and employers. As a practical matter the labor union will be able to say that these are—let us assume egregious economic demands—and the employer is not able to say, "Well, under the circumstances where I know I can't live with that, I know I'm going to lose business. I'll maybe lose my business completely to foreign competition or to other competition who are not able to say that I am going to have to go with permanent replacement workers." If he cannot say that, then his only alternative is just to capitulate to what the unions request of him, and that pertains to all economic strikes.

It is not an easy thing, for instance, for any employer to make the decision that he has to hire permanent replacement workers and retrain his work force. So, it is not something that employers want to go into, and all we have to do is look at the Greyhound strike, for instance, where the employer elected to use permanent replacement workers. They are now in bankruptcy.

So, it is not something that anybody, any employer, wants to do, but my colleagues see that there is that balance of risks. The striker who goes on strike knows that he takes the risk of perhaps losing his job if there are not vacancies there after the strike. That has always been the case, and that is a risk. The employer, on the other hand, takes the risk, if he uses permanent replacement workers, of also having damage done to his business because he has to retrain workers, and so forth.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are just throwing out the window 50 years of unquestioned labor law, and that I think is deeply very unfortunate, and the thing that I feel that is of concern, or should be of concern, to all of us is that perhaps none of us, being so very busy, are fully aware of what is actually taking place here, and I think that we ought to be aware of that.

There is some talk about having an amendment that would in effect in this bill not be effective in regard to the nonunion setting as though, if that amendment were to pass, that that would just solve the problems insofar as employers are concerned, for instance, who are not with union contracts. What those who present such an amendment seem to be unaware of is that the labor law in this land of ours has always applied equally to all of America's workers. Whether they are union or nonunion, the rights that are afforded are the same.

If, for instance, this bill passes granting these kinds of powers; that is, to not have to worry about permanent replacement workers and having the ability to bump any employee that sticks with the employer in a strike, if that is applicable only to the labor unions, then obviously they have a tool to be able to solicit membership which is fantastic, which obviously we will say to all of those who do not join the union, "Well, if you don't join the union, that's the only way that you can protect yourself, you see, from having permanent replacement workers come in and the only way that you can be assured that you can come back and bump the person who was set as a permanent replacement to your job is to join the union," and so obviously unions which are very concerned about the fact that their membership has fallen greatly during the last several

decades would just love to be able to have the law altered so as to give them those kinds of powers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other people here who also would like to speak on this subject, and so I will yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. IRELAND] for comments on this matter.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] has said, soon we will all be asked to vote on H.R. 5, the so-called striker replacement bill. Big labor has targeted this bill as it's No. 1 priority and a must-win issue. If H.R. 5 becomes law, it will be a disaster for American small businesses. The union bosses' gain will be the country's loss—in terms of higher labor costs, more frequent strikes, and the ripple effect on suppliers, customers, subcontractors, and related businesses.

This bill isn't about protecting union members from unfair labor tactics by corporate America. What the bill is about is allowing one or two employees in a small, nonunion firm to hold that company hostage to their employment demands, no matter how unreasonable they may be.

As the National Federation of Independent Business has pointed out in a letter to Members of Congress:

> H.R. 5 incorporates many of the definitions contained within the National Labor Relations Act [NLRA] and existing case law. In doing so, the bill implicitly covers any business that employs two or more employees.

Now I know that there are those who claim that this bill doesn't apply to nonunion small businesses. But they are wrong—and here's why:

H.R. 5 would make it an unfair labor practice "to offer, or to grant, the status of permanent replacement employee to an individual for performing bargaining unit work for the employer during a labor dispute."

This is one of two instances in H.R. 5 in which the term "labor dispute" appears. The legislation does not specifically define "labor dispute." Instead, it incorporates the definition already contained in the NLRA as follows:

> The term labor dispute includes any controversy concerning terms, tenure or conditions of employment or concerning the association or representation of persons negotiating, fixing, maintaining, changing, or seeking to arrange terms or conditions of employment, regardless of whether the disputants stand in the proximate relations employer and employees.

In other words, any two employees who walk off a job to protest a "working condition" are considered to be engaged in a labor dispute. Every business with two or more employees could be therefore covered by the legislation.

And this isn't just pie-in-the-sky speculation. It is a very real problem. A recent example of the broad scope of protected activity falling within the "labor dispute" category is found in a recent Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals decision, NLRB versus Jasper Seating Co. That case involved a nonunion manufacturer whose plant had a large overhead door which was left open when the outside temperature exceeded 68 degrees. One day, two employees who worked near the door requested the door be closed. The supervisor refused the request because the majority of workers in the shop wanted to keep the door open. The two complaining employees walked off the job and were dismissed by the employer.

The NLRB held that the two employees were unlawfully dismissed because, by protesting the working conditions at the plant, they were exercising the legal right to engage in concerted activity.

The seventh circuit enforced that decision, noting that the two employees had a right to protest their working conditions, even if their complaint was unreasonable, lacked merit, and did not have the support of a majority of their fellow employees.

Such situations are generally avoided, however, by the exercise of management's ability to permanently replace such striking workers.

If H.R. 5 were applied to the facts of the Jasper case, the two striking nonunion employees would be engaged in a "labor dispute," and would therefore have immediate reinstatement rights to the jobs they voluntarily vacated—whenever they chose to return to work.

To permit such disruptive activity will not only cause friction between groups of workers, but will also severely restrict an employer's ability to manage and to maintain proper workplace discipline.

What's more, H.R. 5 would apply to any individual who—and I'm reading right from the bill now—"has exercised the right to join, to assist, or to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection through the labor organization involved in the dispute."

Now, supporters of H.R. 5 will try to tell you that the term "labor organization" only applies to certified union representation. But the NLRA definition says otherwise:

> The term "labor organization" means any organization of any kind . . . in which employees participated and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

In other words, whenever any group of employees act in concert—whether over a wage increase or other terms or conditions of employment—the group constitutes a labor organization within the meaning of the NLRA. The courts have made clear in several decisions that you do not need to have a certified union represent your employees to have a labor organization as recognized by the definition contained in the NLRA.

Finally, H.R. 5 would make it an unfair labor practice to permanently replace an individual performing "bargaining unit work" for the employer during a labor dispute.

According to labor experts, past positions taken by the NLRB and the courts make it clear that, while not defining "bargaining unit work," the NLRA has always been interpreted to apply to all workers, whether they are affiliated with a certified union or not.

Clearly, H.R. 5 has implications for all businesses—union and nonunion. And there is no question that smaller firms have the most to lose if this bill were to become law.

Small businesses generate more than 57 percent of all new jobs in the United States. They set the standard for the rest of the world in creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurial spirit. The striker replacement bill is a direct threat to this vital sector of our economy and to our continued competitiveness in world markets. I urge you to vote against H.R. 5.

□ 1940

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. IRELAND]. Once again, he has exhibited the fact that he does his homework and is aware of what the rather arcane labor law is in regard to these circumstances. That is one of the things we hope that we can bring out to our colleagues this evening, that perhaps even the drafters had not realized the full effect their legislation would have.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], because I know he has some comments on this and I always welcome the innovative comments from my good friend from the State of Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me begin my comments, Mr. Speaker, by expressing my appreciation to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] for taking this special order. I would like to point out that I have had the privilege, since I have been in Congress, to sit next to HARRIS FAWELL on the Education and Labor Committee. It has been a privilege for me in particular because HARRIS FAWELL is always one of the most well prepared, most thoroughly disciplined researchers of the fine print of legislation of anybody in Congress, and I have found it to my advantage to sit next to the gentleman on so many occasions because by doing so I could crib off the gentleman's margin notes on the legislation and give the appearance of knowing quite often much more than I did by virtue of the gentleman's hard research. So let me thank the gentleman for that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about this legislation a little bit and put it in the context of understanding this: Who is labor in America today?

We have so many pretensions in legislative and political dialog that sometimes we lose sight of the facts, and there is a tendency, particularly in Washington, to confuse things. We tend to refer to labor, or we use the word, "labor," in Washington when we are referring to organized labor, unionized labor in general, but even more particularly, the AFL-CIO and other national union headquarters here in Washington, DC, inside the beltway. We tend to believe and in some cases we tend to represent the proposition that these institutions inside the beltway in Washington, DC, represent the American workers, and we lose sight of the fact that these institutions represent themselves before the American workers.

□ 1950

Let us make a few things clear. First of all, we can talk about working men and women of this country and talk about all of those people who get up and go to work every day, whether they like it or not, quite often to a job they do not particularly enjoy, because they have children and obligations, and in fact do that heroic thing of bringing home the family's bacon. Or we can talk about labor. If I talk about labor, I am talking about a group of people who sit in Washington, DC, primarily, collecting the dues from those working men and women who choose to join their organizations, and chronically misrepresent the best interests of those men and women as they serve their own first best self-interests.

This is what I call institutional Potomac fever. We need to be aware of this distinction, because each and every Member of Congress has in their home district a large number of working men and women who voted in their congressional election and to whom they have an obligation of representation. That representation to the folks back home is what we ought to put first.

Mr. FAWELL. If the gentleman would yield, I can recall a hearing last year on this legislation, and a member of one of our large labor unions said, "We represent the working men and women of America."

I could not help but say, "Well, certainly you represent some of them, but you represent only 12 percent of the working men and women in private firms of America."

He seemed shocked that I pointed this out to him. In the construction trades, for instance, especially in residential construction trades in my area, 95 percent are nonunion. They are just now learning, for instance, that because of this legislation they may lose the right which they always know is there in abeyance if there are egregious economic demands they cannot possibly meet, the right to be able to hire replacement workers. They are hopping mad.

I am just concerned that not enough people in this Nation are aware of that. The gentleman is so correct. In Washington we think of labor as only the professional labor organizations. Bless their heart, they do their jobs, and that is part of America. But the largest part of American working men and women are not members of labor unions.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for that observation. Let me remind the gentleman, the people at the AFL-CIO's headquarters downtown, the people in the legal foundation of AFL-CIO, those high-placed lawyers, they are working for themselves, just as everybody else is in this town.

We should remember that there is no working man or woman in this country today that is denied the right to join the union if they so choose. They are free to make that choice. Only 12 percent of the nonpublic employed people in this country have elected to choose the union.

If my calculations are correct, that means that 88 percent of the working men and women of this country have made a conscious choice to not join the union.

Why would they make that choice? Mr. Speaker, I have a startling revelation for you. People who are smart enough to learn the responsibilities and the skills of parenthood, to maintain themselves in employment, are smart enough to understand when they get fair value for their dollar. They sit down and they consider the option before them to join the union. If I join the union, and if by having done so I then accept the compulsion to give up some of my hard-earned earnings to the union, will they in fact use that in my best interests, so that it will translate into benefits for me and my family? And they judge it not to be.

So the fact of the matter is, the consistent decline in union membership we have seen over the years, that is such a frustration to all these union bosses here in town, is the free choice of working men and women, to take their hard-earned income and to do the best they can for themselves and their families, without having any part of it siphoned off to serve the interests of the union leaders. This has been a frustration to the union.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say I have been on the Committee on Education and Labor for over 6 years. I can tell Members there has not been a single piece of labor legislation that has been taken up and seriously considered by this committee that was not written at the AFL-CIO headquarters inside the beltway in this town.

It is not the working men and women in Chicago, Detroit, and Dallas, TX, that have said, "We want you to consider this legislation." It is the union bosses here. And they are something different.

As we looked at that, when I first came here, I was confused. I would look at a bill that was taken up by the committee. We would examine the bill, and I had, being from back home and somewhat naive in these matters, an initial impulse to examine the bill with respect to this question.

I would say, "What would the passage of this legislation do for the men and women working back in my district?" Every time I could find no answer.

When I finally began to ask the question, "What will it do for the union bosses in Washington, DC, and the AFL-CIO's high-priced union lawyers in Washington, DC," I began to understand why somebody wanted the legislation, irrespective of its negative impact on the workers in Dallas, TX. And the workers know that, too. They therefore are refusing to join the union.

So I am going to make this point at this time, and then maybe I will speak again later. But the point we need to remember here, this bill, H.R. 5, the so-called Striker Replacement Act, is not about serving the interests of the men and women that are working for a salary back home on behalf of their family. It is about trying to assuage the frustrations of the union leaders for their inability to convince those folks to join unions. It is a union membership bill. That is the reason we have it here.

Mr. Speaker, we need to understand one other thing while I am making the point. We cannot in good conscience vote for those union leaders to have a completely unchecked right to take their 12 percent of America's labor force out on strike and cripple the right of the 88 percent of those who choose not to join the union, who want to work on behalf of their children, to be on the job that day.

The fact of the matter is, while those 12 percent are trying to leverage special privilege under the law, given this legislation, to have a strike that cannot be responded to by management, and to coerce management in this strike circumstance, they will during this incident of increased numbers of strikes, with the attendant strike violence that seems always to be there, temporarily force layoffs on those nonunion workers.

We need to examine that consideration. Why would we want to pass legislation that serves the greed of a few, and forces the cost to be borne by so many?

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, who is always articulate and knows his subject matter. In a sense, it is good to be able

to have these special orders and to realize when you speak some of these I believe truths, that sometimes I think in committee you feel like the skunk at the picnic when you utter these things that are deemed to be not utterable. But these things need to be said, I think.

Again, I hope that we will serve the purpose of apprising people in general of what Congress is about and doing here.

I would now like to yield time to my good friend from the State of Illinois [Mr. PORTER], who also has some comments in reference to this legislation.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed colleague from Illinois for yielding to me and permitting me to address this important issue. I might say to my colleague that I have been an admirer of him ever since I was elected to the Illinois House of Representatives in 1972 and he was a member of the Illinois Senate.

Mr. Speaker, before this House considers H.R. 5, the bill to ban any permanent replacement of striking workers, we ought to take time to carefully consider the single case where our current labor laws do in fact allow permanent strike replacements. There is only one such instance.

Let me point out that permanent replacement is not allowed when employees strike against unsafe working conditions, or against an employer who refuses to bargain in good faith, or when an employer is in violation of fair labor practice laws. Workers involved in an "unfair labor practice" dispute are guaranteed full reinstatement after the strike is over, under our law, as they should be.

The single exception to the rule is the economic strike—a strike for higher wages or increased benefits. Current law says that when employees voluntarily walk off their jobs to demand higher pay, employers have the right to try to stay in business by offering permanent employment to replacement workers—workers who are willing to accept the pay and benefits the employer is offering.

Our labor laws have maintained this distinction, clearly and consistently, for over 50 years, a distinction so essential to fair and balanced labor relations that, until now, it had never been seriously questioned—even by organized labor.

House Resolution 5 would wipe out this distinction, and, in the process, wipe out any notion of fairness or equity during labor negotiations and strikes.

The reasoning is simple: In an unfair labor practices dispute, the employer has broken the law. By denying that employer the right to use permanent replacements, we deny his ability to continue "business as usual" while operating outside the law.

Likewise, when workers have been forced to the picket line by an employer's abusive and illegal labor practices, they are guaranteed automatic reinstatement with full benefits after the strike is over. Current law stacks the odds against the employer who chooses to violate his employee's legal rights, and prevents him from continuing business until the dispute has been settled.

In an economic strike, however, when the employer has not broken the law, has treated labor fairly, and has bargained in good faith—whose only offense has been to disagree with the union's economic demands—the employer has the right to try to stay in business by hiring replacement workers. To attract qualified replacements, it is often necessary to offer permanent employment.

When organized labor does resort to an economic strike, the law already prohibits discrimination based on union membership, and mandates preferential rehiring of returning strikers with full benefits as vacancies occur. Employers are also prohibited from promising preferential treatment to any prospective employees, and may not offer replacements a better deal than they offered the strikers at the bargaining table.

Current law is therefore designed to prevent every dispute and union demand from triggering a strike. When union members voluntarily walk away from $38,000 a year production jobs in Maine, or $98,000 a year jobs as pilots, or $200,000 a year job as professional football players, they know that there is a substantial risk that other workers might find such pay acceptable.

An economic strike—a strike for higher pay—is a voluntary, calculated risk on the part of the union. A union striking for economic demands, which may or may not be reasonable, should not be afforded the same immunity to risk given to workers whose legal rights have been violated by their employer.

Under the provisions of H.R. 5, unions would no longer have to weigh the risks of job loss against the reasonableness of their economic demand. Under the strike replacement ban, the risk disappears, and strikers making any sort of economic demand, no matter how outrageous, would have the same right to automatic reinstatement as workers protesting an employer's illegal labor practices.

A permanent replacements ban would abolish the mutual risk faced by the opposing sides in an economic strike—the vital mutual risk that pressures both management and labor toward compromise and conciliation, and makes both sides think twice about demands or policies likely to precipitate a strike.

H.R. 5 is not an attempt to correct some loophole or address a pervasive problem. Two General Accounting Office reports have shown that permanent replacements are used in only 15 to 17 percent of strikes, and affect less than 4 percent of all strikers.

The infrequency with which employers have exercised their option to permanently replace strikers demonstrates the effectiveness of mutual risks in bringing labor and management closer to compromise, conciliation and continued productivity.

What the proposed legislation would do is create the "no-risk economic strike," at a time when 73 percent of all Americans believe—according to a recent Time/CNN poll—that organized labor has either too much or just the right amount of power.

Disproportionate power on either side of the bargaining table is just bad public policy, and a permanent replacements ban represents an unjustified shift of power to labor's side of that table.

For over 50 years strikes have remained an option of last resort. If enacted, this legislation would make them the first.

Mr. FAWELL. Again I certainly thank my friend from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], who has written this on this subject and I appreciate very much his comments.

Mr. Speaker, what we have in this legislation is a major assault by the professional unions of this Nation representing, as has been indicated, only 12 percent of the private work force, and holding this out as what the people of this great Nation want. I hope we can begin to ring the bell and to apprise people of what is taking place.

What has not been emphasized a great deal here, though I did make some comments about it, is that section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act makes it very clear, after it recites all of the rights of labor, whether members of professional unions or not, to be able to strike, and collectively bargain, to engage in concerted activity in regard to the terms and conditions of employment and wages and so forth, it understandably and rightly recites all of those rights of the workers, but interestingly, Mr. Speaker, it leaves out one right as though it never existed, and it is right there in section 7(2). It sets forth the right of a worker not to strike. You do not have to strike, you do not have to join a union, and if there is a strike and you are not a member, or even if you are a member, you can exercise your right not to strike. That is so important.

The legislation not only takes away from the employer the right to hire permanent replacement workers, for instance, which has been brought out as what he or she must have to be able to counter an egregious economic demand, but it goes further and goes after that guy or that gal who says I am sticking with the employer, I elect my right which has been given to me

for the last 55 years, I elect the right not to strike, and they say to that person all right, you can elect not to strike, but let us tell you that when the strike is concluded and we want to, and the striker comes back, he is able to bump you out of a job, and that has not been emphasized. I think it certainly should be.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

□ 2010

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk and to pick up on the point that we have so much rhetoric going on here surrounding this pretension that H.R. 5 is advanced in the interests of protecting the rights of the worker. You know, one of our colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor refers to this as the right-to-bump bill.

We go to work because we need a job. Most of us appreciate having a job, and we have a certain sense of appreciation for the employer that risks their capital, investment and so forth to make a job possible and a certain loyalty to them. But our loyalty to our family and our needs of our family are even greater.

What happens in a bill like this, if it is passed into law, what you do is you not only take away the right to work from the person that might welcome the opportunity to be a replacement worker for somebody who voluntarily walked off the job in a strike but you take away the right to accumulate seniority on the part of that worker who says, "I must stay on the job. My youngsters need this salary to come in constantly. I am loyal to my employer. I appreciate the right I have to work here."

Let us say I started on the same job behind you 30 days. You went out on strike for 35 days, and I stayed on the job. In this process of accumulating seniority toward raises, advancement and so forth we would not allow me to count, under this bill, I would be prohibited from counting the time that I stayed on the job and the gentleman sat off the job. So that, in fact, the best effort that I made to improve my situation and that of my children is denied me. On behalf of the person who says, "I would go out on strike," they are saying, "We will hold at harm the person who says, 'I cannot afford to; I choose not to go on strike.'" They would hold at harm the person who said, "I would welcome the opportunity to work for a little while or perhaps permanently if I work out here given the opportunity." They hold at harm the person who, for example, maybe, let us say in the airplane industry, a steward or stewardess who does not fly because the mechanics decided to go on strike, and there is no provision in this law that says if, in fact, this strike harms other workers in the firm that we make an exception to the firm's right to hire a replacement worker in order to maintain operations so these other innocent bystanders are not victimized by this strike.

What I am going to suggest is we cannot afford to let those people who simply want to take away this very, very delicate balance between labor and management that has helped us to minimize strikes and attendant strike violence, that has helped us to work out collective bargaining negotiations in peaceful fashions in the past more frequently than not, and it is to give them, in effect, what amounts to on behalf of the union the unmitigated right to go out on strike, call the strike and then coerce the results because their point will simply be, "You must shut down operations during the period of this strike irrespective of its impact on anybody else affiliated with the firm or come to terms with us on our terms." Now, that, I think, is going to result in labor going out on strike more frequently, the strikes being more often, more violent, and I just want to give the Members a quick look here.

Here is a study done by the Wharton School from the period 1975 to 1981. Let me just take one at random. I mean, just what would surprise you most?

The top 20 unions in America were they had experienced union violence during periods of labor strife and strikes from 1975 to 1981, before PATCO, before, it is said, the apparent need for this legislation arose, if we go down this list, the Teamsters were the most violent, 384 violent incidents; the Mine Workers, 204; the Steelworkers, 130; Auto Workers, 128; State, County and Municipal Workers, 116; Machinists, 104; Food and Commercial Workers, 83, and this I was amazed at, the teachers, the National Education Association, and very likely the largest union in the Nation, but the teachers had 80 incidents of violence during that period of time.

The question is where do we have any protection for that person who is assaulted while they are walking to work, that has stones thrown at their automobile? We have had people, for example, who have been beaten with bats. People have been shot at. In one case we had rifle shots actually coming out of the union's headquarters office, and they still were unable to prove in a court of law that the union encouraged that violence.

But I have to tell the Members that I am concerned. I have had so many people visit my office and tell me the stories, truck drivers, coal-truck drivers in West Virginia. There was one gentleman that was shot in the leg as a rifle shot came right through the door of his truck and penetrated his leg.

So I would say we need to be cognizant of these real impacts of giving organized labor an unmitigated right to bully management in total disregard of the other workers in the organization.

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

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I think we have another labor bill coming along.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I would simply announce to the body that we are about to offer a unanimous-consent request which will ask unanimous consent, when it is offered, for the consideration of the bill that will bring a resolution of the rail strike situation.

We believe that the matter will be brought before the House, if the unanimous-consent request is offered and is made, about 9:15 and, therefore, the vote on this matter would happen sometime after 9:15. It will call for an hour of debate. So at the latest the vote could be held about 10:15 this evening, 10:15 or 10:30, but we believe that the vote could come anytime after 9:15.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER TONIGHT HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 222, RESOLVING THE RAIL STRIKE SITUATION

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order tonight to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 222); that the joint resolution be debatable for not to exceed 1 hours, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except an amendment to be offered by Representative DINGELL and one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I most likely would not object, I would ask the distinguished majority leader if he would just explain the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], because as I understand it, and maybe the majority leader can inform us, an agreement has been reached between the administration and both sides of the aisle on the bill that will come before the floor which would not require any substantive amendment.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. Further reserving the right to object, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. The only reason we wanted to leave this language in was in case at the last moment a very technical amendment would have to be offered to clean up some problem that we are not seeing at the moment, but we do not expect that.

We believe there is a total agreement between all parties on what the bill should contain.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would just ask the gentleman, if there were to be some technical amendment, if we could see it in advance.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Absolutely.

Mr. SOLOMON. Fine. And also there is the possibility there might not even be a recorded vote on this? Is that correct?

Mr. GEPHARDT. It is possible, but we never know.

□ 2020

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I will not object, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

THE POLITICS OF TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the unseemly rush to push through two major trade agreements—Mexico Free Trade and the General Agreements on Tarriffs and Trade [GATT], we are told by proponents of the urgent need to support the Mexican Government's willingness to enter into the compact.

We hear—behind closed doors—that if we do not incorporate the Mexican economy into ours that there is a real possibility of civil unrest there in the near future, because of the country's poverty and the instability of its local governments.

It is being inferred—in all of the lobbying—that we must move very quickly on this because President Salinas has only 2 years left in office. That since he cannot succeed himself, we must deal with him because after he is gone, we do not know what we will be dealing with down there.

These arguments sound like trade policy driven by desperation or expendiency—which is always bad for a business, and Mr. Speaker, trade is business, but—in a representative form of government—it is much more.

Trade in goods and services, per se, is understood by the uninitiated to be agreements between countries to buy each other's products. To those in government, especially elected officials who must answer to constituents, the use of trade treaties for international advantage, either military or economic, becomes difficult to explain.

An American worker thrown out of his job by plant closings due to the opening of a free trade zone with Mexico doesn't give a hoot for the problems of illegal immigration from Latin America across the Mexican border. The theory that supplying jobs inside Mexico will discourage illegal immigration sounds much more reasonable inside an air-conditioned office in Washington than it sounds as a rationale in a shuttered steel town during an election year.

The Keynesian idea of redistribution of wealth through U.S. tax law seems to have been expanded through trade policy to the redistribution of U.S. wealth worldwide.

The old Marshall plan idea has undergone some Machiavellian twists. Instead of tied-aid packages going to underdeveloped countries as was the practice after the Second World War, we now send not only dollars which can be spent to buy products or agricultural goods from our competitors; but, also, we have traded off preeminence in whole industries—microelectronics, consumer electronics, machine tools, ball bearings, to name but a few—in order to satisfy the demands of U.S. diplomatic or ideological goals.

In 1984, the beginning year of staggering trade deficits, the late Secretary of Commerce, Malcolm Baldrige, made a speech before the National Conference of Governors outlining the use of this strategy. He warned that the rising balance of payments deficit would have to be borne in order to stimulate the economies of "recession bound Europe" and to transfer dollars into Third World countries staggering under the burden of debt to international banks.

Interestingly enough, this remarkable statement of the thrust of free trade policy for the 1980's received no comment in the press or by any of the pundits; and, disappointedly enough, raised no outcry from American industry.

In all fairness, few people at the time could grasp the sea change that was taking place in our national policy. The concept of opening up U.S. markets to a flood of imports whose sales would prime the pumps of foreign economies is breathtaking in scope and was audacious in its execution.

And there were a host of powerful advocates, else it would not have been so quickly implemented with so little public outrage. There were the economic ideologues who truly believe as an article of faith, that the market should decide which businesses will survive. But, as we have seen played out over the last 10 years, there is not the one free market envisioned by these theoreticians in their ivory towers. We have learned, from the devastating balance of trade deficit, that the free market, the open economy exists only in textbooks and in econometric models being run through business schools and think tanks.

The ideologues, when questioned about the growing evidence of their failed vision and the continued resistance of our trading partners to opening their markets to U.S. products, answer defensively, "They are wrong! And one of these days, they'll find out that we were right!" These pure of theory remind me of the early priests going forward to face the Indians carrying only the cross to protect their belief. It took several generations of lost churchmen to convince Spain that she had better buttress the faith with soldiers.

We have lost a generation of businesses to the free market/trade ideologues and when this idea of unrestricted play was extended into the domestic financial arena, it almost destroyed our savings and loan industry and has left many of our major corporations struggling under a burden of debt from leveraged buyouts and ill-conceived mergers. The decisions of the marketplace have proven to be about as arbitrary, and as fair, as those of the Indians, who probably sacrificed the well-meaning priests to their gods.

I can understand ideology as the basis of a theology, but not as a basis for the economic policy of a vibrant, secular nation. However, other powerful interests endorsed the radical view of the ideologues—so much quick profit can be made when an economic system is in flux that not only do entrepreneurs thrive, but speculators grow apace. After all, to the audacious, opportunity exists only in the movement of money and markets, whether up or down. Closely held, long-term investment creates no new millionaires. The high flyers wholeheartedly supported the newest economic fad. After all, it gave a legitimacy to their menacing financial schemes and if the 1980's saw some of their numbers indicted and jailed, many more took millions of dollars out of old line companies and retired before the junk bonds came due.

International business also had an interest in the new religion. Aware of the markets created by Marshall plan money in the fifties, they looked to the markets in nations newly invigorated with U.S.-exported dollars. Dollars which, when earned abroad and reinvested abroad, escaped the high corporate U.S. income tax. Large U.S. manufacturers struggling with growing environmental restrictions and increasing labor costs eagerly sought out manufacturing bases in nations where

labor and environmental law were nonexistent and where it was possible, in some industries, to lease manufacturing lines on short-term contracts if the items were fashion related and/or speculative in nature.

Large agribusiness, long experienced in international trade, welcomed the entrance of the corporate manufacturing giants of America into the global economy. Some of their more venturesome members, who from the earliest years of the cold war had pushed for sales to the enemy and had suffered a pariah treatment in certain political circles, also gained a legitimacy from the new company they were keeping and from adherence—by the ideologues—to their long-held laissez faire attitudes in international trade.

As large U.S. business interests increasingly became more international, the cost to the traditional American manufacturer was enormous. As late as 1983, 70 percent of all manufacturing employees were working in companies with 100 or less workers. The profile of the U.S. manufacturing base, forced into international competition by economic policy of this time, was not that of big business and giant corporations, but of thousands of small companies in hundreds of towns across the country engaged for the most part in making component parts for the other 30 percent.

It was these companies that the free marketplace, with its flood of imports, shook out. Targeting and dumping of specific industries had begun in the 1970's, but many of the appeals against these illegal marketing practices did not come to the Government until the early 1980's. And every appeal to the Government for protection from illegal foreign marketing practices was turned away with myriad strategies. The industrial fasteners' 232 petition and the Houdaile Corp.'s 301 petition were flatly turned down. Steel and machine tools received voluntary restraint agreement programs with questionable enforcement on the part of the Government. Other industries just withered under the onslaught with only sporadic pleas for help—forgings, shipbuilding, ball bearings, microelectronic manufacturing. The loss in consumer electronics is too grim and too long to be included in this article.

The shoe industry and the apparel industry were put on the bargaining table at every trade meeting with an underdeveloped country. After a decade of cutthroat competition against countries whose wages rarely break through $1 an hour, U.S. shoe manufacturing has virtually disappeared and 60 percent of all apparel sold in the United States is imported. The loans owed to the international banks by the Third World remain largely unpaid.

If imports were sucking out our wealth, before too long, they began to suck out our jobs creating the infamous Rust Belt in the North Central States. In order to stimulate our own economy, sluggish from the deep recession of 1982–83 and beginning to show the effects of the loss of value added industry, interest rates had to be kept high to attract the lost dollars back onshore for our growing internal debt created by the failure of supply-side economics.

In effect, an international Ponzi scheme had been created. Dollars out for imports balanced by dollars back in attracted by high interest rates and increasingly, fewer U.S.-produced products. Needless to say, once in place, every effort, every policy had to keep the two-way flow of dollars moving. Any threat of disruption, whether from protectionist legislation or foreign retaliatory action, was met by a barrage of free trade propanganda and capitulation to every foreign demand.

"Protectionist" became an ephithet, Adam Smith an icon, and agri-business laughed all the way to the bank. If we were being targeted and dumped on with subsidized manufactured products, we were the most guilty of all in targeting and dumping subsidized agricultural products.

The comparative advantage economists—those who believe that each nation should supply to the world economy only those goods which they produce best—were euphoric, the primed economy kept expanding and the flow of foreign wealth and defense dollars ringing through U.S. cash registers drowned out the pleas of our foundering domestic industries.

Over the years of the greatest peacetime expenditure for defense, our strategic position as a fortress of democracy was being eroded by a growing dependence on industrial production in countries within 1 hour's flight time from the Soviet Union. By 1989, the fourth largest U.S. defense contractor was Thomson CSF, the French giant controlled and subsidized mainly by the Government of France.

History has some lessons to teach us about the value of industry to a nation's strength. Edward Crankshaw in his book, "The Shadow of the Winter Palace," reports on the fight waged in Russia between the free traders and the protectionists in the early days of the Industrial Revolution. The protectionists desired to shelter fledgling domestic industries against manufactured imports from Europe. However, grain, Russia's major export was controlled by the wealthy landowners, influential with the Czar. They feared that industrial competition from Russia would cause barriers to be raised inside Europe against their agricultural products.

The first serious Russian economist, Heinrich Storch, the most vocal of the free trade advocates took Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations" as his bible. He felt that Russia would be flouting her destiny if she diverted her resources from agriculture to industry. He believed, also, that the highly productive Russian soil would pay for the import of all the manufactured goods which the country could absorb.

Crankshaw reports the debate in great detail and, it is obvious from the stagnant economy of Russia in the 19th century that the free traders won. However, it should be instructive to note that this economic background and the outcome of the debate is reported as being one of the causes of the Russian Revolution at the end of the century. The agricultural economy allowed for no opportunity for the people of Russia. The entrenched elite stayed entrenched for far too long.

Strangely enough, according to the headlines of last summer, the fate of the Uraguay rounds of GATT hinges on the access of United States agricultural products to export markets. One would think we were mainly a nation of grain farmers. Modern Adam Smith economists remain unchanged after almost 200 years, despite Russia's experience.

To the American manufacturer, however, the Government's interest in trading oranges for machine tools and supplying export bonuses for grain sales abroad, has begun to prove disastrous. Faced with competition from socialist countries which subsidize their corporations and use the value added tax as export bonuses for manufactured goods, fighting for market share against the cartels and mercantilist economies of Southeast Asia, the average U.S. manufacturer feels abandoned by policymakers and a seige mentality is developing in the most vulnerable sectors.

The surprising strength of support for the 1990 textile-fiber-shoe bill, both in the House and Senate this summer, is evidence, I believe, of a fight-back mentality growing in the grassroots of America. Textiles represent jobs for 2 million American workers. Over 2 million American families will be affected by the loss of this industry, not counting the trickle-down effect through the communities to the banker, the baker, and the automobile salesrooms. Currently, textiles account for 25 percent of the trade deficit—now approaching a staggering $500 billion to the world.

The unrest in the country is being fueled, in part, by recent evidence brought out by a Ways and Means oversight subcommittee that as many as 39,000 foreign corporations operating onshore have underpaid taxes in amounts between $35 billion and $50 billion, without penalties, fines, and interest.

The budget deficit, $104 billion above the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings ceiling accepted in the 1989 winter, when investigated, should give even the most stolid free trader pause. Of the unexpected $68 billion shortfall reported

last July, $37 billion was accounted for in lower-than-expected IRS collections of corporate taxes, including payroll deductions; $19 billion was in higher-than-expected outlays for interest payments, much of that flowing offshore tax free. Coincidentally, the rock bottom figure needed to get us through this period without catastrophic cuts is approximately $50 billion—in the range of estimated underpayment of taxes by some of our foreign guests.

The Ponzi scheme, when it evolved, was fueled by a highly industrialized economy. By the end of a decade of exporting America's manufacturing base, the tax returns of a service economy are coming up short. If service industries require little long-term investment of capital contrasted with manufacturing, they also return less value added products thus creating lower tax revenues. If service industries require less skilled workers at lower cost, they also offer fewer benefits—medical coverage, retirement—to their workers and the workers pay less taxes all the while needing more government services to replace benefits once supplied by the private sector.

I am firmly convinced that the emergence of the idea of a service economy in the mid-1980's was sheer expediency. The rapid decline of our preeminence in the microelectronic industry, the industry of the future which was supposed to replace the heavy industrial sector—twilight industries they were called in those days—left our ideologists with no place to go. That we were becoming a service economy, by default, certainly could not be acknowledged. Once it became evident that we had allowed ourselves to be stripped of our manufacturing base, then services had to be lauded and heralded as the wave of the 1990's.

We would celebrate America's decline from a nation of highly skilled, highly paid workers to a country of clerks and food handlers, agricultural laborers, and health care workers. I use the word "celebrate" deliberately. Having spent most of my adult life as an editor in the newspaper business, I feel a real need to comment on a phenomenon of this period which I have never observed before: The creation of a whole jargon as a substitute for economic policy.

Think about the plethora of words and phrases we have been given to refer to complex economic issues and then think of how we have been conditioned by the opinion makers to respond to them: Free trade, supply-side economics, free marketplace, comparative advantage economics, libertarian, revenue neutral, revenue enhancing, global village, mutual dependence—international interdependence—Adam Smith, service economy, consumer in any context—all good; smokestack industries, heavy industry, protectionism, wealth creation, value-added in any context, subsidies, government regulations—all bad. Words which have almost disappeared from usage, because they are totally out of vogue: Taxes, national interest in any context, patriotism, treason, "Made in America—100 percent," solvency, American corporation, debt-free.

In the old dictionaries there is a description of jargon as being the language of thieves and Gypsies. It refers to the need to be wary of the language of the fly-by-nights passing through the village selling something which they really cannot deliver.

In offering us new meanings for old words, the modern alchemists are trying to create a new reality. However, if one takes the time to examine this offering, it is not really new. It is as old as Rousseau, Ricardo, and Marx, and yes, as old and outdated as Adam Smith. All of the hype, all of the ideals to the contrary, some economic and historical truths prevail. Debts will be paid whether in currency or by demand against real assets. Nationalism will not fade out or disappear as evidenced by the surprising resurgence of old national entities in Eastern Europe after 50 to 75 years of Russian efforts to absorb them. Jargon can substitute for belief only until it is challenged by evidence. The current economic crisis should signal the Gypsies that it is time to move on.

But, another factor putting pressure on them, one never included in their econometric models, is the democratic processes underlying this Nation. Unlike most of our other nation-competitors, we are not a cabinet government. There is a popular election every 2 years which serves as a referendum on the behavior of the Government, especially its economic behavior, and signs of unrest began to show up in the polls in the last election year. At this time there is no charismatic leader around which the disaffected can coalesce and the major issue, the loss of economic preeminence in the world, is not easily defined in political slogans; but, the unrest is such that a dramatic downturn in the economy could produce a populist leader in either party, virtually overnight.

In the interim, the next November elections may see some House Members replaced. It will be a beginning of picking-them-off-around-the-edges as everyone holds his/her breath approaching the 1992 Presidential election year.

It seems to me an unfortunate accident of timing that just as the European Community puts the final touches to its agreements on a united European block, after years of negotiations, straws in the wind predict that U.S. trade policy will be embroiled in tremendous domestic political controversy by 1992.

I think the pot is beginning to boil and if it is true that powerful Democrat chairmen in the House will be stepping down in order to keep unspent campaign contributions collected over years, the change in direction in trade policy could be radical. Contrasted with the free trade of the 1980's, any change would have to be more protectionist.

It is also reasonable to assume that the withdrawal of U.S. military support form both NATO and Southeastern Asia will cause a sigh of relief from American taxpayers at the beginning of the end of the Pax Americana. Much of the onus of our $3½-trillion internal deficit can be laid at the feet of our 40-year commitment to protecting the free world.

The efforts of this administration to raise funding from our allies to help defray the expenses of the current crisis in the Middle East tends to make my point. Such a radical change in policy, I think, anticipates the possibility of a taxpayer revolt. Because, if indeed, we are living in a global village, more than any nation in the world we made it a possibility with our microelectronic inventions and aerospace breakthroughs. Starting with the Marshall plan, followed by literally hundreds of U.S.-sponsored programs and billions of dollars, we also—more than any other nation built that global village.

In truth, we created much of our own commercial and agricultural competition and in our enthusiasm to do well while doing good, we never looked ahead to the consequences for our own country of such bountiful sharing of all of our resources. Much of the money loaned to other nations for both World War I and II was never repaid and no demand has been made by the United States for repayment.

Against this history, the economics of the international burden seems to have become too heavy for the American people to accept. I predict, increasingly, America will become more isolationist. Before too long, the cry will grow to bring home not only American troops, no matter where they are assigned, but to bring back onshore U.S manufacturing jobs so the released soldiers will have worthwhile jobs. The numbers of electronics engineers and electronics technicians freed up by demobilization not only of the military, but of the defense industries will put great strains on a service-oriented economy to accommodate the level of skills of the half million or more expected job seekers.

The cost of the Pax Americana is beginning to show up in the most obvious ways—broken bridges and pot-holed highways. It is an anomaly to me, as a member of the Transportation Committee of the House, that we are demanding the Government of Japan spend more money on building infrastructure when our own bridges and roadways are in such bad shape, when we don't have one stretch of highspeed railway in our own Nation. But, the

empty factories and overgrown industrial parks are another mark of our efforts to be the engine of the world. The bill is coming due in so many different ways, in so many different communities that my long experience on the political scene leads me to believe that some major changes will be demanded by the American electorate. The question is to find a formula acceptable to the people, yet strong enough to be effective in revitalizing the economy. Every effort must be made to accommodate and protect the unique American economic system with all of its possibilities of upward mobility economically. Socially, among the leading nations of the world, we are the only true democracy. We have no royal house, no hereditary titles, no recognized ruling families. And, we cannot move toward the economic entrenchment of an elite through the acceptance of cartel structures in our industries and the inherent tyranny of powerful international corporations unrestrained by any political body or bodies. The American people will not accept it.

George Orwell envisioned the all-powerful state with its thought control and its double-speak—jargon, of a kind—but, another writer, a screenwriter, envisioned a more brutal condition, the corporate controlled state in a movie titled "Rollerball." Using poetic license and for effect, these writers dealt in extremes, but current business writers are beginning to echo some of the themes. Hobart Rowan and Jodie T. Allen writing in the Washington Post, March 18, 1989, headlined an article on superfirms, "Brave New World, Inc.," and Business Week's, May 14 cover story was "The Stateless Corporation." Both articles are rewarding, but disturbing reading.

We cannot afford to make a mistake in the path we take out of this morass of debt and economic instability. We cannot respond to the challenge of competing with socialist and/or mercantilist nations by being copy cats.

Our antitrust laws, when they were enforced, created the unique economic mixture that gave America such a strong middle class. Smaller companies were protected from being vertically integrated into the giants, and the giants were protected from their small suppliers banding together against them to set prices. It is a simplistic explanation of 90 years of antitrust law; but, overall, by trial and error, it served to maintain a balance between the great and the small and guaranteed a fair, competitive price in the market. Startup operations could not be frozen out at either end of the spectrum since, absent patent infringement or proprietary information, all raw and semifinished materials and component parts were available to anyone who wanted to buy them for manufacture and/or assembly.

Unfortunately, in the 1980's, the ideologues began to give new interpretations to old law. And, while the threat of possible antitrust action continued to discourage U.S. corporations from adding vertically or horizontally to their lines, foreign corporations seemed able to extend the tentacles of their well-established foreign cartels to America with impunity. The free marketplace has become the free-for-all marketplace for some foreign corporations, while many American companies watch from the sidelines unable to compete under the double standard being applied by various courts and agencies.

Despite the power of the proponents of this antique economic theory, I believe, as with all fads, it has peaked and is beginning to weaken. The results of the experiment have proven so disruptive of the economy and of communities across the country, that the time is coming when the people of America will reject it, given the chance.

My gravest concern is that the political swing not be so extreme that after years of no industrial policy, we will embrace a form of socialist industrial control in a panic to gain back that which we have lost. It is for this reason I continue to speak and write about the deplorable losses in our manufacturing base and the concomitant costs to the American way of life. The history of how this has happened is replete with evidence that no U.S. industrial policy has proved to be a windfall to other governments of the world, replete with industrial policies of all sorts. Japan has a master industrial plan that projects to the year 2015.

The challenge of the 1990's will be to develop a pluralistic approach to Government control and intervention. No purists need apply. We have had excellent results in Government-supported operations like the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA] and the record of the first 20 years of the space agency shine. The Chrysler bailout worked and the loan was paid off in record time. The Federal National Mortgage Association [Fanny Mae] has been a stellar performer in the investment markets.

We can do it. We must do it, lest the summer of our discontent, become the winter of the people's disillusionment with us all.

□ 2050

LOOKING AT THE CHALLENGE OF THE NORTH AMERICA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I take this time this evening, as we are waiting for this critically important legislation which will be designed to ensure that we have a decrease in costs to the American consumer caused by this strike which is going on, this rail strike, because virtually everyone is affected by it, and I wanted to take this time to talk about an issue which is going to be debated very vigorously in this House in the next several weeks, and we will clearly have a conclusion; I hope a positive one. I hope, just like we will have a positive solution to this strike problem that we are dealing with this evening, that we will have a solution that is brought about that will benefit the American consumer and the consumers throughout the world as we look at the challenge of what has become known as the Mexico-United States free-trade agreement, the North America free-trade agreement. It is clearly something that is designed to benefit the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, there are many items which have become very controversial as this debate has continued, and I think that we need to look at some of those problems, and at the same time we need to look at what we offer as solutions to those problems.

For starters, there has been a book that I read in the last year and a half or so which has recognized that, as we face the challenge of trying to provide a wide range of services and products to consumers, we want to provide them at the lowest possible cost, and in a fascinating volume that was written by John Naisbitt called "Megatrends 2000," which was the followup to his first "Megatrends" book, he talks early on in the book about the reduction of those barriers and how it will provide an overall benefit to consumers throughout the world.

Now we have seen some groups work closely toward a reduction of barriers so that they can provide a wider range of services and products, and most notably that is going to be coming about on December 31, 1992, with the emergence of what has become known as EC–92. The European Community has recognized that, if it is going to compete internationally, that it must reduce barriers among these countries so that they can work together as a solid, unified economic bloc.

□ 2100

What will come about with that solid economic block? Well, clearly a reduction of barriers in trade among those countries in the European Community and at the same time a reduction in costs for those in surrounding areas. But the existence of that solid block has created a situation which needs to be addressed, and a response is coming about to EC–92. It is that our neighbors in the Pacific Rim, which are so often

addressed by my good friend from Baltimore, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY], are uniting as an economic block.

They are uniting as an economic block, and I happen to think that there will be a benefit that has accrued from that unification which has taken place. But as that happens, it is clear to me that we in this part of the world need to put together our own response so that we can provide a positive low-cost pack of services and products to consumers throughout the world.

So as we see EC-92 emerging, and as we see the Pacific Rim uniting, as they provide goods and services to other countries throughout the world, it is apparent that what we need to do in the United States is move ahead with this agreement that has been developed between Canada and the United States and expand it, expand it by including our southern neighbors. There are tremendous benefits in that not only to consumers throughout the world but to consumers on both sides of the border, north and south, as we move ahead with this kind of program.

If one looks at a lot of the problems that exist on the borders—and I happen to represent southern California, so I know that we have many problems that exist on the border—we see that one of the great things we debate in the House, and have debated for years, has been the problem of illegal immigration. We have had immigration reform bills in the past several Congresses, and we still have a problem.

I am convinced that while it may not be a panacea, the reduction of these barriers that exist in trade between the United States of America and Mexico will have a salutary effect on this problem of immigration. One of the things that we find in the border States, Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, California, we see many people from Mexico who have to come into the United States to work, and they send their salary back to Mexico. Well, if we are able to see a reduction in those barriers, that will not be necessary because there will be many United States companies which will want to invest in Mexico.

I think that if one looks at what is offered between our two countries, the United States of America and Mexico, it is clear that the United States offers both capital and technology, and Mexico offers both markets and labor.

Now, many people, those who are critical of the prospects of moving ahead with the free trade agreement between the United States and Mexico, say that we will see United States businesses simply taking advantage of this 70 cents an hour labor force in Mexico, and we will, therefore, see a tremendous loss of jobs in the United States because of it. But, if we look at the facts, I really don't believe that that will be the case, Mr. Speaker.

Canada has, of its imports, 87 percent of them coming from high-cost areas, high labor cost areas, because those items which are being imported in Canada are items which are clearly expensive items, items which are created by well-trained labor, not unskilled labor. And in this country it is 64 percent. Sixty-four percent of the imports into the United States come from high labor cost countries.

The only reason it is less than the 87 percent in our country is that we have agreements with China and Third World countries, which do not have low-cost labor, and that is the reason that it is less.

The demand in this country is clearly for those products which are created by high labor cost countries. It seems to me that we need to recognize that benefits can be accrued on both sides of the border if we move ahead with this.

I think if we look at the old adage that a rising tide lifts all ships, it is apparent that we will be able to help the people of Mexico.

Now, I have many colleagues in this Congress who, like me, are concerned about the plight of those who are less fortunate than Americans. We, of course, are anguishing over the plight of the Kurds who are starving in the north of Iraq and in southern Turkey and in Iran at this point.

We are also very concerned about people who are less advantaged in Mexico. Well, it seems to me that if we want to do what we can to enhance the quality of life for our southern neighbors, moving ahead with a free trade agreement would be a very good and positive step for us.

There are other justifiable concerns which have been raised, and I think that I met today with Dr. Blanco, who is the chief negotiator. And he, as we move ahead with the free trade agreement, he clearly wants to address the concerns that labor faces.

Another segment that is concerned is the environmental community. I am very proud of my record here in the Congress, Mr. Speaker, as it addresses the environment. I am one who believes that we clearly do have to play a role here at the Federal level in addressing environmental concerns in this country. The area I represent in southern California, the Los Angeles Basin, happens to have the highest number of first stage smog alerts in the United States. So I am one who clearly is very sensitive to addressing the environmental needs that exist in Mexico, the air pollution problems in Mexico City, as many of us have witnessed on a number of occasions. And so the argument that some have used is that United States business that does not like the kinds of environmental constraints which have been imposed on them by Federal law here will seize the opportunity to go into Mexico and pollute without any kind of responsibility to the people of Mexico. Again, a fallacious argument, Mr. Speaker. The reason being that the Mexican Government clearly does have many environmental constraints which are modeled in large part after the environmental requirements which we have here in the United States.

And the problem has been as follows, Mr. Speaker. There are many businesses in Mexico which have been existing and polluting for years. It is widely acknowledge that the Mexican Government has had a difficult time imposing the proper environmental constraints on existing businesses, but they have, Mr. Speaker, had success in putting together those kinds of requirements on new businesses in Mexico. So while some people say that United States companies will move into Mexico and seize the opportunity to pollute because of lax environmental regulations, they are wrong. As a new business, whether it is domestic, inside of Mexico, or a business that would come in under a new free trade agreement arrangement, they would have to meet the environmental constraints imposed under Mexican law.

There is another area which is of concern in my State of California. People in the agriculture industry do not want to see the Mexican labor force undercut the United States ability to deal with the sale of agricultural products, specifically those in the citrus and other areas of California. And I know in Florida and other States, they are very concerned about it. And there are some justifiable concerns which need to be addressed. Again today I brought one of those to the attention of Dr. Blanco, who is our negotiator. There is something called hydrogen glyceride, which is sprayed on grapes, and it is illegal in the United States. It cannot be used. It is not approved by the EPA, and yet it is utilized in Mexico. The spraying of this pesticide allows the grapes to come to market earlier than it would if it is not used. What has happened is that Mexican grapes have, therefore, been able to come to market beating the California market. For that reason, it seems to me that we need to have some kind of negotiated agreement on the use of that and many other items which are utilized on one side of the border and not on the other side of the border.

So what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that because of some concerns that have been understandably raised in the area of labor, in the area of the environment, and in the area of agriculture, it does not mean that we should penalize the consumer on both sides of the border, in the United States and Mexico, and clearly cast aside the necessity to provide those goods and services to people because of these questions.

□ 2110

What we need to do, Mr. Speaker, is answer these questions and have a negotiated settlement, so that these things can be addressed.

We in the Congress, if we move ahead with what is misnamed the fast-track provision so that our negotiators can go ahead, we in the Congress, and I will not vote for a bad agreement between Mexico and the United States, but I want us to move ahead with an agreement.

One of the arguments that another Member has given in opposition to this is why is it that we have to have a fast track? Why do we have to move ahead so quickly here if we are going to be undertaking a very serious matter, that of eliminating these barriers between Mexico and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I argue that it is essential that we move ahead and move ahead expeditiously. That gets back to what I raised at the outset: we are seeing countries throughout the world unifying. I am talking again about the Pacific Rim and Western Europe.

Many in Western Europe are going to prepare to seize on the 100 million strong labor force, and ultimately market, that exists in Eastern and central Europe, and that again will give them an added advantage in dealing with this.

So as these parts of the world move ahead, why should the United States of America be so far behind? Some who have said that we should delay this process have not recognized that this is not a new concept. This is something that we have been discussing for years and years. It is just that the necessity for it has become greater and greater, and that is why it is now on the front burner.

President Bush has very accurately put this as one of his top domestic policy priorities. It is a top domestic priority, because he wants to help the American consumer, and also the consumer in Mexico and other parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me as we look at the domestic policy priorities which have been established by President Bush, that this is a very important one, because of his desire to do everything that he possibly can to assist consumers on both sides of the border, in the United States and in Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, it is obviously controversial, and it is obviously something that is going to be contentious when we proceed here in the House of Representatives with a debate. But this is something that President Bush thinks is important, and it is something I think is very important, too, and I hope a majority of this House will recognize its importance. Because we cannot stand alone. We often talk about this technology which carries the word from the floor of the Congress, not just to people throughout the United States, but to the world. We are seeing with tremendous communication advances a shrinking world. That is also happening in the area of trade.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that I as a Member of Congress have the right to say to a consumer in this country that you cannot buy the best quality product at the lowest possible price without my imposing a penalty on you. Frankly, those who want to stall and delay this process are getting to the point where a penalty will be imposed on that American consumer.

Mr. Speaker, we today passed out what I think is a horrible budget. It is an unfortunate thing that we passed it in this House, spending hundreds of billions of dollars, the cost of which is being passed on to future generations.

Mr. Speaker, this is Wednesday night, so I guess it was 2 days ago at this time, 9:15 in the evening, people were rushing to the U.S. Post Office with less than 2 hours and 45 minutes to go before that April 15 deadline to pay their income taxes, to send it to those of us here in Washington.

I for one happen to think that that burden is a little too high. I know very well that the ranking Republican on the Rules Committee, who is with us tonight, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], feels that he and the people in upstate New York pay too much in taxes and the consumer is being penalized by our spending policies here and by the taxes which they have to pay.

So President Bush has very rightfully put on the front burner this United States-Mexico Free Trade Agreement so that we can do something to benefit the American consumer, because it has been very frustrating. I think this agreement can help us clearly emerge from this very, very slow moving economy.

Mr. Speaker, the signs are that we are coming out of it. I saw that the Dow Jones industrial average closed at 3,005 today, setting an all-time record. I think that bodes well for the future. Maybe those on the floor of the stock exchange are convinced that we are going to be passing a United States-Mexico Free Trade Agreement, and that might have played a role in encouraging them to run it as high as it is.

Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of tough battles ahead. This is clearly one of the most important ones. We are going to have a lot of "Dear Colleagues" circulated. There is going to be a lot of talk about this, a lot of very good arguments given on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this House will do the right thing and provide President Bush with the support that he needs to bring about something that will clearly be a great boost for the American consumer and consumers throughout the world.

SUMMARY OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 222

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES of Illinois). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I might just alert the membership that there has been an agreement reached on the rail strike legislation, which is House Joint Resolution 222, which will be coming before the House, hopefully any moment now. Perhaps I might just read some of the resolved clauses so that those Members that are listening in their offices or are on their way over here might understand a little bit about what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, this is an agreement, as I understand it, that has been agreed to by both Houses, by the House, the Senate, as well as the administration, as well as management and labor. The House will pass this bill, possibly without even a vote here, in a few minutes, as soon as the Members come to the floor and the managers of this bill arrive.

I understand that the Senate will take this bill up first thing tomorrow morning, and this should result in the railroads going back to work, which is absolutely critical at this time because of the recession we are in.

Mr. Speaker, we have just gone through 8 years of unparalleled growth in this country. Now we are in a recession. We certainly do not want to do anything and we do not want this Congress to be responsible for prolonging this recession. The reason we need this legislation is because of jobs and the economy in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to come from an area in upstate New York where the recession first started. We have a lot of unemployment there. Certainly we want to get those people back to work.

I would just simply begin to read the resolved clauses of this legislation, which states:

> The following conditions shall apply to the disputes referred to in Executive Order No. 12714 of May 3, 1990, between certain railroads represented by the National Carriers' Conference Committee of the National Railway Labor Conference and the employees of such railroads represented by the labor organizations which are party to such disputes:
>
> (1) The parties to such disputes shall take all necessary steps to restore or preserve the conditions out of which such disputes arose as such conditions existed before 12:01 a.m. on April 17, 1991, except as otherwise provided in this joint resolution.

Mr. WALKER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Could the gentleman explain that clause to us?

Mr. SOLOMON. I will, as I get a little further into the bill. This legislation is just out of the printers. It is still hot to handle. But let me just continue for a minute.

Mr. WALKER. I was having trouble understanding what the bill was really saying there. I was just wondering whether the gentleman could explain what the effect of the language is that he just read to the House.

□ 2120

Mr. SOLOMON. It will.

It goes on to say that except as otherwise provided in this joint resolution, it goes on with some other technical information. But I think one of the things that people are interested in hearing is that under section 2, appointment of special board, what this does is set up another Presidential Emergency Board. It says that:

The President shall promptly appoint a 3-member special board. One member of the special board shall be an individual who was a member of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219. The remaining 2 members shall be appointed by the President from a list of arbitrators compiled by the National Mediation Board. No member appointed to such special board shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested in any organization of employees or any railroad. The compensation of the members of the special board shall be fixed by the National Mediation Board. The second paragraph of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act shall apply to the expenses of the special board appointed under this subsection as if such special board were a board created under such section 10.

Section 3 deals with the resolution of issues in disagreement, and it goes on to say that requests for clarification or interpretation of ambiguities—"within 5 days after the special board is appointed under section 2, any party to the disputes referred to in Executive Order No. 12714 may request the special board to clarify or interpret any ambiguities in the recommendations of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219."

Section B, clarification and interpretation report, says that "within 15 days after the special board is appointed under section 2, the special board shall issue a report addressing requests made under subsection (a)."

Then it goes on with another section, requests for modification.

Within 10 days after the special board issues its report under subsection (b), any party to the disputes referred to in the executive order may request the special board to modify any special recommendation of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219 with respect to any issue on which the parties may remain in disagreement. Issues on which Presidential Emergency Board No. 219 made no specific recommendation shall not be subject to consideration by the special board.

I just look around the room here to see where the managers of the bill are from the Energy and Commerce Committee. I assume they are on their way over because we want to dispose of this legislation and get it over to the Senate as soon as we possibly can.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I hope they are not in their offices waiting for the gentleman to finish reading their bill for them.

Mr. SOLOMON. I hope they are not either, because I still have a couple of long pages to go.

But in anticipation of their arrival, Mr. Speaker, I will just say that subsection (d), procedure and determination says, "The special board shall conduct such proceedings as it considers necessary to review requests made under subsection (c)."

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I just wanted to make the gentleman aware, since it is somewhat different than the information that he had a few minutes ago, that we understand that the Senate is in session, and as soon as the House has cleared action on this legislation the Senate will deem it to have been passed so that the action can be completed on it yet tonight.

Mr. SOLOMON. That is very good news, because we were worried that as long as this strike stays in effect it does severely affect the economy throughout the country. Just, for example, I was on the phone with an automobile dealer from upstate New York a few minutes ago and they are on a just-in-time order situation now. Because of the recession they have not stocked up on automobiles, and as they have been selling them, they have been ordering them from Detroit. Should the strike, of course, continue in effect, they would not have automobiles to sell. And if we just magnify this all over the country, the automobile industry is a major, major part of the economy of this country. That is why we cannot afford to have this strike stay in effect.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield, that is also true, of course, of the manufacturing process for automobiles. Most of the automobile factories have gone to a just-in-time ordering system for parts that they put into automobiles so that a rail strike affects the ability of the automobile manufacturers to make the cars in the first place. So this indeed is a situation which can rapidly escalate into major layoffs in the country.

But it does appear as though the Senate is prepared to act yet tonight. The bill should be enrolled and be sent to the White House sometime in the course of the night or early tomorrow morning. So we should have the action underway.

I did not hear, in what the gentleman was telling us about the nature of the bill, a time frame. It is my understanding that this new board will essentially act for a 65-day period. Is that the gentleman's understanding as well?

Mr. SOLOMON. That is correct. As a matter of fact, that would be a cooling off period when all parties could get back together, and that the new presidential emergency board could then attempt to negotiate a settlement of all of the involved issues.

Mr. WALKER. That of course should give some time for some of the issues that have been outstanding to be resolved and for some of the things that have exacerbated the process to perhaps be worked out.

I think the gentleman has described the nature of the board which is going to be put together to do this, and I agree with him. I think it is good news that the situation with regard to presidential appointment was resolved in the legislation. But it does appear as though we are creating a time frame that hopefully will resolve the issues before we have to come back again in a similar situation.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would take notice that the ranking Republican on the Energy and Commerce Committee has just arrived in the chamber. We are very, very happy to see him. But I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. The ranking member may want to speak. I would just like to report that the committee has just met. Chairman DINGELL should be on the floor in the next 5 minutes. We reported by unanimous consent, without any negative votes, the compromise legislation. And we are very hopeful that the train will leave the track and we will move forward.

Mr. SOLOMON. I appreciate that information from the gentleman from Texas, and since the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT] has just arrived on the floor, perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] could repeat the information he just received from the Senate as far as the Senate's action.

Mr. WALKER. I was just telling the other gentleman from New York that it is our understanding that the Senate is in session and that as soon as we complete action here that they will deem the action taken by the House to have passed the Senate, which means we will complete action on this matter tonight. And it is my understanding that the President will sign this as soon as it reaches the White House. Is that the understanding of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding. I just wanted to report

that the full Energy and Commerce Committee within recent minutes has reported out legislation, House Joint Resolution 222, with some very minor technical amendments to settle the national railroad strike.

□ 2130

For any of our Members who may be en route to the House Chamber, the sooner they get here the better, because we will be in a position to take this legislation up momentarily.

Mr. SOLOMON. I have just been reading a draft of the legislation, but to put it in layman's language, perhaps the gentleman could just give us a brief summary of what the agreement contains.

Mr. LENT. If the gentleman will yield further, very, very briefly, what we are doing here is the President will appoint a Special Board to review the situation as between the parties, and that that Special Board will settle ambiguities in the Presidential Emergency Board. It will consider issues on which there is disagreement between the parties where the Presidential Emergency Board issues specific recommendations, and it will also clarify other issues as requested by the parties.

The main thing is the railroad workers, under the terms of this legislation, will return to work as soon as possible under conditions in effect prior to April 17, 1991, except where there is a mutual agreement between the individual labor union and the railroads.

As I mentioned a moment ago, a special three-person Special Board shall be appointed by the President. Any party seeking modification of the existing PEB, or Presidential Emergency Board, recommendation can overcome the presumptive validity of the recommendation if the party shows to the Board that the outcome of the PEB recommendation was based on a material error or a material mistake or is demonstrably inequitable.

The time line for the Board's considerations is as follows: Following the appointment of the board during the first 5 days, the parties present clarification issues to the board. During the 6th to 15th day, the board considers and rules on clarification issues. Between the 16th and the 25th day the parties present remaining disagreements to the board. Between the 26th and the 55th day, the board considers and rules on remaining disagreements, and between the 56th and 64th day, the parties would be allocated a cooling-off period where they may negotiate and conclude agreements, and by the 65th day, the Presidential Emergency Board, with revisions, if any, by the board, minus any issues the parties have mutually agreed are settled as imposed and have the same effect as if the parties had arrived at a mutual agreement under the Railway Labor Act.

That is a simplified version of what is in the legislation.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, because that is really good news, I think, for everyone out there, for business, for labor and management together.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Here comes our chairman.

We had an extraordinary crisis that Congress dealt with in literally 1 day. We began at 8 a.m. this morning, and I think tribute must be paid to the chairman, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT], and the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER], because this crisis had the potential of costing this Nation $50 million to $1 billion a day, and to be able to handle it in such a short period, I think, is a tribute to the gentlemen I mentioned. I think it is a tribute to the Congress.

I wish we took some of the other problems that we confront as seriously and dealt with them as expeditiously.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman.

I also would like to commend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] for the swift action that they took on this bill today, because, as the gentleman said, if this had carried on for another 3 or 4 days, it could have been an economic catastrophe for this country at a time when we can ill afford to have that happen. So, again, I commend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT], and certainly the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT].

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to thank the gentleman for the colloquy that has been going on. The chairman of the full committee is handling a couple of details, and he will be here immediately to bring up the bill.

But I think that the opportunity that you had to talk with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT], who is the ranking Republican on the full committee, has been very helpful in layout out what the issues are.

Very shortly we will get to the consideration itself of the legislation, and at that point we will have a detailed explanation.

I think the important thing here is that the House is ready to act and hopefully within about an hour we will have this resolved. We will have done our part with the possible exception of a brief conference.

I am still very hopeful that we will be able to have this bill on the President's desk before midnight tonight.

Mr. SOLOMON. I really do appreciate the gentleman's response. Again, this House, every Member, owes the gentleman and the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the chairman of the committee, and all of the Members a debt of gratitude for getting it to the floor.

PROVIDING FOR SETTLEMENT OF RAILROAD LABOR-MANAGEMENT DISPUTES

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House earlier today, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 222) to provide for a settlement of the railroad labor-management disputes between certain railroads represented by the National Carriers' Conference Committee of the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The text of House Joint Resolution 222 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 222

Whereas the labor disputes between certain railroads represented by the National Carriers Conference Committee of the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees represented by certain labor organizations threaten essential transportation services of the United States;

Whereas it is essential to the national interest, including the national health and defense, that essential transportation services be maintained;

Whereas the President, pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 160), by Executive Order No. 12714 of May 3, 1990, created Presidential Emergency Board No. 219 to investigate the disputes and report findings;

Whereas the recommendations of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219 issued on January 15, 1991, have formed the basis for tentative agreements between some, but not all, of the parties to the disputes;

Whereas the recommendations of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219 issued on January 1991, have not resulted in a settlement of all the disputes;

Whereas all the procedures provided under the Railway Labor Act, and further procedures agreed to by the parties, have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of all the disputes;

Whereas it is desirable to resolve such disputes in a manner which encourages solutions reached through collective bargaining;

Whereas Congress, under the Commerce Clause of the Constitution, has the authority and responsibility to ensure the uninterrupted operation of essential transportation services;

Whereas the Congress finds that emergency measures are essential to national security and continuity of transportation services by such railroads; and

Whereas Congress has in the past enacted legislation for such purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONDITIONS DURING RESOLUTION OF DISPUTES.

The following conditions shall apply to the disputes referred to in Executive Order No. 12714 of May 3, 1990, between certain railroads represented by the National Carriers' Conference Committee on the National Railway Labor Conference and the employees of such railroads represented by the labor organizations which are party to such disputes:

(1) The parties to such disputes shall take all necessary steps to restore or preserve the conditions out of which such disputes arose as such conditions existed before 12:01 a.m. on April 17, 1991, except as otherwise provided in this joint resolution.

(2) The final paragraph of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 160) shall apply and be extended for an additional period with respect to the disputes referred to in Exective Order No. 12714 of May 3, 1990, so that no change shall be made before the expiration of the period described in section 3(e) of this joint resolution by such parties, in the conditions out of which such dispute arose as such conditions existed before 12:01 a.m. on April 17, 1991.

(3) Except as provided in section 3 of this joint resolution, the report and recommendations of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219 shall be binding on the parties upon the expiration of the period described in section 3(e) of this joint resolution, and shall have the same effect as though arrived at by agreement of the parties under the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 151 et seq.).

SEC. 2. APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL BOARD.

The President shall promptly appoint a 3-member special board. One member of the special board shall be an individual who was a member of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219. The remaining 2 members shall be appointed by the President from a list of arbitrators compiled by the National Mediation Board. No member appointed to such special board shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested in any organization of employees or any railroad. The compensation of the members of the special board shall be fixed by the National Mediation Board. The second paragraph of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act shall apply to the expenses of the special board appointed under this subsection as if such special board were a board created under such section 10.

SEC. 3. RESOLUTION OF ISSUES IN DISAGREEMENT.

(a) REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION OR INTERPRETATION OF AMBIGUITIES.—Within 5 days after the special board is appointed under section 2, any party to the disputes referred to in Executive Order No. 12714 of May 3, 1990, may request the special board to clarify or interpret any ambiguities in the recommendations of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219.

(b) CLARIFICATION AND INTERPRETATION REPORT.—Within 15 days after the special board is appointed under section 2, the special board shall issue a report addressing requests made under subsection (a).

(c) REQUESTS FOR MODIFICATION.—Within 10 days after the special board issues its report under subsection (b), any party to the disputes referred to in Executive order No. 12714 of May 3, 1990, may request the special board to modify any specific recommendation of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219 with respect to any issue on which the parties remain in disagreement. Issues on which Presidential Emergency Board No. 219 made no specific recommendation shall not be subject to consideration by the special board.

(d) PROCEDURE AND DETERMINATION.—The special board shall conduct such proceedings as it considers necessary to review requests made under subsection (c). In making a determination under this subsection, the special board shall accord a presumption of validity to the recommendations of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219. The party requesting a modification of a particular Presidential Emergency Board recommendation shall bear the burden of persuasion with respect to the modification of such request. In order to overcome such presumption of validity, the party requesting a modification must show that the Presidential Emergency Board recommendation is demonstrably inequitable or was based on a material error or material misunderstanding. No later than 30 days after the 10-day period described in subsection (c), the special board shall complete its review and issue a final determination on all requests made under subsection (c), modifying in whole or in part the recommendation of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219 as to which the request was made, or denying such request.

(e) EFFECT OF DETERMINATION.—Upon the expiration of 10 days after the issuance of the determination of the special board under subsection (d), such determination shall be binding on the parties and shall have the same effect as though arrived at by agreement of the parties under the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 151 et seq.).

(f) CLARIFICATION OF DETERMINATION.—In the event of disagreement as to the meaning of any part or all of the determination by the special board under subsection (d), or as to the terms of the detailed agreements or arrangements necessary to give effect thereto, any party may, by December 31, 1991, apply to the special board for clarification of its determination, whereupon the special board shall reconvene and shall promptly issue a further determination with respect to the matters raised by any application for clarification. Such further determination may, in the discretion of the special board, be made with or without a further hearing.

(g) PRECLUSION OF JUDICIAL REVIEW.—There shall be no judicial review of any report or determination of the special board under this section.

SEC. 4. MUTUAL AGREEMENTS PRESERVED.

Nothing in this joint resolution shall prevent a mutual written agreement to any terms and conditions different from those established by this joint resolution.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. DINGELL: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. CONDITIONS DURING RESOLUTION OF DISPUTES.

The following conditions shall apply to the disputes referred to in Executive Order No. 12714 of May 3, 1990, between certain railroads represented by the National Carriers' Conference Committee of the National Railway Labor Conference and the employees of such railroads represented by the labor organizations which are party to such disputes:

(1) The parties to such disputes shall take all necessary steps to restore or preserve the conditions out of which such disputes arose as such conditions existed before 12:01 a.m. on April 17, 1991, except as otherwise provided in this joint resolution.

(2) The final paragraph of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 160) shall apply and be extended for an additional period with respect to the disputes referred to in Executive Order No. 12714 of May 3, 1990, so that no change shall be made before the expiration of the period described in section 3(e) of this joint resolution by such parties, in the conditions out of which such dispute arose as such conditions existed before 12:01 a.m. on April 17, 1991.

(3) Except as provided in sections 3 and 4 of this joint resolution, the report and recommendations of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219 shall be binding on the parties upon the expiration of the period described in section 3(e) of this joint resolution, and shall have the same effect as though arrived at by agreement of the parties under the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 151 et seq.).

SEC. 2. APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL BOARD.

The President shall promptly appoint a 3-member Special Board. One member of the special Board shall be an individual who was a member of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219. The remaining 2 members shall be appointed by the President from a list of arbitrators compiled by the National Mediation Board. No member appointed to such Special Board shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested in any organization of employees or any railroad. The compensation of the members of the Special Board shall be fixed by the National Mediation Board. The second paragraph of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act shall apply to the expenses of the Special Board appointed under this subsection as if such Special Board were a board created under such section 10.

SEC. 3. RESOLUTION OF ISSUES IN DISAGREEMENT.

(a) REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION OR INTERPRETATION OF AMBIGUITIES.—Within 5 days after the Special Board is appointed under section 2, any party to the disputes referred to in Executive Order No. 12714 of May 3, 1990, may request the Special Board to clarify or interpret any ambiguities in the recommendations of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219.

(b) CLARIFICATION AND INTERPRETATION REPORT.—Within 15 days after the Special Board is appointed under section 2, the Special Board shall issue a report addressing requests made under subsection (a).

(c) REQUESTS FOR MODIFICATION.—Within 10 days after the Special Board issues its report under subsection (b), any party to the disputes referred to in Executive Order No. 12714 of May 3, 1990, may request the Special Board to modify any specific recommendation of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219 with respect to any issue on which the parties remain in disagreement. Issues on which Presidential Emergency Board No. 219 made no specific recommendation shall not be subject to consideration by the Special Board.

(d) PROCEDURE AND DETERMINATION.—The Special Board shall conduct such proceedings as it considers necessary to review requests made under subsection (c). In making a determination under this subsection, the Special Board shall accord a presumption of validity to the recommendations of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219. The party requesting a modification of a particular Presidential Emergency Board recommendation shall bear the burden of persuasion with respect to the modification of such recommendation. In order to overcome such

presumption of validity, the party requesting a modification must show that the Presidential Emergency Board recommendation is demonstrably inequitable or was based on a material error or material misunderstanding. No later than 30 days after the 10-day period described in subsection (c), the Special Board shall complete its review and issue a final determination on all requests made under subsection (c), modifying in whole or in part the recommendation of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219 as to which the request was made, or denying such request.

(e) EFFECT OF DETERMINATION.—Upon the expiration of 10 days after the issuance of the determination of the Special Board under subsection (d), such determination shall be binding on the parties and shall have the same effect as though arrived at by agreement of the parties under the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 151 et seq.).

(f) CLARIFICATION OF DETERMINATION.—In the event of disagreement as to the meaning of any part or all of the determination by the Special Board under subsection (d), or as to the terms of the detailed agreements or arrangements necessary to give effect thereto, any party may, by December 31, 1991, apply to the Special Board for clarification of its determination, whereupon the Special Board shall reconvene and shall promptly issue a further determination with respect to the matters raised by any application for clarification. Such further determination may, in the discretion of the Special Board, be made with or without a further hearing.

(g) PRECLUSION OF JUDICIAL REVIEW.—There shall be no judicial review of any report or determination of the Special Board under this section.

SEC. 4. MUTUAL AGREEMENTS PRESERVED.

Nothing in this joint resolution shall prevent a mutual written agreement to any terms and conditions different from those established by this joint resolution.

Mr. DINGELL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House earlier today, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks will not explain the legislation except to indicate that this amendment is essentially a technical amendment which cleans up certain defects which crept into the legislation as the drafting process went on. It has been cleared with and discussed with my colleagues on the minority who are well familiar with it. There is nothing in the bill here which is changed except defects in the draftsmanship and in misspellings and things of that sort.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to confirm the statement that the gentleman has made that the amendments are purely technical in nature, and the minority has no objection to them.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, my purpose here is to pay tribute, first, to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT], who has processed this legislation within the committee, and his very able staff; also, the very able staff of the full committee, my two dear friends on the side of the minority, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT], the distinguished ranking member, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER], ranking member of the subcommittee.

The staffs of the minority, I think, deserve special tribute as does the distinguished Secretary of Transportation, who has worked with us most closely, and his staff. I would like to pay tribute also to my colleagues in the Senate who have worked upon this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, while not all are happy with the legislation, the bill was reported unanimously from the full committee, unanimously from the subcommittee, and it is my belief that, consistent with the way that similar resolutions have worked in the time since 1962 when this committee has brought some 16 of them to the floor, it will work to resolve the issues and see to it that rail service commences.

□ 2140

It is my belief that this will effectively be a process which over a very brief period of time will rationalize the differences, will leave with Members a work arrangement between management and labor on the railroads which will resolve the question which vex all parties at this time, and will terminate the strike.

I commend all of my colleagues on the committee, their staffs, and all who worked with Members, under some very remarkable time pressure. We have brought this bill to the floor from the committees at a speed which I have never, never often seen.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS). The Chair is advised that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] will control 30 minute on the minority side. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] wishes to explain the overall bill at this time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I will make two points. Let me make a preamble. I think that often Congress is accused of being unnecessarily and too frequently partisan. We are sometimes guilty of that. Sometimes I think we are misunderstood. We are carrying out legitimate differences of opinion that exist between the parties.

This is an issue that is complex and dire. It is one on which the temptation for trying to make partisan advantage is great, and it is one in which no one, either side, the administration or Congress, House or Senate, try to do that. Resolving this issue quickly is terribly important to the health of our economy, and I think that all of my colleagues can be proud in the expeditious way in which we addressed the issue, the flexibility in which we addressed the issue so that the compromises which can take days and sometimes months in this institution, in effect, can be honestly worked out in a period of hours.

With that, let me describe the provisions of the agreement that has been worked out between Members of the Senate, Members of the House, and with the concurrence of the administration. First of all, the railroad workers will return to work as soon as this bill is enacted and signed into law, under conditions that prevailed immediately prior to the strike.

Second, a three-person special Board will be appointed. That Board will, first of all, settle ambiguities in the Presidential Emergency Board; second, consider issues on which there is disagreement between the parties where the PEB issued specific recommendations; third, clarify other issues as requested by the parties. The Board will not consider issues on which the PEB makes no specific recommendations and which parties did not raise an issue.

There is presumptive validity given to the PEB report, and the burden of persuasion rests upon the party seeking modification of a particular PEB recommendation.

The party seeking modification of a PEB recommendation can overcome the presumptive validity of the recommendation if the party shows to the Board that the outcome of the PEB recommendation was based on a material error or material misunderstanding, or is demonstrably inequitable.

The time line for the Board's consideration is as follows: Following appointment of the Board, there are 5 days for the parties to present clarifying issues to the Board, followed by 10 days during which the Board continues and rules on the clarification issues. Following that, 10 more days are devoted to the parties presenting the remaining disagreements to the Board. Then the Board has 30 days to consider

and rule on the remaining disagreements. Finally, there is a 10-day cooling off period for the parties, where they may negotiate and conclude agreements. That takes a total of 65 days.

With the revisions by the Board, if any, minus any issues the parties have mutually agreed to, the PEB is imposed and shall have the same effect as if the parties arrived at a mutual agreement under the Railway Labor Act.

That is the agreement that was developed. It is a fair one. I heartily recommend to my colleagues to support it.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT], the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, the passage of this bill means the strike is over. The strike that began at 12:01 this morning concerns more than management or labor; it means the disruption of rail service for thousands of commuters who must find alternative ways of getting to work; it means the tremendous waste of fruits, vegetables, and poultry that will spoil before getting to market; it means the loss of potentially billions of dollars to the American economy.

I support this legislation and urge my colleagues to join me in voting to get America on the move again. I want to commend the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, JOHN DINGELL, as well as subcommittee chairman AL SWIFT, for their efforts in moving this process along expeditiously and fairly. I also want to note the able assistance of my good friend and colleague, DON RITTER, who is the ranking Republican on this subcommittee. We have been able to work together in a bipartisan manner to ensure that American lives will not be further disrupted.

The legislation before us isn't perfect; no compromise ever is. But it does accomplish several goals. First, it stops the strike and gets America moving again. However, it does so without unduly interfering with the collective bargaining process, and without tilting the scales toward either labor or management. In addition, this bill does not set the dangerous precedent of making Congress the final arbiter in all future contract disputes.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee have worked tirelessly with our other colleagues and our friends in the Senate. Our actions have been swift, decisive, and fair. The result is a compromise that deserves our support.

My understanding is that the bill we are considering tonight could be on the President's desk by midnight tonight.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, first of all my congratulations to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT], for some excellent work.

A number of Members have said that enactment of legislation that developed from the Presidential Emergency Board recommendation builds on a number of precedents which have been set in the past. One of the precedents often cited is the most recent precedent, involving the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad. As a sponsor of legislation implementing the Emergency Board recommendations in that case, I would like to point out a difference between the Chicago and Northwestern and this case, which I believe has a great deal of merit.

For this purpose, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Hazardous Materials, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

Mr. SWIFT, the Emergency Board recommends in this case that crew issues be decided through local arbitration. My understanding is that the PEB does not recommend any specific cash settlement for those workers who no longer have jobs after any arbitration is completed. Is that understanding correct?

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that understanding is correct.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, when I agreed to sponsor legislation implementing the Presidential Emergency Board recommendations in the Chicago and Northwestern case, I did so in great part because those recommendations contained $50,000 cash settlements for those union members who voluntarily decided to resign their positions.

□ 2150

It was my belief that a cash settlement of that size would induce a significant number of union members to voluntarily move to new careers. While the cash settlement was significant, it was also a very worthwhile investment by rail management. It allowed the CNW to streamline its operations and improve its competitive capabilities. At the same time, it did not take the costs of the competitive improvements out of the pockets of railway workers. My belief that this would induce significant voluntary departures was correct and many employees sought retirement, to the benefit of workers and management.

Does the gentleman agree that in passing this legislation it is the sense of Congress that any local arbitration on crew consist issues build on the success of the $50,000 voluntary payments made and make those job losses voluntary?

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I agree that the gentleman's understanding is certainly the sense of Congress.

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

Mr. Speaker, we meet this evening to vote on legislation designed to end the railroad strike and reaffirm the integrity of the Railway Labor Act and particularly the integrity of the Presidential Emergency Board process. The rail strike affects everyone, not only those who are employed or who manage or who ride the railroads; if this strike were allowed to continue, jobs in the railroad industry and manufacturing across the board and in agriculture would be imperiled.

We have heard that as many as a half million jobs above and beyond the 250,000 jobs in the railroad industry would be at stake. As much as a billion dollars a day could be lost.

As Secretary Skinner told the Transportation and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee this morning at 8 a.m., a fragile economy cannot long endure the effects of a national railway shutdown.

My own district, the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania is the home of a major Conrail marshalling yard, an intermodal facility, Union Pacific's corporate headquarters, Bethlehem Steel, and many smaller and mid-size manufacturers who depend on railroads. Thousands of jobs depend on the ability to get materials of production and finished goods into the marketplace. The same is true across America.

In an age of just-in-time inventory when railroad cars back up to factories, unload, and the material goes on to the production line, we can ill-afford a national strike.

Mr. Speaker, the Presidential Emergency Board recommendations are at the nucleus of the bill that we will vote on shortly.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT] talked about presumptive validity given the PEB report and recommendations. That is important, because this Presidential Emergency Board worked for 10 months. Their report extended to 21,000 pages.

The burden of persuasion rests upon the party that seeks to modify this long and durable process and seeks to modify any particular Board recommendations. The party seeking modification of a PEB recommendation can overcome the presumptive validity of the recommendation if that party shows to the board that the outcome of the Emergency Board recommendation was based on a material error or a material misunderstanding or is demonstrably inequitable.

Again, this preserves the integrity of the Presidential Emergency Board process. The bill also establishes a fair and equitable mechanism for the resolution of disputes that are at this time still unsettled. The bill favors neither management nor labor, but is fair to both.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and our staffs have worked diligently throughout recent days and nights to bring this legislation to the floor this evening and save the United States from an economic catastrophe when our economy is in soft shape.

The House leadership and the administration have worked with us in our efforts to bring legislation to the floor tonight.

I want to commend the hard work and leadership of Chairman DINGELL and our ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT].

For Chairman SWIFT and myself, this was a kind of maiden voyage. I must say, the two of us had able captains in Chairman DINGELL and ranking minority member LENT.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, House Joint Resolution 222.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support of House Joint Resolution 222 dealing with the current situation with our Nation's freight railroad carriers and railroad workers. On April 16, 1991 at 12:01 a.m., negotiations between 11 major railroad unions and freight carriers ceased. We are now confronted with a major railroad strike or shutout while this Nation is struggling to break the bonds of an economic recession. The economic realities will be devastating. Equally as important is the fact that, railroad laborers have not received a pay increase in 3 years and are confronted with unreasonable recommendations that were issued by Presidential Emergency Board No. 219. I strongly believe that a reasonable agreement could have been reached if the carriers had exhibited more concern for its workers, where wages, work rules, and health benefits were concerned.

The parties involved in this agreement began negotiations 3 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the negotiations process properly followed the procedures governing railroad labor disputes. The parties began negotiating a settlement 3 years ago. However the negotiations broke down. Subsequently, the National Mediation Board intervened and ultimately recommended the appointment of a Presidential Emergency Board to study the issues. President Bush's Presidential Emergency Board No. 219 issued its report and I believe that PEB No. 219 went too far in agreeing with the carrier's bargaining positions.

As of today, the labor laws that govern railroad disputes have been exhausted and the Congress has authority to step in and stop a transportation strike. The participation of the Congress, I feel, should focus on two key issues: The interruption of interstate commerce, and privilege of railroad laborers to bargain collectively for wages, health care benefits, and work rules.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about interruptions in interstate commerce. A protracted railroad labor strike will have a devastating impact on our economy and national security. The railroads are essential in moving our Nation's auto parts, paper products, steel, lumber, coal, glass products, chemicals, and plastics. Even more important, our troops are still in the Persian Gulf and may need vital equipment and other essentials that are transported by the freight railroad carriers.

However, the concern for interruptions in interstate commerce must not overshadow the concerns for the laborers who dedicate their lives to their respective carriers. The unions, using the collective bargaining process, have taken a strong stand on their wages, health and welfare benefits, and work rules. The freight carriers contend that they are unable to provide pay increases and health benefits. This is far from the truth. Freight carriers are financially sound due to increasing profits and favorable tax laws. I strongly feel that the Congress should respect these vital wishes of the 235,000 railroad workers.

I urge the Congress to move quickly to pass House Joint Resolution 222 to extend negotiations and set up a board to further study the issues in dispute. For the Congress to accept the recommendation of Presidential Emergency Board No. 219, I believe, would be tantamount to voting away railroad jobs, wages, and health care benefits without the consent of railroad workers.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, when we started out in these negotiations, there were two issues: How many people does it take to safely operate a train, and how many miles must a crew travel to earn a day's pay?

Mr. Speaker, this is a good agreement. What it does, first of all it says that this issue should not be returned to the Congress anymore.

Second, it says that we do not reopen the Presidential Board anymore.

Third, it is a bipartisan solution, and lastly, it is a responsible proposal.

What this legislation does, is stops the strike. It does not interfere with the collective bargaining process and it makes the Congress no longer the ultimate arbiter.

This is a good resolution. It brings pain to both sides and it is something that is needed to rescue economic stagnation in this country.

SETTLEMENT OF RAILROAD DISPUTE, APRIL 17, 1991

(PRESIDENTIAL EMERGENCY BOARD NO. 219)

(1) Railroad workers return to work under conditions in effect prior to April 17, 1991, except where there is a mutual agreement between the individual labor union and the railroads.

(2) A three person Special Board shall be appointed.

(3)(a) The Special Board will:

(1) Settle ambiguities in the Presidential Emergency Board (PEB).

(2) Consider issues on which there is disagreement between the parties where the PEB issued specific recommendations.

(3) Clarify other issues as requested by the parties.

(b) The Board will not consider issues on which the PEB made no specific recommendations (i.e. line sales, etc.).

(4) There is presumptive validity given to the PEB report and recommendations. The burden of persuasion rests upon the party seeking modification of a particular PEB recommendation.

(5) The party seeking modification of a PEB recommendation can overcome the presumptive validity of the recommendation if the party shows to the Board that the outcome of the PEB recommendation was based on a material error, or material mistake, or is demonstrably inequitable.

(6) The time line for the Board's considerations is as follows: Following appointment of the Board—

Days 1-5—Parties present clarification issues to the Board.

Days 6-15—Board considers and rules on clarification issues.

Days 16-25—Parties present remaining disagreements to the Board.

Days 26-55—Board considers and rules on remaining disagreements.

Days 56-64—Parties have a "cooling off" period where they may negotiate and conclude agreements.

Day 65—PEB, with revision by the Board (if any), minus any issues the parties have mutually agreed as settled, is imposed and shall have the same effect as if the parties had arrived at a mutual agreement under the Railway Labor Act.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, we have been working all day on this agreement in a bipartisan manner. I think this agreement really reflects the best process of this House. I think it is important to commend our chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT], who just did a tremendous job.

This issue was very important to me. I must have one of the largest rail labor populations in America, some people who deserve a good compensation and health care package, people who are some of the most hard-working and productive people in my congressional district, people who want to work and people who want to provide service to the people in the Houston area and all of Texas.

I was very concerned that if this strike were prolonged, there would be a great deal of diversion of cargo from our rail system and that would have a long-term negative effect on the railroad; so it is great to report that tonight there will be an agreement, not only in the House but also in the Senate, and an agreement that the President can sign.

In addition to being worried about the rail employees in my district, I was worried about other workers. In Houston, we are one of the largest port cities in America, in fact the largest in terms of import tonnage; 28 percent of the cargo that moves out of the Port of Houston moves by rail.

It was reported that as much as a million dollars per day could be lost by some of our petrol-chemical companies, and it was reported that if this strike were prolonged, if it did take several days or actually go into weeks, that some of those refineries would shut down and jobs would be lost.

So again, I think it is wonderful that we can report to the country and particularly to my home district that we have reached an agreement, that we will go forward and work out the differences that remain.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to express my deep gratitude to the chairman of the committee, to Chairman SWIFT and our friends on the other side of the aisle for their hard work in developing this piece of legislation which is before us for consideration this evening.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. Speaker, I will ask the chairman, the Presidential Emergency Board, on page 78 of the report, states that it is clear that the retroactive payment which will be recommended as well as the general wage increases imposed, may be larger than one or two carriers can afford. Further, the Board cites in this connection uncertain and possible loss of jobs that the inability of a railroad to meet its financial obligations would entail. In other words, the Board appears concerned that it is possible that the inability of one or two carriers to afford the recommended wage and payment levels could go so far as to contribute to the carriers failure. It is my firm understanding that the only carrier which has sought and which would be covered by this language on page 78 is the Southern Pacific Railroad Co.

The Board recommends that the parties negotiate "to adapt the Board's recommendations to the particular circumstances present in each railroad." That recommendation makes perfect sense in the context of the PEB, which is, first and foremost, meant to provide a structure for negotiation, for voluntary settlement by the parties.

The problem arises when we convert the PEB into a legislative imposition. In the absence of a voluntary agreement on individual adaptation, we could be imposing upon the carrier "impracticable," even fatal, wage and benefit levels.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the legislation we are considering today does not impose on the Southern Pacific Railroad Co. the wage levels set forth in the PEB, but instead establishes a binding process under which the Special Board would have full authority to adapt the wage and benefit levels to that which the Southern Pacific's operations can sustain, if the parties do not reach voluntary agreement on the matter.

It is my further understanding that the Special Board would have authority to decide that the matter of adaptation to the carrier's financial circumstances should be referred to binding arbitration, should the Board believe that is the most appropriate method to accomplish the task.

I ask the Chairman, Mr. DINGELL, if my understanding is correct.

□ 2200

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLATTERY. I yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the understanding of my friend from Kansas is correct. The Congress is well aware from its experience with Conrail, the Rock Island, and the Milwaukee, of the consequences when income from operations is not adequate to sustain a railroad. This is a matter of grave importance to the national transportation system. But I emphasize to the gentleman from Kansas that the Southern Pacific is the only railroad qualified under the PEB's page 78 language to raise this issue.

Mr. SLATTERY. I thank the chairman for his clarification.

Mr. Speaker, again I commend the chairman for his hard work and his leadership.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLATTERY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SCHAEFER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the two gentlemen for entering into their colloquy. This side of the aisle wholeheartedly supports the outcome of this situation.

Mr. SLATTERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the railroad strike has been ended because the Congress of the United States was able to muster its collective will and work on a bipartisan basis to end it to the satisfaction, at least temporarily, of the parties involved. Would it that this could occur on budgetary matters and other kinds of crises that we face on a daily basis in this body. But for once we can feel proud that the rush to action, the call to action was answered by the Members in a bipartisan way and one in which they worked with the White House itself and with all the parties.

This should be considered a banner day for the Congress of the United States and should signal new efforts on a whole host of other issues on which we could work in the same manner.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. ECKART].

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Seven years ago rail labor/rail management first started debating the questions of health and welfare issues.

Forty months ago they first filed their notices to negotiate these matters. Then on January 17 PEB issued their report. On the 17th the time ran out, and people agreed not to strike. It has been a long time to get to this point, and people wonder why did it take so long? Well, it was 15 hours ago that the strike began. It was 14 hours ago that the committee began its work. Now, just shortly after 10 p.m., the strike will end. The strike will end and send a very powerful message to railroad workers across this country that you are going to get what you thought you could not get, and that is, a second chance. The strike will end, and rail management will get what they did not think that they could get, and that is, an end to a strike that was going to cost them $50 million a day, and some certitude to the negotiating process.

This is the largest, most complicated negotiation that has gone on in 29 years; 10 unions, 200 railroads, 200,000 railroad workers.

Mr. Speaker, with this bill, railroaders will go back to work, the country will get back about the business of moving the business and commerce, and we will send a very powerful message that the playing field is level, that the negotiations will be fair and we will balance the needs and the opportunities for all those who seek to participate in the collective-bargaining process.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, only to observe that great credit belongs to members of the committee, certainly the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has been most cooperative and helpful in this and has done very well; the distinguished gentleman from New York, the ranking member who has done an outstanding job; the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH] and all the other members and the staff which worked very hard.

Certainly the Secretary of Transportation has been an outstanding force in accomplishing this legislation.

One last thought I would like my colleagues to keep in mind: Never, never, never during the consideration of this legislation was there one moment of partisan behavior or recriminations. That does great credit, I think, to the members of the committee, members of the subcommittee, and to the institution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 222, legislation to resolve the current railway strike. And I would like to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] for their Herculean efforts to bring this improtant legislation to the floor today.

Since January 1988, there has existed a dispute between our Nation's railway unions and our class I freight transporters. Unfortunately, as of 12:01 a.m. on Wednesday, April 17, 1991, all existing channels of resolution had been exhausted, and the unions and their 235,0000 workers decided to strike.

Unfortunately, at this time our economy is currently experiencing a period of recession and the railway strike could devastate our Nation. The Department of Transportation estimates that the strike could idle as much as 550,000 workers in industries directly affected by rail transporation. The effect of this sudden shock to the economy is a test we would all like to avoid.

In my own 22d District of New York, among other industries, my constituents depend on the General Motors plant in Tarrytown, NY, for their livelihoods. Unfortunately, General Motors estimates that within the next 24 hours, the company will be forced to curtail approximately 75 percent to 80 percent of their operations. During this time of economic hardship, such a curtailment would be an additional burden that could devastate these working families.

The legislation before us would allow our Nation's railway workers to return to their jobs and provide the services that our Nation so desperately needs. At the same time, the legislation creates a Special Emergency Board to resolve the remaining disputes between our railway workers and the railroads. Furthermore, the legislation establishes a 65-day cooling off period during which the Board, the unions, and the railroads will have an opportunity to resolve this crisis.

We sympathize with the concerns of both the unions and the railroads and it is our hope that the new Special Board will resolve those issues and our Nation can return to work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation in order to allow our Nation to return to work.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS). Pursuant to the order of the House of earlier today, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 5, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

YEAS—400

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allard
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bunning
Burton
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Gray
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Marlenee
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Nussle
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yatron
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—5

DeFazio
Edwards (CA)
Gonzalez
Moody
Perkins

NOT VOTING—26

Aspin
Berman
Bryant
Dornan (CA)
Dymally
Flake
Ford (TN)
Hall (OH)
Hughes
Lehman (FL)
Levine (CA)
Markey
Martin
McDade
McDermott
Miller (OH)
Molinari
Murphy
Sharp
Solarz
Udall
Vander Jagt
Waxman
Weber
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2235

Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. MOODY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BENNETT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was present during rollcall No. 72 on House Joint Resolution 22 and voted "yea." However, the RECORD indicates that I did not vote.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on House Joint Resolution 222, the joint resolution just passed.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I take the time simply to ask the gentleman from Michigan whether or not we are going to take some action with regard to enrolling the bill, so that it can be acted upon as quickly as possible?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I can advise the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that the Speaker has advised me he is going to have the bill enrolled just as fast as he can, get it to the Senate, and hopefully the Senate will act on it tonight so it will go to the White House at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. I did not know whether we needed a unanimous request for hand enrollment or not.

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will yield further, I am advised that if we were to do that, we might actually slow the process.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, Wednesday, April 17, 1991, the House will now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The House is now in recess.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2335

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi) at 11 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.J. Res. 222. Joint resolution to provide for a settlement of the railroad labor-management disputes between certain railroads represented by the National Carriers' Conference Committee of the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DREIER of California, for 25 minutes, today.

Mr. SOLOMON, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BACCHUS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OWENS of Utah, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RIDGE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KLUG.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. MCEWEN.
Mr. SCHULZE.
Mr. COUGHLIN.
Mr. CRANE in two instances.
Mr. LOWERY of California in two instances.
Mr. GALLEGLY in two instances.
Mr. MCGRATH.
Mr. CAMP.
Mr. GOSS.
Mr. OXLEY.
Mr. GEKAS.
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BACCHUS) and to include extraneous material:)

Mrs. KENNELLY.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. ERDREICH.
Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.
Mr. DONNELLY.
Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.
Mr. PENNY.
Mr. TRAFICANT in two instances.
Mr. SMITH of Florida in two instances.
Mr. KLECZKA.
Mr. SKELTON in two instances.
Mr. PALLONE.
Mr. BERMAN.
Mr. TALLON.
Mr. APPLEGATE.
Mr. MINETA.
Mr. LUKEN.
Mr. LAFALCE.
Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
Mr. WEISS.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.
Mr. MAZZOLI.
Mr. WAXMAN.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 248. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain sements of the Niobrara River in Nebraska and a segment of the Missouri River in Nebraska and South Dakota as components of the wild and scenic rivers system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 740. An act to provide a new civil cause of action in Federal law for international terrorism that provides extraterritorial jurisdiction over terrorist acts abroad against United States nationals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, April 18, 1991, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1101. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a notice of Final Priorities for Technology, Educational Media, and Materials for Individuals With Disabilities Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1102. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Family Planning and 5-Year Plan reports for the two most recently ended fiscal years, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 300a-6a(a); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1103. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of intent to exercise authority under section 506(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, in order to provide international assistance in the Persian Gulf region, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2318(a)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1104. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting his notification that, pursuant to Executive Order No. 12730, foreign policy controls will be expanded to include 39 chemicals that can be used in the production of chemical weapons, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2405(o)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1105. A letter from the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the CBO and OMB report estimating the change of outlays in each fiscal year through 1995 as a result of the passage of Public Law 102-26, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1106. A letter from the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the CBO and OMB report estimating the change of outlays in each fiscal year through 1995 as a result of the passage of Public Law 102-27 and Public Law 102-28, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1107. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1108. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1109. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the second report on the extent to which Federal agencies are using the authorities vested in them by the Federal Technology Transfer Act of 1986, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 3710(b); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

1110. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to delete the requirement that settlements of claims in excess of $1,000,000 on a construction contract be provided for specifically in an appropriation law, and to provide instead that the Secretary notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations of construction contract claims settlements of more than $1,000,000; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1111. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, Department of Energy; transmitting a report on Candidate Sites for Expansion of the Strategic Petroleum Reserves to 1 Billion Barrels; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Energy and Commerce.

[Omitted from the Record of April 9, 1991]

1112. A letter from the Secretary of the Army and Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting notification of the intention of the Departments of the Army and Agriculture to interchange jurisdiction of lands and facilities surrounding Lake Isabella and Pine Flat Lake, CA, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 505a, jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Public Works and Transportation, and Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ANTHONY:

H.R. 1840. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on N,N'-Ethylenebis(5,6-dibromo-2,3-norbornanedicarboximide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1841. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on 1,2-Dibromo-4-(1,2-dibromoethyl)cyclohexane; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1842. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on Tetrabromocyclooctane; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1843. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1844. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspensions of duty on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 1845. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit contributions by multicandidate political committees and to limit contributions in House of Representatives elections from persons other than individual in-State residents; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BALLENGER:

H.R. 1846. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on 3-amino-acetanilide-4-sulfonic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1847. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on 2,4-dinitroaniline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1848. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on chloranil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1849. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on diazo-2,1,4-sulfonic acid and its salts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1850. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on acet-p-anisidine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARNARD (for himself and Mr. JENKINS):

H.R. 1851. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspension of duty on certain piston engines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 1852. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve Department of Defense oversight of special access programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUSTAMANTE:

H.R. 1853. A bill to provide for the duty-free liquidation or reliquidation of, and the refund of customs duties for, certain entries of tissue paper products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BYRON:

H.R. 1854. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act to require that consumer product warranties include a statement of the availability from the manufacturer of spare parts; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARDIN:

H.R. 1855. A bill to extend through December 31, 1994, the suspension of import duties on synthetic rutile; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1856. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the discharge, or repayment, of student loans of students who agree to perform services in certain professions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

H.R. 1857. A bill to extend for 3 years the existing suspension of duty on Ala Pro; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 1858. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty of Basic Blue 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H.R. 1859. A bill to make a technical correction with respect to the temporary duty suspension for clomiphene citrate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. GRANDY, and Mr. MOODY):

H.R. 1860. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of certain amounts received by a cooperative telephone company indirectly from its members; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DWYER of New Jersey:

H.R. 1861. A bill to suspend for a 3-year period the duty on famotidine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1862. A bill to extend the existing suspension of duty on D-carboxamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1863. A bill to extend the existing suspension of duty on amiloride hydrochloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 1864. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow small builders to compute on the installment sales method income from the sale of certain residential real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRADISON:

H.R. 1865. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HATCHER:

H.R. 1866. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on pyrmethyl alcohol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1867. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on TAC; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1868. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on metmercazole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HATCHER (for himself and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 1869. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on fluometuron and IBTF; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. SCHROEDER,

Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AUCOIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mr. KOPETSKI):

H.R. 1870. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a taxpayer conscientiously opposed to participation in war may elect to have such taxpayer's income, estate, or gift tax payments spent for nonmilitary purposes; to create the U.S. Peace Tax Fund to receive such tax payments; to establish a U.S. Peace Tax Fund Board of Trustees; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H.R. 1871. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Tralomethrin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1872. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Fenbendazole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1873. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on halofuginone hydrobromide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1874. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspension of duty on certain sulfonaides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1875. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on fenoxaprop-ethyl and fenoxaprop-p-ethyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KENNELLY:

H.R. 1876. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on ceramic (non-porcelain) mugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1877. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on imitation non-metal jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1878. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on porcelain ornaments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

H.R. 1879. A bill directing the Secretary of State and the Director of the Foreign Commercial Service to appoint permanent cultural and commercial representatives to the Baltic States, to encourage the President to appoint a special envoy to encourage Baltic-Soviet negotiations, and to extend certain assistance to the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 1880. A bill to increase the amount of deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY of New York:

H.R. 1881. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on vigabatrin, nitrazepam, and clobazam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCURDY (for himself, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. ROWLAND, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. PENNY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. SABO, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. OLIN, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TALLON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. PEASE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. RUSSO, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 1882. A bill to establish a commission to advise the President on proposals for national commemorative events; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MCEWEN:

H.R. 1883. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the special employment tax treatment of certain family services providers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1884. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to extend the suspension of the duties on certain bicycle parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 1885. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to protect investors in limited partnerships in rollup transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MINETA:

H.R. 1886. A bill to terminate the effectiveness of certain amendments to the foreign repair station rules of the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 1887. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on Peridur; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PATTERSON:

H.R. 1888. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on Phospholan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PATTERSON (for herself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Ms. LONG, Mr. PENNY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. PARKER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. VALENTINE):

H.R. 1889. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to reform the Federal budget process, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committee on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. OBEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 1890. A bill to increase the minimum basic formula price for class I milk, to provide payments to producers of milk that is not used for fluid milk products, and to establish the solid content of packaged fluid milk products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 1891. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspension of duty on certain sulfonamides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1892. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on N,N-dithio-di-(2,1-phenylene) bis benzamide until January 1, 1995; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1893. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on dephenyl guanidine until January 1, 1995; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1894. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on di-o-tolyl guanidine until January 1, 1995; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 1895. A bill to repeal the United States prohibition on air transportation with South Africa; to the Committee on Works and Transportation.

H.R. 1896. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of certain weaving machines for fabrics in excess of 4.9 meters in width; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming (for himself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. COX of California, Mr. KYL, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. WALKER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina):

H.R. 1897. A bill to limit the growth in the number of civilian employees within each branch of the Government; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, House Administration, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 1898. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to repeal the reduced Medicare reimbursement for new physicians; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VALENTINE:

H.R. 1899. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspension of duty on Tfs Lys Pro in free base and tosyl salt forms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 1900. A bill to provide for the granting of asylum in the United States to nationals of Laos, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Burma who assist in the return to the United States of living Vietnam POW/MIA's; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VALENTINE:

H.R. 1901. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspension of duty on norfloxacin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1902. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on keto ester; to the Committe on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1903. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on lisinopril; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 1904. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 1905. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1906. A bill to suspend for a 3-year period the duty on certain sheet glass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOLKMER:

H.R. 1907. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on oxalacetic acid diethyl ester sodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1908. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspension of duty on difenzoquat methyl sulfate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1909. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspension of duty on sulfathiazole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1910. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspension of duty on sulfamethazine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOLKMER (for himself, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. JONTZ):

H.R. 1911. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to provide grants for the purchase of recycling equipment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1912. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 25-percent investment tax credit for recycling equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARPER:

H.R. 1913. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on PCMX; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MFUME:

H.R. 1914. A bill to provide for the acquisition and publication of data on police brutality complaints, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 1915. A bill to suspend for a 3-year period the duty on omega-dodecalactam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY):

H.R. 1916. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to establish Federal standards for long-term care insurance policies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. LENT, Mr. WELDON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. TORRES, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. STOKES, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ROE, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. DELLUMS):

H.R. 1918. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a service pension of $100 per month for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. LENT, Mr. SWIFT, and Mr. RITTER):

H.J. Res. 222. Joint resolution to provide for a settlement of the railroad labor-management disputes between certain railroads represented by the National Carriers' Conference Committee of the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FOGLIETTA (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. ROE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GUARINI, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.J. Res. 223. Joint resolution to designate September 17, 1991, as "Constitution Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. PATTERSON (for herself, Mr. GORDON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. TALLON, and Mr. HUTTO):

H.J. Res. 224. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to contributions and expenditures intended to affect congressional, Presidential, State, and local elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHULZE (for himself, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. ROTH, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. RAY, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. RHODES, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. PAXON, Mr. GALLO, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FISH, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. ECKART, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. BYRON, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. REGULA, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H.J. Res. 225. Joint resolution to designate September 28, 1991, as "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STALLINGS (for himself, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. WYDEN):

H.J. Res. 226. Joint resolution designating the month of June 1991 as "National Forest System Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. KLECZKA):

H.J. Res. 227. Joint resolution to designate October 1991 as "Polish-American Heritage Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself and Mr. BROOMFIELD):

H. Con. Res. 127. Concurrent resolution calling upon the President to take action through the United Nations to bring Iraqi officials, including President Saddam Hussein, before an appropriate international tribunal to be judged for war crimes and crimes against humanity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PENNY (for himself, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. BROWDER, and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey):

H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the need for a new approach to controlling the growth of Federal spending and reforming the priorities of such Federal spending in order to revive the progressive goal of national fiscal policy; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALLON (for himself, Mr. ROTH, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SWETT, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CARR, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HORTON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia):

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that employers resume normal business travel and that travel and tourism-related businesses intensify efforts to promote travel both to and within the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WEBER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. GRADISON, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H. Res. 127. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HASTERT:

H. Res. 128. Resolution applauding the Architect of the Capitol and the Committee on House Administration for developing an effective recycling program in the House office buidings, and supporting ongoing efforts to expand and update source separation and recycling in the House office buildings during the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LOWERY of California:

H.R. 1917. A bill for the relief of Michael Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 5: Mr. ROEMER.

H.R. 34: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KYL, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. COX of California, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 44: Mr. WELDON and Mr. AUCOIN.

H.R. 68: Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. GRAY.

H.R. 77: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ROE, and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 78: Mr. GEKAS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. GRANDY.

H.R. 81: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 173: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 179: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. GORDON, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 187: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PAXON, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. MANTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 298: Mr. WEBER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 303: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. MCCRERY.

H.R. 310: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 350: Mr. WILSON, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 351: Mr. BLAZ, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KYL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ECKART, Mr. FISH, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. DREIER of California.

H.R. 352: Mr. HERGER, Mr. ROE, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. FISH, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 371: Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 413: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. HERTEL, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

H.R. 467: Mr. MARTIN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 516: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 539: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 540: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 559: Mr. SMITH of Florida and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 565: Mr. SUNDQUIST and Mr. HERTEL.

H.R. 587: Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

H.R. 652: Mr. LAGOMARSINO and Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

H.R. 661: Mr. DELAY, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 698: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 699: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 722: Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 723: Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 766: Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 768: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 811: Mr. ALLARD.

H.R. 821: Mr. STOKES, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 826: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 827: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 843: Mrs. LOWEY of New York and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 908: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 915: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. GRANDY.

H.R. 916: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 945: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HANCOCK, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. MCGRATH.

H.R. 951: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GILCHREST, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 961: Mr. ROE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 967: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. SARPALIUS.

H.R. 1059: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1070: Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 1093: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SARPALIUS.

H.R. 1125: Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 1144: Mr. FISH and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1155: Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. KLUG, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. ROE, and Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 1163: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 1197: Mr. EVANS, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1200: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FISH, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1235: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ORTON, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. FROST, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 1263: Ms. DELAURO AND MR. JACOBS.

H.R. 1264: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 1270: Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 1292: Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 1325: Mr. BARRETT and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1330: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. GORDON, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. WEBER, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. ROSE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 1348: Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WEBER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. SPENCE, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. GORDON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. COBLE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SABO, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DICKS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SWETT, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. WISE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. TALLON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 1360: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1406: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WISE, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 1421: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 1439: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 1454: Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 1468: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1473: Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CAMP, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 1476: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.R. 1504: Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 1572: Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. TALLON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. WEBER, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.R. 1629: Mr. VOLKMER and Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

H.R. 1649: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 1667: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1676: Mr. BATEMAN and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 1719: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ROE, and Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.R. 1753: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1755: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. RHODES, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. COX of California, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. INHOFE.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. SANTORUM.

H.J. Res. 66: Mr. DE LA GARZA.

H.J. Res. 78: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LENT, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ROE, Mr. MFUME, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. FISH, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. WALSH.

H.J. Res. 90: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. RHODES, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.J. Res. 103: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. ECKART, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JENKINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LENT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. OAKAR, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. RAY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WELDON, Mr. YATRON, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. OLIN, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. TAUZIN.

H.J. Res. 141: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SWETT and Mr. JACOBS.

H.J. Res. 143: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. PORTER.

H.J. Res. 154: Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. RHODES, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUMP, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. WELDON, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr.

ASPIN, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.J. Res. 171: Mr. SWETT, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. ECKART, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, and Mr. SANTORUM.

H.J. Res. 173: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOODY, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NOWAK, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. ORTON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. YATRON.

H.J. Res. 175: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. ESPY, Mr. BLILEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ROSE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. EMERSON, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ROWLAND, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ZIMMER, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. DWYER OF New Jersey, Mr. FROST, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 194: Mr. Dwyer of New Jersey, Mr. MINETA, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. ROYBAL, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. CARR, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. SABO, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. HOYER.

H.J. Res. 209: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. KOLBE.

H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. COX of California, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. KLUG.

H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. HEFLEY.

H. Con. Res. 103: Mr. HYDE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H. Res. 101: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. RAVENEL, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. PALLONE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1292: Mr. PANETTA.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

58. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, NY, relative to urging the Congress to enact a 1-percent surcharge on Kuwaiti rebuilding projects to benefit veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.