SENATE—*Thursday, March 18, 1993*

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 3, 1993)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable BYRON L. DORGAN, a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

* * * *ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.*—Ephesians 6:4.

God our Father, we pray for children—not only our own, but the children of the world. We think of the thousands of children who are starving to death. We think of the thousands of youth wandering our streets, hostage to every form of evil. We pray for these children and, though we cannot respond to their situation, help us to take seriously our responsibility to our own. Save them from being sacrificed for our work. Remind us that "children are a heritage of the Lord * * *." (Psalm 127:3), and that they are our greatest resource for the future. Give us grace to fulfill our responsibility as parents and as neighbors and as leaders. God save our children.

We pray in His name who said:

* * * *Suffer the little children to come unto me; and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.*—Matthew 19:14.

Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 18, 1993.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BYRON L. DORGAN, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. DORGAN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the pending business.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998.

The Senate resumed consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we are on the budget resolution; correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the pending business. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, could I ask the Senator from Nebraska, does he want to speak as in morning business or is he going to speak on the budget resolution?

Mr. KERREY. I was going to ask to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. For how long?

Mr. KERREY. Ten minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I will yield the floor to the Senator from Nebraska to speak as in morning business for no more than 10 minutes if I will be recognized immediately afterward and if the time of the Senator from Nebraska not be charged to either side on the budget resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska for 10 minutes.

Mr. KERREY. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. KERREY pertaining to the introduction of S. 610 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might use. And for the benefit of people who are waiting to take the floor, I would suggest that I probably would not be much more than 25 or 30 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, first of all, for people who maybe were not able to follow the Senate yesterday, late yesterday we started on our annual process of adopting the first budget resolution, and we are in the process by which in a macroeconomic sense we decide in broad categories where the $1.6 trillion of money that we spend annually will be going. So we are speaking probably generally about the budget situation and not to real specific programs as we might do on the specific appropriations bills that come up later in the year.

Mr. President, the Clinton budget and the modified budget voted for unanimously by the Budget Committee majority just last Thursday represents, in my opinion, a complete reversal of what was promised to the American people by candidate Clinton throughout the 1992 campaign. I think the budget is replete with broken promises, false advertising, and what I consider fiscal insanity. The American people were promised by their candidate bold change. This budget is certainly bold. But it is not bold change. It is bold-faced. I have spoken on this floor in the recent past specifically where this budget departs from the President's promises and where it departs from how it was advertised and was projected to be in the last campaign.

I have spoken about how it makes little economic sense, and I think that is what ought to worry us most, is whether or not this is good economic policy for the Federal Government regardless of whether it brings change as the President promises and whether it is something he advertised differently, the point being that if it is not good for the economy of the United States, it is not good for any reason.

Now, I want to go beyond what I previously said, Mr. President, in past speeches on the floor on the budget. This budget does not learn from the lessons or mistakes of past administrations. And for all of my colleagues here who think that maybe I would just be critical of the Clinton administration, I think I have a reputation for having been critical of the deficits of Reagan and Bush alike.

And so I stand here not to be a stumbling block to this new administration. I want this President to succeed because if he does not succeed, America will not succeed, and if America will not succeed, this will not be a very good country for Republicans to take over in 1996. We want it to be preserved. We want to do well.

And so it does not learn from the mistakes of past administrations. In fact, it takes what was done and done

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

wrong in the Reagan-Bush years and stands it on its head, because what was underfunded in the Reagan-Bush budgets is fully funded in this budget. What was fully funded in the Reagan-Bush budget is underfunded in this budget. What was undertaxed in Reagan-Bush is fully taxed in this budget. And what was fully taxed in Reagan-Bush is undertaxed in this budget.

This is a mirror image approach to budgeting, and it is analogous to taking all the chairs that were on one side of the *Titanic* and moving them over to the other side of the *Titanic*. And, yes, the ship might be leaning more to port side than previously, but it is still headed for an iceberg.

This budget does not reflect the lessons learned from throwing too much money at the defense industry during the 1980's. And I was highly critical of Reagan doing that. Instead of more defense, under Reagan we got less and more expensive defense.

Now, in the 1990's, under this new administration and with this new budget, we run the risk of doing to domestic programs what we did to defense programs in the 1980's. In this budget we are throwing money at domestic programs. We are not reinventing Government first and then funding a more effective, more efficient Government with fewer dollars.

This budget also does not learn from the high-tax, high-spend policies of the Carter administration. We are raising taxes by $300 billion in this budget. That is the biggest tax increase in the history of the country. That is an enormous burden on any economy let alone one that is just emerging from a recession, with many of our largest corporations themselves in the process of going under major restructuring.

In this budget plan, deficit reductions occur by raising $3.50 in taxes for every $1 in spending reductions. This is very clearly a tax-and-spend budget. Seventy percent of the taxes increased will be spent by Congress under this budget. There is no change here.

Now, if the Reagan-Bush economics were called voodoo, then this is surely "deja voodoo." You heard it, this is surely "deja voodoo." Avoiding the iceberg would also require much more deficit reduction, both in the short term and the long term. In the short term, the problem is what we are adding to the debt itself.

President Clinton rightly deplores the record amounts of debt racked up during the Reagan administration and in the Bush administration, and I will say "right on."

The charts that I have here, Mr. President, show that the Clinton administration, however, will be much worse. Not that that is the intent. I do not attribute any bad or ill-intent to the President's budget.

This first chart shows that Clinton's proposed debt increase is just as bad as the actual debt increases under Reagan-Bush. What makes it so bad is that the actuals are always so much worse than what is proposed. So if history merely repeats itself, this budget resolution is a ticking time bomb of red ink.

Specifically, this chart shows the accumulation of debt since the first days of the Republic. That is this column. Then for the 12 years, 8 years of Reagan and 4 years of Bush, the top line, the red line—that is the sharply rising line—shows the trend in the national debt. You will see that that trend is soaring. The beginning, of course, is $1 trillion that was accumulated during our first 200 years of history. Then it went up to $1.8 trillion under the first Reagan term. Then, in the second Reagan term, it went up to $2.9 trillion; then to $4.4 trillion at the end of Bush's term in office.

Those are exactly the same figures that you will hear from Candidate Clinton in the last campaign. We do not and we cannot dispute those. And I do not say that that is good public policy. It is very bad public policy.

Up to where the green starts on the chart, that is all history. That takes us up to where the yellow meets the green.

The yellow represents history; the green is what Clinton proposes. We know that what ends up at the end of a term is always worse—much worse—than what each one of these Presidents proposed.

So I have reason to believe that even what is being proposed here at the end of Clinton's 5-year time span of $6.2 trillion will even be worse. I think we have every right, based upon the history of the past, to fear that it will be worse.

This 5-year budget proposes to increase the national debt from $4.4 trillion now to $6.2 trillion in fiscal year 1998. That is after 5 years. It is all right here in the chart.

Mr. President, I think it cannot be reiterated too much that that is a shocking figure.

The national debt will rise to $6.2 trillion, 5 years from now, in fiscal year 1998.

It is right here also in our committee report. On XI, on line 12, it says that in fiscal year 1998, we are going to have $6,161,400,000,000 in total debt.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will yield.

Mr. SASSER. I ask my good friend from Iowa—just agreeing for a moment, for the purpose of argument, that the chart is correct—if his figure of $6.2 trillion at the end of 1998 is correct, without the Clinton proposal, which reduces it $502 billion, then that number would be $6.7 trillion as opposed to the $6.2 trillion.

Mr. GRASSLEY. The Senator is right.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Senator for his candid answer. Further, looking at his chart, it would appear that in the first 8 years of the Reagan term that we doubled the national debt that had taken us 200 years to build.

Is that not a fair assessment?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I have already made that point. So, obviously, I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SASSER. One final question, Mr. President. Let me ask my good friend from Iowa, whom I have the greatest respect for, as he knows, in the Bush 4-year term, we have in essence doubled the national debt that we had incurred during the 8 years of the Reagan term.

Is that a fair statement?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SASSER. I guess my point to my good friend from Iowa is, even though the debt does go up under the Clinton proposal, if it were not for the Clinton proposal, it would go up to $6.7 trillion.

And what would my friend suggest we do, other than adopt this Clinton proposal?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Of course, Mr. President, both Republicans and Democrats, I think, will have a lot of recommendations for changing this proposal that is before us, and hopefully making it better, not only on the bottom line of what the debt is, but also in ways that we can do it without the big tax increase.

But, Mr. President, I think that obviously the Senator, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, the Senator from Tennessee, does not in any way say anything that I dispute. He has repeated what I have said.

But we are here, and my point of discussion during this debate is to point out that we ought to be learning, including those of us in this 100-Member body right now, that what happened during this historical time is not good, and that what we are actually doing is increasing the debt yet. So it is business as usual. This is the proposed deficit of the Clinton budget, and we always do worse than what is proposed.

So this lesson on history, for the benefit of the Senator from Tennessee, is that we always do worse than what we plan on doing. I want us to avoid making that mistake this time.

It is very important for the American people to know, and for my colleagues to know, that there is only one measurement in this entire budget resolution that tells it all. There is only one measurement that cuts through all the smoke and mirrors, and that is the increase in the debt. Because, ultimately, that is what we owe—each of us owes and each of our constituents owes.

Out there at the grassroots of my constituency in the State of Iowa—and I will bet you it is the same in all the other 49 States—there is not a constituent we have that is going to belie the argument just made by the distinguished chairman that because this is

$6.2 trillion now, without the Clinton proposals, this could be $6.7 trillion; that somehow we are saving $.5 trillion of national debt.

What the public is going to look at, when they measure whether or not we are doing any good through the process of budgeting and cutting down on debt and cutting down on expenditures, is how much are we increasing next year over this year's level of expenditure. They do not buy the argument that some department expects to get $100 billion and we only give them $90 billion, that they are getting cut, that we are cutting the budget $10 billion. If that department got $85 billion last year and we give them $90 billion this year, the taxpaying public knows in a commonsense fashion that we are giving a $5 billion increase, not a $10 billion reduction.

I want to point out a very interesting and important discrepancy. This budget resolution that I just read from states that the deficits over the next 4 years will total $871 billion. But the debt grows from $4.4 trillion this year to $5.8 trillion 4 years from now. So that is a $1.4 trillion increase over the next 4 years—not just $871 billion more of debt. That means that the actual debt is expected to be 61 percent higher than we are led to believe, if we look only at the stream of optimistic deficits.

Mr. President, according to national polls, Mr. Clinton's budget plan was well received in the country, and maybe still is well received in the country. To those of you who support the Clinton budget, just let me say this: If we adopt the Clinton budget, the national debt will soar from $4.4 trillion to $6.2 trillion. How can that be called change, the change that was the theme of last fall's campaign and what has been talked about since the new administration started? Change is what the President promised.

This change simply does not comport with change that we were promised, nor with the change that we were led to believe we were getting with this budget. That is an average yearly debt increase of $350 billion, Mr. President. That is the real deficit; that is the real measure of what the public owes—$1.4 trillion over the next 4 years.

Let me just drive home the point, Mr. President, with a second chart that I will put up here. This chart, I think, makes the whole point a little more lucid, why the Clinton administration is starting off on the wrong foot. It shows how the President has squarely put himself behind the eight ball with a budget that fails to cut spending.

This second chart shows the difference between proposed deficits and actual deficits by previous Presidents. It shows how President Clinton's proposed deficits match up against those of the other Presidents. The most obvious fact in this chart is that reality is always worse. As you can see, Reagan thought he would only have $62 billion in accumulated deficit and ended up having $733 billion of accumulated deficit. The green bars in the chart show what was proposed. It does it for Reagan, his first term, his second term, Bush's only term, and then Clinton's term.

Next to the green bars, the red bars show us what actually happened, the actual accumulation of deficits during each President's term. Notice the very large gap there is for each Presidential term between what is projected—that is the green bar—and what is actual, the red bar. This shows that reality is always worse than projected.

The other obvious point in this chart is that, given this budget resolution that we have before us, we are in for a very big debt explosion. Clinton's proposed starting point is just as bad as the actual records. In other words, where Clinton proposes to take us is just as bad as the actual records of Reagan and Bush, whose records, I might add, Mr. Clinton constantly and rightfully deplores.

If this is where Mr. Clinton begins, he is surely going to end up off the chart someplace.

Mr. President, this is the best illustration that this budget does not represent change, and I accept change as defined by Mr. Clinton during his campaign. This is business as usual. We had this problem before this new President came to town. We had this problem during the decade of gridlock. This is not new. This is old, very old. This is not a new kind of Democrat budget. This is kind of a previous President's program. This could be Jimmy Carter. This is adding to the problem, not correcting it.

This budget is nothing more than a hangover from the decade of gridlock. All that has changed, as I said earlier, is that the chairs were switched from starboard to port on the deck of the *Titanic*, but the *Titanic* still is on course to the iceberg. If you look at the bottom line, Mr. President, the tide of red ink continues to rise at a pace equal to that of past administrations, and we have done nothing to alter the course toward the iceberg.

If there is any doubt that this budget is indeed a hangover from the decade of gridlock, let me try another persuasive argument. Last month, President Clinton met with my colleagues and me on this side of the aisle up here in the Capitol during our Tuesday caucus luncheon. There were news stories the next day quoting several of my colleagues, who said that President Clinton did not have more spending cuts in his budget because he could not get them through Congress. The White House denied these reports. Yet, we are still seeing reports saying the same thing. For example, on March 3, in the Washington Post, on page A4, there is an article entitled "Clinton Finds Hill Republicans Bearing Gifts: Proposed Budget Cuts." I would like to quote from that article. It says: "Administration officials said Clinton refrained from proposing cuts that he knew would be unacceptable on the Hill."

Now, Mr. President, if that is not business as usual, if this budget is not business as usual, I do not know what is.

Ross Perot are you listening?

I will tell you what else is business as usual, Mr. President. My offering a freeze is business as usual. That is proof positive that we are doing things the same way now that we have since 1982 when I first offered a budget freeze.

I would have expected, based on what the President promised, that he would have offered a freeze as a point of departure, and I would have offered a 10-percent across-the-board cut together with initiatives to reinvent Government.

But a freeze is all that is doable in a climate where Congress continues to protect the status quo and all the spending habits that go with it, and even then it is not clear if this amendment can carry the day.

This is a great disappointment, Mr. President, and I do hope that the American people and all of those out there who supported Ross Perot are taking note of what is going on in their capital. It is a hangover from the decade of gridlock. It was going on for 12 years before November and it is still going on.

Mr. President, I mentioned earlier that to avoid the iceberg in our immediate path we had to address both the short- and the long-term horizons so I would switch to the long term. The long-term deficit problem is best understood by viewing the stream of deficits from 1998 to 2003. The CBO baseline issued in January shows the deficit will rise to $653 billion by the year 2003. This budget will probably lower that figure but by not enough to stem the rising tide of red ink. The bottom line is a business-as-usual budget which will do little to protect against the ongoing bow wave of massive deficits.

For these reasons I offered in committee an amendment to freeze nondefense discretionary spending for 5 years. I intend to offer that amendment again here on the floor together with the help of Senator NICKLES and Senator BOND.

It is my great hope, Mr. President, that my colleagues will find the necessary courage to do what is right, to do something that we should have done years ago, to freeze spending, to help prevent a fiscal crisis of mounting debt in the years immediately ahead.

So, my message to my colleagues, Mr. President, and in a sense asking President Clinton to help as well, is to have guts, make cuts.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa yields the floor.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I yield such time to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina as he may consume.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I voted in the past with the distinguished Senator from Iowa on budget freezes, and this particular Senator has been offering freeze amendments for 10 years. But the potential for a realistic freeze, Mr. President, had largely evaporated by 1989 and 1990. Now we are beyond the point where a freeze alone will solve the deficit problem. However, yes, we ought to freeze some spending.

But the freeze the distinguished Senator from Iowa proposed in the Budget Committee would freeze health care spending for 5 years. I do not think that is going to happen. That is unrealistic.

The 5-year freeze of the distinguished Senator would freeze the FBI and Federal prisons for 5 years. That is totally unrealistic, given the growing problems that we have in law enforcement.

The distinguished Senator from Iowa would have frozen education for 5 years, yet we are trying to restart education. I well remember introducing the new Secretary of Education, Dick Riley, at his confirmation hearing. I said that America's long national nightmare in education was finally over, that we are finally going to move forward.

This crowd came to town 12 years ago and said do away with education, just get rid of the Department; let the private sector operate. And they still insist on it with respect to these tuition grants, vouchers and denigrating of public schools. They want to finance private education, not public education. They are totally twisted in their minds as to our duty.

The duty of a public servant is to provide for public education. The duty of the public servant with respect to the private schools is to leave them alone. If we are going to start funding those, then next we are going to start imposing rules and regulations.

Go down the list of 5-year freezes, and there is a freeze on transportation, environmental protection, agriculture, and so much more. So I could not support the freeze of the distinguished Senator from Iowa in the Budget Committee even though I voted for his freeze in previous years, because we were both trying to arrest and stop this rising tide of red ink.

So it is disingenuous for this crowd on the other side of the aisle to come now and say they just now discovered the red ink. Come on. After 12 years of drift and deficits, they dare to call the Clinton plan business as usual.

The truth is otherwise. We have, finally, a program from a President who says freeze, cut, abolish this, delete COLA's for Federal employees, streamline Government, increase taxes, provide investment stimulus. It is a bold plan. And all the opposition can do is produce these 12-year charts. But it is they who caused the red ink on those charts. They had been at bat for 12 years.

President Clinton didn't get elected on his economic promises. They do not understand yet how they lost. Clinton was not elected President on account of his promises. He was elected on account of the promise that George Bush made—one singular promise that he was not going to do anything about this economy.

President Clinton is doing something, and that is why we are moving along with a thoughtful, coherent program that even Fed Chairman Alan Greenspan says is good. I was up in New York, and I can tell you Wall Street thinks it is good. As to the economy, yes, people are investing, interest rates are going down. Yes, the recovery is going on, on account of the Clinton election. It was not because George Bush put anything in force. George Bush was leading us straight to a $500 billion deficit.

Look at the President's figure right today. The Congressional Budget Office figure is $361 billion for fiscal year 1993. That is without the Social Security trust fund, but with the trust funds for highways, airports, Medicare, Federal finance, all these others. If you exclude all the trust funds, you have a deficit in excess of $400 billion deficit right this minute.

So the gentleman only got to town here on January 20. Heavens above. He comes to town as the new President and in a few weeks they, all of sudden, want to marry him to the disaster that this Congress, you and I, and Reagan-Bush caused. That is who really caused it.

Come on. But, as to this rising tide of red ink, it is as though they just discovered it, and now Clinton is trying to do something about it. If he had not acted, we would have been on a deficit course of $500 billion. I do not think we have done enough on the deficits and I will make some comments on that, because I am afraid that the problem, the disaster, has not been described sufficiently or understood. We are being eaten alive by interest costs and, yes, 4 years from now we could end up with a deficit as big as the one that we inherited here from George Bush.

First, Mr. President, let me commend our distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee. I have been that chairman, and to get together with the prima donnas that we have, including me, on that committee with the different ideas and the different interests—one Senator has an interest with respect to the super collider, another wants to get rid of the space station; another one wants to do some more for agriculture; some want to do some more to reduce the deficit. There are hundreds of disparate interests and ideas that must be reconciled.

But the distinguished chairman of our Budget Committee is able to look with a broader vision as to what has really occurred. He sees that, yes, there has been a change. We do have a President and he is leading, and he has a program. So the chairman of the Budget Committee said: You have a program, put it out there where we can get the votes for it.

I had certain alternative ideas. But I could not get a program that I could rally a majority for on that Budget Committee. Others had amendments, but once those amendments were adopted, then you could not get a majority out of that Budget Committee. But under Senator SASSER's leadership we got a very good, consummate, comprehensive, realistic budget, which CBO has validated. Now compare this to 12 years of Stockman and that manipulator, Darman.

For 12 years, all we have had is tricksters.

So, without smoke, without mirrors, and with the Congressional Budget Office figures, the chairman of the Budget Committee cut the Clinton budget an additional $38 billion. Look at the charts. Look at the reports that are given to Senators. He said, "I thought we could do better." So he sat down and studied it and worked it out with the budget staff and then sold each of us on even further cuts.

So I think that is real leadership and we ought to understand and acknowledge it. We now have a real and credible document out here.

But what gets me is the fact that the opposition acts as if this thing all of the sudden occurred. And the media have feigned surprise, too. I see the press gallery is empty. In fact, that pretty well reflects their stories. They are empty.

If you want to get some term limitations on politicians, we need some term limitations on reporters. I am tired of reading how those people are constantly reporting misfacts.

I have tremendous respect and affection for Tim Russert. But I listened to him on the weekend. And he said, "Well, there is a Congressman from Ohio and he has got a budget that really gets rid of the deficit without any new taxes."

I said, come on. I have said I would consider going along with Congressman KASICH—I have gone along with Republicans, Gramm-Rudman. I do not mind. If he can get rid of the deficit and the

debt without taxes, he has performed a miracle.

But KASICH, by his own admission, has $50 billion less deficit reduction than the President, so he is $50 billion under the President, yet still complaining the President has not done anything about the deficit.

So we start with that missing $50 billion. Next, Mr. KASICH said he is sending his budget line by line to the Congressional Budget Office for them to review. That is a Gary Hart dare. Go ahead and send it over there and have it scored and they will knock out another $50 billion of it.

We know that just from working with budgets in the past. So he missed $100 billion right off the bat.

And we are not going to do away with health care as he proposes. We are trying to broaden health care to 35 million more people. Yes, we are going to have cost containment, but we are going to broaden health care coverage. And you are not going to do away with another $100 billion in KASICH's proposed cuts. So KASICH is more than $200 billion below the Clinton plan, below the budget before you today.

And we rightly claim we have only just begun the assault on the deficit. I have that particular complaint. I acknowledge that, because I am impressed to see this sincere, dedicated sense of purpose and hardworking until 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning on the part of President Clinton. He is the first President who has really understood anything about Government in years, sitting there with his staff until 1 or 2 in the morning wanting to know about this line and that line.

President Reagan never understood or even cared about the budget. He left it up to Stockman. The distinguished President Reagan always told us delightful stories. He was very interesting and amusing. President Bush, similarly, he loved to travel but, as was said by one of the wags downtown: The deficit was not caused on his watch; he was not in town at the time. Come on. He left it to Darman.

And so that is what we had to contend with. It was not leadership. It was nonleadership of chaos and trickery, and just finessing.

So now we get a President who comes to town and works around the clock and brings out a document, and the opposition dares to say there is no change. At the same time, the President is out trying to sell the major portion of this document to come later—health care reform.

Now if you can put the first lady to work, brilliant as she is and dedicated as she is, and have a track record of accomplishment as she has, they can stop all the little jabs and whining about input. We have had 12 years of input. We have the Rockefeller study; we have the Kennedy approach; we have this bill and that bill.

Last year, I think there would have been 30-some bills in both Houses proposing to deal with health care.

But now they are complaining, "We do not have any input." We have given them input. She is going all over the country, and there is no secret about it. She has to put out something realistically attainable by this U.S. Senate and U.S. House of Representatives.

So they can stop all the whining about secret meetings and the appeals before courts and everything else to again dissemble and confuse. They know better. They know we are going to get some kind of health care reform, because we have to do it.

So the President put his own name and the First Lady's name on the line—that is leadership—and said, "We are going to work at it."

Of the 400 task forces—incidentally, 100 in medicine. There are 60-some doctors and 40-some nurses, all of them working, everybody is continually being briefed. It is hard work.

In this context, it is absurd to have Tim Russert assert, "We have a man with a budget that can really solve the whole problem—get rid of the deficit and the debt without any taxes." Absolutely false.

Ask this group over here on the other side of the aisle to put in the Kasich budget and call the role and see how many will vote to decimate Amtrak, child nutrition, Medicare, Medicaid, and more. You can just go right down the lot of the things that are in there, because those make nice, little 20-second sound bites. And they have—we have—the 20-second biteitis, all of us. That is how we got here, not on our track record. By gosh, I tried to run on my record and could not find it with my opposition. So we had to put out 20-second bites.

But tell them to put out their alternative budgets and see how many votes they get to do away with health care and what they are talking about with our taxes. Let us get a rollcall vote.

It is the same on spending cuts. We made this challenge before in 1986 when the Republicans controlled this U.S. Senate, and none other than the distinguished former chairman of the Budget Committee, the Senator from New Mexico, said, "I'm tired of the talk. We are putting it up for a vote."

He put up all the Reagan cuts. And you are not going to get a better cutter than Ronald Wilson Reagan. He wanted to get rid of the Government, period; get rid of the bureaucracy on the Potomac, the Department of Energy, deregulate everything.

And so, as a result, Senator DOMENICI put the spending cuts to a vote. There were 43 cuts that amounted to about $4 billion. That is all. But they were all the Grace Commission cuts, all the cuts. They got only 14 votes. They got only 14 votes.

So let us start writing and talking and acting in the world of reality and not the lies.

I think of Vaclav Havel at the time he took over as President of Czechoslovakia.

(Mr. FEINGOLD assumed the chair.)

Mr. HOLLINGS. Havel, in his inaugural address, turned to his people and said, "We have been lying to each other for 40 years, saying one thing and believing another. Czechoslovakia has many problems, and only we can solve them."

In a similar vein, Mr. President, this morning we could as well say we in America have been lying to each other for 12 years, saying one thing and believing another.

Our United States has many problems and only we can solve them.

Lying? Good gosh, you could go immediately to deregulation. Yesterday we appointed an airline study commission because the airlines are now all going broke. We can study it for 90 days, we can study it for 90 months. There is one word to the report: Deregulation. It wrecked the airlines, it wrecked the savings and loans, and everything else. So you can go down that list.

Another lie of the last 12 years was free trade. Half of our problem is that sing-song of "free trade, free trade." There is no such thing. There never has been and never will be. We have to get a competitive trade policy. Instead, what we have been doing is subsidizing foreign protectionism. When we knock Americans out of their jobs, we have to vote unemployment compensation. So with United States tax money, we subsidize the protectionism of Japan and the other trade competitors. We protect their protectionism with a free-trade sing-song of unrealistic nature. As Red Poling, chairman of the board at Ford Motors said the week before last in my office, "We export free trade. They export automobiles."

And there is another lie that has been prominent over the last 12 years with regard to Social Security. Senator MOYNIHAN and I have been trying to make Social Security truly a protected trust fund. I put in a little amendment in 1990, requiring that you not count the Social Security trust funds to reduce the deficit. But along came Senator MOYNIHAN even with a better approach, saying we did not need to raise taxes on Social Security in January 1991. That was just one of the tax increases that President Bush sponsored. They opposed the Moynihan amendment on the grounds that we in the Congress should not mess with Social Security.

We got voted down on the spurious call, do not mess with Social Security. Yet, that is exactly what we now are doing on a massive scale. We are going to spend another $62 billion of Social Security trust fund money in this budget to obscure the deficit. And, by 1999, in 6 short years, we will owe Social Security $1 trillion. That is why

they cannot understand that when you cut Social Security COLA's, you do not help your actual deficit and your debt, you simply increase the trust fund, which is then robbed blind to hide the deficit.

Admittedly, I am trying to rebuild that fund. So I will go along with it. But it does not help the deficit and the debt. We have to bring in focus the reality of the problem on the one hand and the mammoth effort that must be made in order to really begin to tackle this problem. But the lie was, "Do not mess with Social Security" so we could continue to mess with it and use the trust fund as a slush fund to obscure the deficit, to show what good boys and girls we were, read my lips, no new taxes, and it can be done strictly by cutting spending. That argument was the big lie of the last 12 years.

Of course, the lie was we are going to grow out of the deficits. I still read this line of argument in the Washington Times. You would think we did not have an election in November of last year. They continue to write the same rubbish, these same old writers. Let us please have term limitations on these journalists and writers. Because I am tired of hearing them. They do not know what is going on. They say we will grow out of deficits—growth, growth, growth. They say, growth, growth, growth.

You cannot get elected on sloganeering anymore and symbols. You have to get real. The American people said that. Ross Perot did not discover it. He does not understand that we have a government in here that is getting real on the deficits, and Perot is still running as if we did not have an election last year.

But a talk was made here last week by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas. He said: "Reagan, he made his promises and that is what he was elected on, where President Clinton made his promises, but he is not carrying them through."

Then he went down the Reagan promises to cut the size of Government, but he did not do that, and to do this and do that. I agree. He made those promises. But he made an even bigger one. He promised to balance the budget. Instead, he tripled the debt.

I was here when we got a balanced budget under President Lyndon Johnson; 12 years later, in 1980, I went to President Carter on Friday after he was defeated and said, "Mr. President, you are going to leave the biggest deficit in the history of the United States Government and we Democrats are never going to get elected to anything."

He said, "How much?"

I said, "I have the Congressional Budget Office figure of a $75 billion deficit."

He says, "Heavens, what are we going to do? What did I get from President Ford?"

I said, "Well, President Ford's deficit was $66 billion. What we are going to have to do is a fancy word—I have been arguing with my House colleagues and we tried it a couple of times but I think we can do it—'reconciliation.' That is a fancy word for 'cut.'"

I came to the distinguished Senator from Washington, Senator Magnuson, and the distinguished Senator from Idaho, Frank Church, Senator Culver of Iowa, Senator McGovern of South Dakota, Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana, Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin. I called them affectionately "my spending friends." And I said, "Look here, you have to give me a vote. We are going to leave the worst deficit record you have ever seen. We are going to leave a $75 billion deficit and we will never get elected to anything."

We did it; the first reconciliation spending-cut bill. I have the pen from the signing ceremony. President Carter signed it and brought the deficit down. But I can tell you this. I remember well the promise President Reagan made. He said he was going to balance the budget in 1 year. That is what he ran on; balance it in 1 year. After taking his oath of office, he said, "Oops, this is worse than I ever thought. It is news to me. It is going to take me 2 years, until 1983 to balance this budget."

So he extended himself and was going to balance the budget. But he said he would balance it by means of growth—growth. He said we are going to cut all the revenues and we are going to grow out of the deficit.

Ask any mayor to cut his revenues 25 percent; ask any Governor in America to cut the State's revenues 25 percent. They would lose the bond rating, the mayor would have to get rid of the policemen and firemen. And the voters would get rid of him. They would ride that mayor out of town on a rail. I can tell you that right now. That is total economic baloney. But that is what Congress adopted.

President Reagan gave us the first $100 billion deficit, the first $200 billion deficit. President Bush gave us the first $300 billion and the first $400 billion deficit. Add it up, and go right this minute to the Congressional Budget Office. This fiscal year baseline is $361 billion and add the other $50 billion trust funds and you are up to over $400 billion. You are running at $400 billion, heading to $500 billion when we come to town. But that is the lie we told each other—read our lips—Democrats as well. I can tell you right now, if President Clinton had not said the word "taxes," you would not have gotten a word out of this crowd. I tried. I offered a VAT in 1987 to try to avoid the recession. I found out they were beginning to finesse Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. Gramm-Rudman-Hollings was a sword to prompt fiscal responsibility, not a shield for us to lie about the deficit.

So it was clear we were going to need revenues at that time, and we got eight votes out of the Budget Committee. We got two of our Republican colleagues. We could work in a bipartisan fashion at that time.

Now President Clinton comes and gives a dynamic plan, including much of what Republicans have been talking about, but they are giving us charts and business as usual. They act innocent like they just came to town, like we are just walking out of Independence Hall and Government has just started. Come on.

They have wrecked the economy. When we talk about jobs, that age group 18 to 24 in America today cannot find a job or they cannot find a job that lifts them out of poverty. You and I go around making graduation talks in May and June, "What a wonderful future you have. The future belongs to you." Heck, they walk out on the sidewalk and say, "There are no jobs. I am going back to graduate school and get a higher degree." All this retraining, retraining skills—we have skills coming out of our ears. We do not need retraining; we need jobs, we need opportunity.

They wrecked the economy and the Federal budget. You know the litany. The United States has gone from the largest creditor to the largest debtor nation. We have gone to quadrupling the debt from $903 billion back in 1981, less than $1 trillion. Now it is over $4 trillion, $4.2 trillion. The interest costs are eating us alive. Let me get to that point because I cannot make it strong enough, when you read the best of writers, Mort Zuckerman, week before last in U.S. News & World Report. He said the policy of borrow and spend in the 1980's was a deferred tax on future generations. Wrong, that is a tax on us here and now it has us into a deep hole. The debt and the interest costs on that debt are growing faster than the economy.

When George Bush came to town, he had a $5 trillion economy and as he left in January, he had a $6 trillion economy. But the debt was $2.5 trillion when he came to town and now it is over $4 trillion. So we have the economy growing by only $1 trillion, but you have the deficit, the debt growing by over $1.5 trillion. You are in a downward spiral headed to a $5 trillion debt as you come to town now. But the penalty of interest costs is not on the future alone, it is on us right this minute.

In that span of 12 years when they were going to balance the budget, as I pointed out, what did they do? They spent $1.7 trillion in net interest costs on interest and $2.4 trillion in gross interest costs. That is the Grace Commission group. Do you remember, they were going to do away with waste, with

waste, with waste? They have created the biggest waste ever in the history of man, where you go on a 12-year binge and talk about the jobs you created and then you look at 53 percent of the 18 million jobs paying wages at poverty and below the poverty line. So over half the jobs they created are below that $12,000 poverty line. We have been on a binge. We have divided our society. We have crowds who think they can shoot people on account of their beliefs, and this is the crowd that gave them that belief.

I can tell you that right now, they have wrecked the economy. Americans cannot get jobs. That crowd wrecked this budget and they want to worsen the wreck.

Why, just yesterday the distinguished former chairman of the Budget Committee, the Senator from New Mexico, started off his talk and he said, "I got a call from the airline industry; I got a call from the chemical industry." Does he not know at least from Ross Perot we have to get rid of the special interests? I got a call from all of these industries, too, but he starts off his talk like we did not have an election. He says, whoopee for the special interests.

Everybody is going to be affected. All taxes are regressive. I can give you any chart. You give me the tax, I will tell you how many jobs you lose. But they do not tell you how many jobs you lose when your interest costs are growing faster than your spending cuts. In spite of the mammoth job that has been done here, which is more than the Presidents of the last 12 years, our spending cuts for 1994 are $18 billion; look over on the other ledger, the interest costs are $23 billion. They want to stop the increase in spending as they continue the increase in spending. That is their approach on this deficit.

So there we are. We are into the soup. If your interest costs are growing faster than you can agree on spending cuts, you are going backward.

Let us get right to doing away with the domestic side of Government.

I want everyone to please pay attention to just this. For sake of argument and illustration, let us not talk about cuts, let us talk about eliminating huge chunks of Government in their entirety.

Go down the list. Imagine eliminating function 250, space and science.

Let us eliminate all the spending, the outlays for function 270 for energy.

Let us eliminate all of the function 300, the park, natural resources, the Army Corps, EPA and the whole thing right there.

Let us go to function 350. Just eliminate agriculture. Just eliminate function 350.

Eliminate function 370, commerce and housing.

Eliminate—do not cut it—eliminate transportation.

Eliminate 450, regional development, community action block grants.

Eliminate 500, just do not cut education.

Eliminate health because the trust funds are there for Medicare but to administer Medicare in this program, just eliminate that.

Eliminate 600, income security, WIC, Head Start. Do not cut it, eliminate it.

Eliminate 700, Justice Department, eliminate the FBI, the border patrol, the immigration service, the judges, the justices, the courts, the Supreme Court.

Eliminate the President's staff, eliminate the Congress, general Government, the IRS—we will all vote for that—eliminate the IRS.

Just eliminate it all and then add it up and see where you are. You have eliminated domestic discretionary spending—they are talking so big—right this minute it is $229 billion.

I just gave you the figures. You are headed to a $500 billion deficit this minute. Subtract the $229 billion and you still have at least a $200 billion deficit—and that is after totally eliminating most of the Government other than defense.

So, heavens above, quit running home to the Rotary Club talking about how spending cuts alone will solve the problem. Clinton has a solid program there, but I think we ought to cut spending more. But we can only go so far. Eliminate the entire blooming thing—all of domestic discretionary spending—and you still have $200 billion in deficits.

Then they go and talk about defense. And we have closure of bases and a drastic situation in my own backyard. But do you know what they try to do? Politics as usual. They try to blame the closure of the bases on President Clinton.

Now, let me educate you about that. We got together in 1988—I remember well in 1972 the U.S. Army tried to close Fort Dix, and for 20 years they could not get it closed. We said this is ridiculous; we have to get together and have some kind of plan that politically sort of spreads the responsibility but gets the job done.

And so President Bush and the Congress agreed on a procedure, and with that particular procedure we had a wave of closings in 1988; we had a wave of closings in 1991. They closed my Myrtle Beach Air Base. The other side did not holler politics then. And now they are closing the Charleston Navy Yard and the economy of my own hometown. The Republicans are saying we are weakening defense. Well, I yield to no one in my zeal for a strong defense.

But look at the facts. Add up the first term of Ronald Wilson Reagan, the total outlays in defense—$877 billion. Add up the first term—and I emphasize, gentlemen, the first term—of President Bill Clinton—$1 trillion in defense outlays. We are going to spend $1 trillion even with the cuts that they say are devastating defense. The outlays right this minute are $294 billion on defense and over 4 years we go down to $250 billion. Nonetheless, President Clinton will spend more on defense than Reagan in their first terms.

So you can throw these figures around and terrorize these writers up here, but they do not bring it into focus. We are going to spend way more even without communism in Russia because, heavens, we do not need a standing army with Russia now. Yes, we are worried about nuclear. We are worried about their missiles. But we are no longer worried about the army coming against Germany and France right now.

Yet even without the threat of the Soviets, we are going to spend way more, with the cuts, under President Clinton for defense than what we spent under the first 4 years of President Reagan, who is, in my opinion, given a large credit for the fall of the wall, because I was for increasing defense along with President Reagan. I supported him in the deployment of the Pershing intermediate-range missiles in Europe. It was a sort of put up or shut up, and we were putting up. And, yes, we were, as a result of that, spending the Soviet economy into defeat.

So I commend President Reagan for that. We were in lockstep.

But let us not say, now that we have spending cuts, base closures, and everything else of that kind, that we are decimating defense. Certainly, the latest wave of base closures is the third wave to occur under the Bush defense budget.

Now, let me agree in a breath that the Clinton cuts will be more than the Bush cuts. But let us pass it in September-October this year, and then let us look at 1995 and say this is what Clinton did. But, heavens above, this is what Bush did, and you do not think President Clinton, as good a politician as he is, came to town and said, "I want to run over to the Pentagon and start closing bases."

When I asked him way after we had had a hearing over there in the Pentagon, he said he had not seen the list. I do not blame him.

The process is similar to how we now hire postmasters. We have it now, Mr. President, that if I recommend you for postmaster in Madison, WI, it is a felony. It is a crime. We were so assiduous to make sure that Congressmen and Senators could not recommend anyone for postmaster, we made it a felony. And that is exactly the attitude of a President coming to town with all the budget and Cabinet and all the problems he has, Bosnia, Somalia, Haiti, everything else. I do not see how he does it. The poor man did not even know where the Pentagon was. He sent

one fellow over there and it gave him heart trouble. We do not even have a Secretary of the Navy for me to appeal to. Heavens above.

But that is the other side's whole political strategy of politics as usual. They are the guardians of gridlock. That is the way they want to posture themselves. They will not put up a plan at all.

So what we have here at best is the big change. Let me get to that because I am going to have time later, the distinguished chairman will give me time on a VAT amendment. I want to put in a value-added tax. The reason I want to put that in—and I have talked to Leon Panetta, I have talked to the Vice President, I have talked to the President, I have talked to Mr. Rubin, and I have talked to all the people I can find, Alice Rivlin and others—I have shown them how 4 years from now we end up almost with as big a deficit even after enacting the Clinton plan.

Look at the particular deficit without Social Security in your budget report, and it is not $187 billion in 1997; it is $272 billion. And then you will get slippage. This is just the first go round on the floor of the Congress here in March. I can tell you by the end of the year these figures slip; you are back up to over $300 billion. And come election year in 1996, I do not want my President being accused of ending up with a deficit as big as he inherited from President Bush.

The reason that occurs under this splendid document—and I support it like it is and I will vote for it like it is, but I want to do more. The reason for that is no one has told the truth that we are headed at the particular moment for a $400 to a $500 billion deficit in 1997. We have the interest costs eating us alive. And we cannot even get on top of the economy with jobs and all the things to be done with the stimulus package.

But we do get a President who tries. Now, that is a big change. Because I had to talk to a group at home and they would say, "Well, tell me about President Clinton," I studied him. I was not in the loop. I was not BC—before Clinton—or FOB—friend of Bill. I would like to be one. But I had to survive, and in my State Bush is overwhelmingly popular. In fact, if you had a vote there today, I would hate to see the outcome. That same crowd that is hollering "politics," they better not holler politics on base closures because I am a gone gosling. Maine and New Hampshire voted for President Clinton. My State voted for Bush.

So I was doing my best to help the cause of the Democratic Party and help President Clinton get elected. But you could not call me a Clinton stalwart, and I have been studying him. And the big change is, one, the gentleman likes Government. Now, you have to like Government, Mr. Chairman, to stay down there in Arkansas for 10 years and make $35,000 a year.

I mean any fellow with a Yale law degree, who is a Rhodes scholar, can come to this town, and he starts at $200,000 at age 25. Then read the financial statements of all of these folks who have been at it for a few years, after retiring from the Cabinet. He would be up there at the million dollar mark like all the rest of them.

So he is totally unselfish. He goes down to his little State—and I come from a little State. I made $15,000 as Governor. I do not want you to say that I was overpaid. I made $15,000 a year for 4 years.

This gentleman made $35,000 annually for the last decade as Governor. But he works on the problems at the local level, on education, on the environment, on law enforcement, and all those particular problems, with a total familiarity over a 10-year period. He likes it. He comes to Washington not thinking that he ought to be the President.

We have a hundred of us here, and we all think we ought to be the President. I know. I know all of us. And I tried. We all thought we ought to be President, and Lord knows the last two thought that they were the crown.

I mean President Reagan tried for 4 years, and he finally arrived. He knew he ought to be there. Once he arrived, he turned the hard work over to his staff.

Bush was Vice President and had been in Government. He was accustomed. His whole life in a particular role was in Government. And he finally arrived there. He thought he ought to be the President. There was not any way for him to lose in 1992. That is why he ran a sorry campaign. There was not any way for him to lose to this little Governor from little Arkansas—because he thought he ought to be the President.

President Clinton does not think he has a divine right to be the President, and he is trying his case. I dreamed of taking the job. And, if I took it in the next 10 minutes, I would need help because I know I ought not to be the President. I would need the best and the brightest, as Kennedy had around him.

Now we have the best and the brightest coming in at every level. You name secretary for secretary, and I will compare them. This is a far superior, more outstanding Cabinet than what we have been seen with for the last 12 years.

Many of the Reagan-Bush Cabinet headed off in disrepute. The President himself had to pardon his Secretary of Defense because the Secretary was about to implicate him in what we knew he knew, and then had to make a sweetheart deal with the White House Archivist. He learned something from Rosemary Woods—get rid of the record. Leave town under a cloud. Come on.

So we come to town with a President who likes Government, who wants to work on the problem, who, by gosh, knows who he ought to be, and knows he is on trial himself; working around the clock with a staff and everybody else involved, and willing to lead. That is the change.

The distinguished Senator from Iowa offers no change. We have a President who says, here I am, and I am going to freeze everything. You are not going to get any Government increases. Man, I can tell you, there would have been a howl if it had been anybody else. He quieted me down. He said, we can do it. We finally have a fellow who is going to cut the White House 25 percent.

He has me cutting my Commerce Committee 10 percent, and my staff. Clinton said, do not, by gosh, disassemble Government—by gosh, streamline it, trim it down. He went down through the departments in this budget; the streamlining and the cuts. He had the Vice President working on further cuts. What more does the other side want? What more do they want?

So he has been working on all of those things. He last confronted the biggest headache of all in domestic government—health care, with the First Lady.

What more can you ask than that? He is working around the clock.

Let me say a word about the stimulus package. The stimulus package is probably best considered in the context of investment. Last year, over a year ago, in fact the year before last, I thought we ought not to have just spending cuts and freezes. But we ought to have investment in the public and the private sector, the investment tax credit, capital gains going down on the private side; and then on the public side, women's, infants', and children's feeding, Head Start; go right on down in transportation, to get jobs done because you have a very tenuous situation.

I will never forget President Clinton telling us that John Major, the Prime Minister, was coming over. Major said, look, for the next year or so there is going to be zero growth in Europe, Japan economically is in bad shape, and you, the United States, are going to have to be the economic engine for the recovery of the global economy. We run up almost a $500 billion deficit and we have to, all of a sudden, be the engine for world growth.

So on that particular score, the President has come up with the chassis for that engine. And with the investments he put in there, with respect to the private side, we do have the capital gains cut, we put in unemployment compensation, the investment tax credit. And on the public side, he boosts investment in WIC, child care block grants, Head Start, summer jobs, vaccinations, roads, highways, airports, community development block

grants, weather services, small business. I favor all of them. In fact, you have economists like Robert Kuttner and others who say we ought to have a $60 billion stimulus package.

But I think the President has come down pretty good on the stimulus. Highways, that is not uncalled-for stimulus. That is finally spending highway trust fund money on the highways. The highway users paid the $19 billion in tax, and we have been siphoning $12 billion of the $19 billion to hide the deficit. We have been using $12 billion on the highways and only $7 billion on the deficit.

With respect to the airport and the airways, we have not built any except out in Denver. So we come around and we use $7 billion or $8 billion of the airport and airways trust fund, but not on airports and airways; we spent it on the deficit.

They call that increased spending. Any time they can get increased spending, they do not want to talk about the increase in spending with respect to the interest costs that are going out through the roof.

On that basis, I want to get that deficit really down. And the only way to do it is the way we proposed the year before last: a 5-percent value-added tax with revenues going into a trust fund for the deficit, the debt, and health care. Look at my talk on the floor the year before last, over 2 years ago now. I said that is what we ought to do. Put the revenue into a trust fund for the deficit, the debt, and health care costs. A 5-percent value-added tax.

Our competition in Europe has an average of 16 percent. Out in the Pacific, Korea has 13 percent. It is not ruining their economies, it is propeling their economies forward.

It is time we paid the bill in America. But in order to pay the bill we have to understand the terrible dilemma economically that we find ourselves in. We are not running a $300 billion deficit, we are not running $400 billion, we are headed this minute to a $500 billion deficit. To bring it down to $272 billion is a feat in and of itself. I support it. I support it very strongly. There is no credible alternative out here on the floor in this Congress to be considered. None of these plans, the Senator from Colorado's, the Congressman from Ohio's, or anything else they had up, the Congressional Budget Office, [CBO]—all of those things. You will find you have bigger deficits.

I have tried. I offered a package last year with the Senator from Missouri, the Senator from New York, two Republican colleagues, the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Alabama, Democratic colleagues, and others. We put out a package of not increasing the deficit and the debt, without increasing taxes, and bringing in a budget. We supported it strongly. But we could not get anywhere.

Now having had that experience over the years, working on freezes, working on Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, working on taxes, that studied viewpoint, I can look at this and say I agree with Alan Greenspan. And I agree with the chairman of our Budget Committee. This is a heck of an accomplishment at this particular time. I want to do more. I hope we can get to do more. I think they really are holding back. This is my own suspicion for the health care cost. But I would rather pay for that future health care reform costs in this budget now. Not the health care programs, obviously, but as it affects the budget. Put the cost for health care, whether it is $10 billion, $20 billion, $30 billion, into this budget. The rest of it goes in that trust fund for the deficit and the debt over at Treasury.

I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for his statement of support of the Clinton budget as modified by the Senate Budget Committee this morning. I want to particularly express my appreciation and thanks to my friend for the kind words that he said about the chairman of the Budget Committee. The great work that the Budget Committee did in the past week would not have been possible without the cooperation and encouragement and constructive advice of the Senator from South Carolina who, in times past, has served as the chairman of the Budget Committee. He has been a source of support and sound advice to me over the past few weeks.

Mr. President, I see the distinguished ranking member wants to speak.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, maybe the chairman can remain for a moment and just exchange some views with me. It is my understanding—if we read this Budget Act, it says that 4 hours shall be used, equally divided, to discuss the broad economic issues, which I assume means that he is hoping that we would use that up before we have any amendments?

Mr. SASSER. Yes; it would be my hope that it would. We have other Senators on our side who want to address the economic issues.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me suggest that we have not always—in fact, more times than not we have not used the rule that you do not offer amendments during that time. It is up to either side if they want to use it all. But I will agree with the Senator that we are going to try to add up some time on our side for people who want to be heard. I think we have 43 minutes left. If we used all of my time last night, which I said was going to be on economics, and what has been said by Senator GRASSLEY, we have 43 minutes left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority has used 1 hour 53 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much has my friend used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two hours 40 minutes by the majority.

Mr. DOMENICI. Before I make a proposal, let me just ask the distinguished chairman, as the Senator knows, on our side, based on what occurred in our committee and what other Senators that are not members have talked about amending, we have many, many amendments. We will try to get together, once we have decided how we are going to go about this process, and sort of itemize ours in terms of which ones we are going to take up in some kind of order. We cannot do them all. We cannot get this list for everything. We can get it for 5 or 6 so we will know where we are going, and maybe we can get 5 or 6 on your side.

I am hopeful that we can do that, and we will assume that we have 43 minutes left on our side, because that kind of fits with some arithmetic that I have done. We will not use any more than that in these opening remarks, and we will be ready for amendments after that. Can the Senator tell me how much time he might want to use before we get to an amendment?

Mr. SASSER. I say that we will want to use at least an hour. We have the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, who wishes to speak. I see the distinguished Senator from Maryland, who has arrived on the floor. I would say approximately an hour on our side, maybe a little more. The distinguished Senator from Maryland is asking for a little more. I suspect I can yield some time off of the bill to my friend from Maryland. Perhaps we could set a time for beginning amendments at 2:30.

Mr. DOMENICI. Well, let me just say there is no intention on my part at all to keep Senators from speaking. The problem is, we are under a 50-hour timeframe overall, and we have a lot of amendments. Your side apparently has some.

Mr. SASSER. We do.

Mr. DOMENICI. To the extent that we do not get on the amendments, either your side is going to get shortchanged on amendments, or we are; so I urge that we get on amendments as quick as possible.

Mr. SASSER. I suggest this to my friend. Why do we not begin here and see how we get along? Maybe we are going to move faster than we would anticipate here in the beginning.

Mr. DOMENICI. Then, do I understand that—in the past we have had a rotation. If you go first on an amendment—and I assume you will—you tell us what that might be, and we will tell you what ours is, and we will go back and forth.

Mr. SASSER. That is fair.

Mr. DOMENICI. He will have the first amendment on his side.

Mr. SASSER. We would take the first amendment and yield to the minority

to offer their amendment and back and forth.

Mr. DOMENICI. What I want to do for the purposes of managing our side—we ought to talk later on with the leadership about second-degree amendments one way or another. We are willing to have none on our side, if you have none, and have everybody's amendments taken up. Otherwise, I am very fearful that on the first amendment there will be second-degree amendments. I think maybe the Senator does not want that, and I do not want that.

Mr. SASSER. I think we should take that up with the leadership before we get into amendments.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I believe that I am going to turn over management of the time to the Senator from Missouri, Senator BOND. He will speak, and he will invite some Republicans who feel they ought to speak early on, and he will manage our side; and we will be very cooperative in trying to use up as little as possible and be on the floor at all times.

So I ask the Chair to recognize Senator BOND as the manager on this side for the allocation of time, not for introduction of amendments. He knows that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the ranking member and the chairman of the committee. This is a very serious matter that faces us, because the deficits, the annual shortfall between revenues and expenditures, and the 4 trillion dollars' worth of debt which comes along as a result of it, are the major economic problems facing our Nation today.

The deficit and the debt are drags on our savings, drags on our productivity; and they threaten the economic prosperity and the future of our children. This is something that I believe is well understood throughout America. People in the real world know they have to live within a budget. Businesses have to live within a budget, as State and local governments have to, and they are very concerned that the Federal Government cannot.

I came to this body with a serious commitment to reduce the deficit, and I have fought for all kinds of proposals, such as entitlement cuts, defense cuts, program terminations, freezes, caps, line-item veto, balanced budget amendment. I even voted for the 1990 budget agreement, its caps and yes, its taxes.

Last year, I was one of only 28 who voted for the Nunn-Domenici proposal to cut defense, freeze other spending, and limit the growth of entitlements, which would have eliminated the deficit before the end of this decade. I still think we are going to have to come to something like that, because what is so clear to me today is that the only way really to cut the deficit is to cut spending.

Four times over the past 10 years, taxes have been raised, and what happened? The deficit is twice as big today as it was when tax raising began, and the economy is weaker, and our future is bleaker. That is because Congress has shown no ability to use the new revenues to reduce the deficit. Instead, spending is allowed to grow even faster.

Yesterday, an interesting article appeared in the Washington Post on the death of C. Northcote Parkinson. He created Parkinson's law, which said that work expands to fill the available time. His second law was the expenditure rises to meet income. The corollary was that, with Government, expenditures rise more than income. Governments, he said, would spend whatever they had and perhaps a bit more; thus, if Congress were to raise taxes, they would raise spending.

Well, it turns out that that is exactly what has been going on. The Joint Economic Committee has studies that show for every $1 in new taxes in recent years, Congress has gone ahead and spent $1.59 cents; that does not reduce the deficit. That is Beltway math. Out in the real world, you know you cannot reduce the deficit on that kind of formula, even if you do it in volume, which is unfortunately what we do.

I was very much impressed by my good friend and former gubernatorial colleague, President Bill Clinton, when he came before the joint session and he spoke admirably and strongly about his view for the future and his view of the economic program. He sold the sizzle, and he sold it very well. He is a compelling speaker and a dedicated person. But if you look back through the campaign, during the campaign, he said he would cut $2 of spending for every $1 of new taxes. After the campaign, his Budget Director reiterated that pledge. But then in his State of the Union, he said he was going to have a $1 spending cut for $1 in tax increase. It was going to be equally divided, he told us. Now we see that it is $1 of cuts for almost $4 of spending.

Mr. President, that reminds me of a problem that happened in a small restaurant back in my State. A friend of mine went in to order rabbit stew, and this place was supposed to have good rabbit stew. He started eating the stew, and he said, "This tastes funny."

He called the chef over and said, "This does not taste like rabbit. As a matter of fact, this tastes like horse meat."

And the chef said, "Well, yeah, I did have to stretch it a little, so I put in a little horse meat."

My friend said, "How much?"

He said, "It was equally divided."

I said, "Explain to me what you mean by 'equally divided.'"

My friend said: "Well, I put in one horse and one rabbit."

That is the problem that we have with this Clinton budget plan. He has 313 billion dollars' worth of taxes and user fee horse meat and only 81 billion dollars' worth of bunny rabbit spending cuts. But he keeps selling it as rabbit stew. And then, when you look at it real closely, the rabbit is actually 74 billion dollars' worth of defense cuts. We should have a dead eagle down there and maybe a little bitty mouse. A little mouse got in the stew. That was $7 billion in domestic spending cuts.

Mr. President, that is not going to sell. That rabbit stew did not sell back home and this economic plan is not going to sell back home either. We have to get more rabbit in this stew. We have to get some spending cuts.

I believe very sincerely that the massive tax increases in this package will accomplish only two things. First, they will choke off the recovery and cost us jobs. Second, they will be used to pay for new programs not to reduce the deficit. As you look at the long-term projections, under the Clinton plan, you see the budget deficit coming down in the first years as we implement the defense cuts. But because we have not dealt with entitlement programs and have not cut spending, the deficit starts going back up in fiscal year 1997, and gets to $400 billion annually by the year 2003.

These tax increases will cost jobs, I think millions of jobs. I met on Monday of this week with people who are in the barge business, who use the inland waterways. The five-hundredfold tax increase on user fees on inland waterways would raise more money than the entire domestic barge industry earned last year. The American Farm Bureau said those taxes would raise 7 to 8 cents a bushel for corn and soybeans being shipped out of the Midwest for export to New Orleans. Farmland industries in my home State said it would be 10 to 12 cents. The real answer is it will put the barge industry out of business, meaning 50 percent of the transportation capacity from our part of the country. And the Btu energy tax will cost, I believe, a million jobs. For anyone who wants the study on which that was based I can provide the DRI model for them. The energy tax will devastate not only the energy industry but also the transportation industry, the aluminum industry, and it will hurt agriculture and rural America.

I talked with a representative of TWA. This Btu tax when fully implemented will cost TWA $50 million a year in 1995 and 1996. That would wipe out their profits that they project for 1995 and 1996, and threatens the future of the industry.

The average Midwest farmer under this Btu tax will have to pay $500 to $700 a year on a small farm, according to studies by the Farm Bureau, but some individual farmers who kept good

records say it will cost them a lot more than $500 to $700—more in the range of $1,500 to $2,000 on many family farms that are engaged in commercial production.

Mr. President, back in 1990 there were some on the other side of the aisle who thought a luxury tax on boats was a good idea. They said soak-the-rich. Let us put a 10-percent tax on luxury boats. Boy, we are going to sock it to them. Do you know something? Taxes change behavior. The rich people stopped buying boats or they bought boats from overseas. They did not pay the taxes, and the men and women who worked in the boatbuilding industry lost their jobs. We lost revenue, their salaries. We lost the taxes on the profits of their employers.

Mr. President, I am afraid this is the sort of thing that is going to destroy our economy if we keep taxing jobs. What we need is a package which makes real and meaningful cuts in spending. It should encourage family savings and long-term investment, and it should lock in cuts before anyone starts looking for new taxes. We need a real rabbit stew, not a horse and rabbit stew.

I answered President Clinton's call for additional spending cuts. I sent him my proposals. They provide an additional $220 billion in cuts to reduce the deficit by terminating programs, reforming entitlements, trimming pork, cutting the Congress and White House.

I will be happy to share any of these with any of my colleagues who want them. I cut out the superconducting super collider. The Clinton administration extends it, and actually adds $2 billion more to it. I cut out the mission to Mars. I cut out the EPA green lights program. It is only a $60 million a year program to convince Fortune 500 companies to incorporate energy efficiency modernization. Hey, if they are going to save money let them do it themselves, rather than making the taxpayer pay for it. I privatize crop insurance. I made Medicare reimbursement rates apply to Federal employees and to Members of Congress as they do to senior citizens. I would put Medicaid under managed care. We tried that in our State and it works. It would save $20 billion over 5 years. I would reform the CDBG grants by eliminating the entitlements for wealthy communities, and I would cut President Clinton's proposed new spending increases by 80 percent.

In the Clinton plan that has been presented to us, in order to offset the significant increases in the nondefense area they have listed cuts of supposedly $70.9 billion. But let's take a look at some of his cuts. Other administrative reforms, $11.3 billion; streamlining Government, $12.1 billion; reducing personnel 100,000, $10.5 billion.

These are awfully dubious. Take a look at today's Federal page in the Washington Post, because they are beginning to point out where the smoke and mirrors are. Eliminating authorized positions is a great way to achieve paper savings, but unless you actually put people out on the street, you aren't cutting the size of Government.

A couple of weeks ago an article said after all the much highly vaunted cuts in the White House staff the members of the press found more people at more desks. Where did they come from? I suggested smoke and mirrors.

Just like the President, I was a Governor once and we talked about streamlining government and making savings, and that was very important. But I am from the show-me State. I want to see where those real savings are coming from. I tell you it requires a good sense of humor to claim specific savings in advance in a budget document where you do not even lock in the numbers and, as an aside, I would point out that in the Budget Committee when my colleague from Texas, Senator GRAMM, offered an amendment to lock in the savings it was defeated. But worse than the sense of humor it requires to propose to claim those savings in advance, it requires an unreasonable suspension of prudent skepticism to accept these on the cuff.

I have to address one other saving; $16 billion is claimed for moving from long-term to short-term interest rates in the financing of our Federal debt. They claim to lock this in the budget; that is where the savings is going to come from. Yesterday we had the opportunity to hear from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve. So I asked him. I said, "How can we claim in the budget that we are going to save $16 billion by going to short-term interest rates rather than long term?" And they both said, and I agree that it is something that is a reasonable management tool that must be considered, but the Chairman of the Federal Reserve warned that we could not promise it or lock it in or specify it legislatively, because it is a very, very critical skill to be able to manage the maturities of the debt instruments, the Federal Government issues.

There is a marketplace reason why the long-term interest rates are higher and we would be betting our judgment against the marketplace if we said we could finance all of that debt short term.

Mr. President, you know the last time someone made a bet like that on a big scale, went for the short term interest rates at the expense of long term, borrow short and lent long, was the savings and loan industry in the seventies and eighties. They made a bad bet. We as taxpayers are having to bail them out by $150 billion. We ought not to be claiming in the budget document that we can lock in savings by mandating how the Treasury is going to manage their maturities of their debt instruments. Certainly, it requires all the skill that the Treasury has, and with the leadership of our former colleague I am sure they will do a good job, but they may find that the savings aren't there. You cannot claim the budget is going to save $16 billion, because we are going to switch everything to short term maturities tomorrow and not be risking the same tragedy that befell the savings and loans—and then the American taxpayer.

Mr. President, in the Budget Committee I offered four simple, easy to understand amendments. One was for specific savings in entitlements, to go to managed care in Medicaid. One was to cut pork by enacting a line-item veto to get the $9.8 billion that the President claimed would be spent were he not able to exercise the line-item veto.

I also offered an amendment to cut new spending by 50 percent. And the last is a classic case of if at first you do not succeed, try, try again. I even offered to reduce his new spending by 10 percent.

All of these amendments, I feel, were good amendments and should have been supported. I think the American people, if they had their way, would support them. But, in lockstep fashion, they were all rejected on a party-line vote.

Our economy needs real spending cuts, not real tax increases.

This budget resolution is a jobs killer. And, as more and more people see and understand what is in it, more and more are expressing their concerns.

Taxes do not create jobs. And many of the taxes in the President's plan will go even further and cost us jobs.

Unfortunately, this is the plan we have before us. It is not shared sacrifice. It is shared foolhardiness.

I oppose this plan. I ask and plead with my colleagues, especially those on the other side of the aisle, to resist the President's call for blind adherence to his budget of job loss and deficit increase, to think of what is best for the people in their States, and to help us take the horse meat out of this rabbit stew.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from New Jersey how much time he will require.

Mr. BRADLEY. Thirty minutes.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

URBAN COMMUNITY-BUILDING INITIATIVE: A SUMMARY OF SPECIFIC LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, it was less than a year ago that we watched Los Angeles explode in riots across our television screens, followed by the parade of people saying it was time to do something about our cities. And of course, nothing was done.

There are no cities burning today—no shopkeepers protecting their stores with guns right now—no mass looting or mass angle being played out on neighborhood streets at the moment. But that does not mean the problems are gone.

I do not believe we can wait until the next urban crisis to start doing something about the problems facing our cities.

Last year I spoke on this floor to paint a picture of America's cities. I described places that were poorer, sicker, less educated, and more violent than ever in my lifetime. I described places where plummeting incomes, skyrocketing unemployment, deteriorating physical conditions, and an absence of meaning in people's lives come together at the barrel of a gun, places where fear covers the streets like a sheet of ice. I talked about the cost of neglect to our economy and our humanity if we do nothing.

Today I want to show a new picture of the same places. It is a more hopeful picture, though there has been no great change. But life in cities is always full of more complexity and more hope than either the media or the politicians want to admit. Today I want to talk about converting despair to hope, about the cities in which it is already happening, and about how human beings in the midst of the turmoil can become islands of courage and dedication, about how we can build bridges to connect islands and bring us all together.

Dedicated individuals in every city have built communities for themselves by inventing new tools. With little help and less encouragement from government, they have had to recombine and reinvent government programs intended for completely different objectives in order to make them do some good. Today I am announcing my urban community-building initiative, a package of bills that will take the tools invented at the community level, and use the power of Government constructively to make those tools available to every community where there is the will and imagination to make them work. These are tools for creative communities to achieve self-improvement.

Life loses its meaning where there is no community. Community today means the chance to build a better future with savings and capital for economic growth, safe streets and comfortable public spaces, education and skills, and strong families. People who share goals and a common effort are people with a purpose in life. But where young people languish without work skills and public spaces crumble, while no one makes the connection between work to be done and people to do work, there is no community. Where there are 10 check-cashing shops for every bank or credit union that lets people borrow and save for tomorrow, there is no community. Where police respond only to crimes that have already taken place, arriving too late to help people who are strangers to them, there is no community. Where children are born to teenage mothers who do not know the effects of drugs on a fetus or a child, or why a child cries, there is little chance of a community for the next generation. Where the Government's only effort to help people escape poverty is a futile flow of income for spending, while Government penalizes savings and investment, there is no community. Where cities are nestled in prosperous metropolitan areas that generate thousands of entry-level jobs a year, but those jobs are only in suburbs, accessible to poor people only by a bus trip of several hours and transfers, there is no community.

Last year I painted three possible futures for urban America.

One was abandonment meaning recognizing that with the billions of investment in the national highway system which led to suburbia, corporate parks, and the malling of America, and with communications technology advancing so fast that the economic advantages of urban proximity are being replaced by computer screens, in those circumstances, the city has outlived its usefulness. Like the small town whose industry leaves, the city will wither and disappear.

The second possible future, encirclement, means that people in cities will live in enclaves. Politics will amount to splitting up a shrinking economic pie into ever smaller ethnic, racial, and religious slices. It will be a kind of clockwork orange society in which the rich will pay for their security, the middle class of all races will continue to flee as they confront violence, and the poor will be preyed upon at will, or will join the army of violent predators. What will be lost for everyone will be freedom, civility, and the chance to build a common future.

Conversion, on the other hand, means winning over all segments of urban life to a new politics of change, empowerment, and common effort. Conversion is as different from the politics of dependency as it is from the politics of greed. Its optimism relates to the belief that every person can realize his or her potential in an atmosphere of nurturing liberty. Its morality is grounded in the conviction that each of us has an obligation to another human being, simply because that person is a human being.

There will not be a charismatic leader here but many leaders of awareness who champion integrity and humility over self-promotion and command performances. Answers will not come from an elite who has determined in advance what the new society will look like. Instead, the future will be shaped by the voices from inside the turmoil of urban America, as well as by those who claim to see a higher picture.

Conversion requires listening to the disaffected as well as the powerful. Empowerment requires seizing the moment. The core of conversion begins with a recognition that all of us will advance together, or each of us will be diminished; that American diversity is not our weakness but our strength, and that we will never be able to lead the world by the power of our example until we have come to terms with each other and overcome the blight of racial division on our history.

The Government in Washington cannot create community where there is none, or generate a commitment to the politics of conversion. But we can provide tools to those who are committed to building it for themselves. That is the idea behind the urban community-building initiative which a group of Republican and Democratic Senators will introduce next week. These eight bills offer innovative, cost-effective solutions to each of the obstacles to community that I have described. The total cost of the package is only $1.45 billion a year, but taken together, it represents a massive investment of innovation and new thinking. These ideas will seem untested only in Washington, where this is a very new approach, but in the streets and community-based organizations where these ideas were born, they are hardly outlandish.

The first proposal is the Neighborhood Reconstruction Corps. I have spoken here and in the past about the deterioration of public spaces and the vast number of young people, with a high-school diploma or even a long work history, who need skills and work. But today I want to speak about people who are gaining skills and public spaces that are being improved. In East Harlem, for example, Dorothy Stoneman started YouthBuild in 1978 to give young people both basic education and marketable vocational skills. While getting their high school equivalency diplomas, they have rehabilitated hundreds of abandoned buildings to create affordable housing. Other programs, such as developer James Rouse's Enterprise Foundation, have shown in Baltimore, Detroit, Miami, and other cities that local companies are willing to participate in rebuilding the cities in which they prosper.

To combine the idea of improving job skills with the idea of asking private companies to help build an economically healthy community, I have devel-

oped the Neighborhood Reconstruction Corps. This demonstration would provide Federal funds to match private investments in light infrastructure projects for public entities. For example, if a local company was willing to put up money to help repaint an inner-city school, or to refurbish a neighborhood center, some money would be available but only if an important condition was met: The project must employ a Neighborhood Reconstruction Corps, a corps of disadvantaged workers who would be organized and trained for light construction by a community-based organization. The first idea might come from a company that realizes its own profit depends on clean, modern roads and good schools and housing. Or the initiative might come from the community-based organization that first assembles a Neighborhood Reconstruction Corps and then seeks out companies that want to undertake projects. Everyone must work together—the private business that will put up at least half the money, the local government or school system, and the community-based nonprofit—and if they do, the Government will be there to help.

The second proposal is community schools, which Senator DANFORTH has given a great deal of thought to. One of the great outrages of our cities is that the one public building that is part of every neighborhood and every family's life—the school—bolts its doors tight every afternoon at 3:30 or 4 and every Friday for 48 hours. During that time, kids whose parents are not home often have no safe place to go and no one to help them with homework, sports, or the basic questions about growing up. The dedicated people of the community, who want to be a part of raising the community's children, have no place to come together and help. But if we look at what a few dedicated people have done, we can find an answer. In Newark, it's the Boy's and Girl's Club of Newark. In East Orange, NJ, a local YMCA is transforming itself into a "safe haven" for young people after school. And in Washington, DC, a former executive named Kent Amos gave up his career to give his full attention to the 50 or more kids who come to his home every afternoon for help with homework and other activities.

Meanwhile the school buildings, with their gyms and libraries, their nurses offices and auditoriums, are shuttered. Later this year, I expect to join Senator DANFORTH in introducing a bill called Community Schools. It will provide basic funds to open the schools after hours for purposes the community chooses. It might be a safe place for homework or an athletic program or a parenting program for young mothers. Kids need two things during their free time: a place and a mentor. This bill will give them both, in communities where there is the kind of commitment that Kent Amos and others have demonstrated. But now a caring community can affect hundreds of thousands of kids, not just 50.

I also want to use Community Schools as an example of how the programs in this package are interconnected. For example, if the community wanted to use a school for some new purpose, such as a drama program, but they needed repairs and new facilities, a neighborhood reconstruction corps could do the work. If the community wanted to use the school for an entrepreneurship training program for high-school students, maybe even to start a small business based in the school building, they could combine community schools with the entrepreneurship training component of this package. Communities that can address more than one of the leverage points of conversion at a time will see the impact multiply as expectations and results build on one another in a positive direction.

The third piece of this initiative is the Community Capital Partnership Act. Most of us take basic financial institutions for granted. We have savings and checking accounts, our bank lends our money to businesses in our communities, and we borrow ourselves when it comes time to buy a home or we have an inspiration to start a business. But in most American cities, the only financial institution they know is the check-cashing cubicle, which charges up to 5 percent just to cash a Government check, and takes the money back out of the community. People who want to save have nowhere to go and businesses have no access to capital. Within the 165 square miles that make up the areas most affected by the Los Angeles riots, there are 19 bank branches, as compared to 135 check cashing establishments.

Over the last 20 years, Shorebank of Chicago has shown the world that a financial institution that is committed to community development can lead a community back from the brink of economic and social decline. Since 1973, it has made $340 million in development financing, mainly for the purchase or rehabilitation of housing units in Chicago's South Shore neighborhood.

Shorebank is more than just a bank. Through its various subsidiaries and affiliates, it has been an active force in the revitalization of the South Shore. Shorebank has used a subsidiary, City Lands, Corp., to make high-risk loans for housing development. It has used a nonprofit affiliate, the Neighborhood Institute, to help disadvantaged residents achieve their GED's, start up small businesses, and train for jobs available in the community. It has used its depository institution, South Shore Bank, to make loans to people seeking to renovate apartment buildings and establish small businesses that generate jobs in the community.

The bank now boasts over $211 million in deposits, almost half of which come from residents of the South Shore community.

Another home-grown project dedicated to the benefits of capital and savings is New Community Corp. in Newark, NJ. New Community Corp. was formed in the wake of the Newark riots of 1967. Over the last 25 years, it and its subsidiaries have developed over 2,500 housing units, 25,000 square feet of office space, and an $11 million extended care facility. New Community has also built a $15 million shopping center, which contains central Newark's only major grocery store built since 1967.

New Community's founder, Msgr. William Linder, testified recently before Congress, "I have seen bank branch after bank branch close because the bank did not find serving our community profitable. There was always the same trend. Managers were frequently changed, service became poor, the facility was always dirty. Frankly, no one in authority cared about our community."

But instead of giving up hope, Monsignor Linder and others started a credit union. He now presides over a credit union with about $1.7 million in assets that provides basic banking services to community residents. Last year, New Community's credit union made 165 loans, mainly to poor residents of Newark's Central Ward. Basic banking services like check cashing, consumer loans, and savings accounts are taken for granted by a lot of people, but in places like the Central Ward of Newark they have become scarce and prized resources. Like Shorebank, New Community, in its own way, has recreated opportunities for its community.

The bill I introduce today commits the Federal Government to efforts like these all across this country. It increases the amount of funds authorized in various Government programs for the benefit of community development financial institutions, and expands the number of institutions that are eligible for the funds. It creates a new program specifically designed to help institutions like New Community—community development financial institutions—grow into community development banks like Shorebank, and it helps institutions like Shorebank expand their services.

The fourth bill provides training and help for entrepreneurs. When we confront our fears about the city, we have to start with our assumptions about the people who live there, particularly young black men. But here is another view of the young people of the inner city: "They confront risk daily, they are resilient, intuitive, creative, and observant, and they have learned to take great initiative within a stifling environment, just to survive." To Steve Mariotti, a former Detroit auto

executive, these were the characteristics of a successful entrepreneur. With help from private foundations, he started the National Foundation for Teaching Entrepreneurship. Where others looked at these same kids and saw only their deficits and their problems, Steve saw their strengths. And he was right. By working in schools and settlement houses with kids as young as 6 and up to the age of 24, he taught people about the value of money, and about how to use their instincts and skills to grow in the long run, not just to survive in the short run. In 1990, the foundation graduated 225 young entrepreneurs, who started 152 businesses, including retail clothing firms, food and catering businesses.

The Foundation for Teaching Entrepreneurship is just one program that might benefit from my entrepreneurship training program for urban residents young or old. The bill authorizes $85 million in grants to community colleges and community development corporations in economically distressed central cities to develop an entrepreneurship curriculum and train urban residents for self-employment. It also provides $150 million in guarantees of loans made by community development corporations, community development loan funds, community development credit unions, and community development banks to finance small business startups by graduates of such self-employment training programs.

Fifth, I will introduce the Community Policing Assistance Act. Business can hardly survive, much less grow, if there is no safety. Three weeks ago in Newark I met a man who owned a small store, an immigrant, who was terrified of frequent robberies. His store was in the shadow of city hall, just blocks away, but when he called the police, he said it took 3 hours for a squad car to respond. He concluded that government would do nothing to ensure his safety, and now he carries a gun.

Government's response to the epidemic of violent urban crime has been to toughen and toughen again the penalties in the letter of the law. I have supported this effort—because the penalties should fit the magnitude of crimes involving both drugs and violence—but there is a larger point. A police culture that isolates officers in squad cars, responding to crimes only after the fact, will never prevent crime and will rarely catch the criminal.

While Government was speaking louder about crime, but carrying what looked like a smaller and smaller stick, a few communities were inventing for themselves a new way to ensure safety. In East Orange, NJ, police officers recently took the roughest 12-block zone of the city and made it a miniprecinct, with an accessible office and distinct neighborhood beats for every officer. A similar program that started in 1990 in Columbia, SC, brought an immediate 30 percent reduction in crime. An elderly woman living in a housing project, who had slept on her floor for 5 years because she feared bullets coming through her window, was finally able to get back into bed. Now police officers worry less about what crimes have occurred, and spend more time talking to people, finding out where trouble is brewing, and intervening before it happens. Police know the mothers who are worried about their sons and daughters; they know the shopkeepers who are worried about neighborhood thugs, and they know the thugs the shopkeepers worry about. With knowledge comes trust and trust is the foundation for security.

This new model, known as community policing, can build a base of trust and knowledge in every community. But it requires an investment, at least at the beginning. When police officers spend more time on the streets, preventing crime, a city needs more police officers to provide the same basic level of security and the same response time when crime does occur. My community policing bill, the third component of this initiative, authorizes $200 million in matching funds to local law enforcement and community groups to support community policing activities in economically distressed central cities. Police departments can use these funds for local police substations, or to staff regular police neighborhood beats.

As essential as investment, capital, and infrastructure are, they are not family. They are not children. And nothing is more vulnerable than children to the pressures of the city. Raising children is a 24-7-365-20 proposition: 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, for 20 years. Young mothers often do not realize this, and with the pressures of the city—the economic pressures, drugs as a commonplace of life, crime and guns—it is more difficult for them to provide that steady hand then for most other parents.

Yet a few people have stepped in to build communities that set children on a sound course through life by caring for them in the most important 15 months of life: the last trimester of pregnancy and the first year after birth. In Los Angeles, Bea Stolzer and an organization called New Economics for Women put together everything they could find, including low-income tax credits, local housing development credits, CRA credits, and welfare system funds to build Casa Loma, a residence for 110 single parent families and senior citizens, with child care space, family services, and vocational programs. In New York, the Bronx Parent Association has developed a 12 to 18 month residential program—La Casita—to serve pregnant women and women with young children. It provides initial evaluation of enrollees for psychosocial needs and substance abuse problems, counseling, onsite medical services, job training, parenting classes, onsite day care, and a 1-year followup.

From these home-grown initiatives, I have come up with the idea of 15-month Houses, and later this year I will introduce a bill authorizing $250 million to establish residential programs for low-income and young mothers during the third trimester of the mother's pregnancy and the first year of life. The program must provide the mother with health and substance abuse screening or treatment, and education in parenting. For the children, the program must include cognitive stimulation as well as immunizations and other care. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation recently completed a study showing that if children are provided not just healthy care during the first year of life, but also systematic cognitive stimulation, behavior problems will be reduced later, they will progress more quickly in education later, and the burden on the school to remedy problems from early in life will be correspondingly reduced. Fifteen-month houses will be intended to provide that safe and stimulating year to the most vulnerable children.

Another reality of city life that we have to face up to is Government's failure to lift people out of poverty. The average income in Newark, NJ, is only $9,424 a year. The average income for New Jersey overall is $24,881. While cities have gotten poorer, Government has been engaged in an endless debate about whether traditional welfare programs give people too much income, discouraging work, or too little. While this debate is important, it misses a key point: traditional welfare programs that support income and spending can never, by themselves, lift people out of poverty. You can no more spend your way out of poverty than you can borrow your way out of debt. To become economically self-sufficient requires at least some assets—a house, a savings account in case of an emergency, even an education counts as an asset. Poor people are much poorer in assets than in income. For example, black families with monthly incomes below $900 have an average net worth of only $88. That includes everything—furniture, a car, savings, the value of a pension. The average net worth for white families earning only two to three times as much is more than $50,000.

For middle-class people, the Government encourages and heavily subsidizes the development of assets. Interest paid on home mortgages is tax-deductible, at a cost of more than $40 billion. Pensions are tax-deferred, and individual retirement accounts allow people with $2,000 to spare to save for the future. Meanwhile, poor people live in neighborhoods where there are no

banks; without a pension or a downpayment on a home, they cannot take advantage of the many ways our Government helps people develop assets. If they are on welfare, they cannot even save $2,000 or so to buy a car and get to a job without a penalty. Indeed, in Milwaukee, WI, 2 years ago, a young single mother named Grace Capitello managed to save $3,000, by making clothes and toys for her daughter instead of buying them, and by scrimping at the grocery store. For her efforts, she was charged with fraud by the county and ordered to turn over all her savings. Fortunately a judge understood. Throwing out the case, he complained, "I don't know how much more powerfully we could say it to the poor in our society: Don't try to save."

From the creativity of Grace Capitello comes the idea for the Assets for Independence Act. This bill would not only allow poor people to save without penalty, it would encourage it. It would allow anyone with income up to twice the poverty line—or about $22,000 for a family of four—to establish an individual development account and contribute up to $2,000 a year, the same as in an individual retirement account. This account could be used for only four purposes: to buy a first home, to pay for college education, for retirement, or to start a small business. To reward savings, the program would provide funds to community-based nonprofits to match the savings in an IDA, up to a total of $2,000. This bill would authorize $200 million to establish a broad demonstration of this revolutionary concept.

The most striking characteristic of American central cities today is their isolation. Once the hub of their regions, the center of commerce, jobs and culture, innercity residents are now isolated socially, culturally, and economically. Outsiders look in, through movies like "Boyz in the Hood," at a world with its own values, its own language, and its own icons of popular culture. But all the talk in Washington about the culture of poverty diverts our attention from the very simple fact of isolation from jobs. It is not news that a central city like Newark lost 80,000 jobs between 1970 and 1988. But these cities are nestled in metropolitan areas that were creating far more jobs than were lost, including many entry-level jobs with modest skill requirements.

Unfortunately, those jobs were in the suburbs. To say that an urban resident can't get an entry-level job until the city revives in total is to say that a generation will be wasted as politicians of all races give excuses and bureaucrats twiddle their thumbs and push paper. In 20 large metropolitan areas of America, more than 75 percent of the jobs created in the 1980's were outside of the central city. And in six areas, including Chicago, Cleveland, and Detroit, every single new job created—100 percent of the net job growth—was in the suburbs. Government has tried various costly strategies to address this enormous disparity. Urban development has cost hundreds of billions, gentrified a few small downtown areas, but still left poor people in the cities living increasingly in areas where almost everyone else is also poor. The latest effort at urban development, enterprise zones, might turn out to be more successful, but the cost is high and the change only marginal. Dispersal strategies, efforts to help inner-city residents move to the suburbs, have been very successful when ordered by a court, as in the Gautreaux project near Chicago, but encounter intense political resistance. With the failure of these two strategies, the only alternative has been abandonment, leaving the cities, with their vast human capital behind, while businesses in the suburbs struggle to fill $5-an-hour entry-level jobs from a limited labor pool.

There is an alternative, possibly a much less expensive one: mobility. In southeast Chicago, residents of the Le Clair Court housing project concluded that the barrier between Le Clair residents and jobs was simply transportation. Most Le Clair residents don't own cars, and bus transportation to a suburban job means getting up 3 hours before work and returning home well after dark. With the help of a creative young manager named Theresa Prim, they scraped together $250,000 from foundations to buy five 20-person vans, and began to talk to suburban businesses about their desperate need for entry-level workers. They concluded that if people had good jobs, they would pay $6 a day for transportation to those jobs. Now fares paid by workers or employers cover almost half the cost of the Accel Transportation project. The vans are full. And many Le Clair residents soon buy a car to get to their new jobs, opening a spot in the van for someone new. Besides transportation, the program includes job counseling and conflict resolution for workers who are not used to suburban jobs and employers who are not accustomed to hiring inner-city residents and often must overcome their own ingrained impulses on issues of race.

I have not given up hope that we can draw more jobs to the cities, but we can no longer put all our hopes in that strategy. We know where the jobs are, and we know that in good economic times, companies have a hard time filling those jobs. In 1987 and 1988, companies in northern New Jersey were desperate for workers and began to run their own vans into Newark. But when the economy turned down, companies quickly cut this cost, and urban workers were cut off before they developed a permanent attachment to the work force.

My mobility for work initiative is intended to build a lasting connection between urban workers and suburban jobs by helping projects like Accel Transportation get going. At only $15 million, it is the least expensive component of this urban initiative, but one with the most possibilities. Everything is interconnected. For example, when city dwellers return to their communities in the evening with real earnings from jobs, banks, and retail businesses will emerge to serve them, creating more jobs in the community and starting a cycle of prosperity. Some urban residents might move out to the suburbs, closer to the jobs, or some businesses might be drawn back to the city, once they overcome their prejudices about inner-city minority workers. This is a demonstration program, with a rigorous evaluation at the end to determine the effects of this new strategy.

These eight programs form a coherent strategy to build communities by restoring their public spaces, by fully utilizing schools, by making capital available, by bringing law enforcement into the community, by helping people save for the future, by strengthening families, and by connecting people with jobs. All eight are demonstration programs, to give these new ideas a serious test before we implement them nationally.

Most of the eight programs also include a peer review panel to look at the initial applications for demonstration grants and design the evaluations. All eight programs have a strong accountability provision with rigorous standards and frequent review and assessment. The money provided under this initiative will not be distributed by bureaucrats in Washington, but by people with experience in making these programs work at the local level. In many cases, it will be the people who invented them. They will know whether the groups that apply for grants really have the ability and commitment to make them work, or they just know how to write grant applications.

These programs are also concentrated where the need is greatest. Too often when we design programs for cities, the political process spreads the distribution so widely that cities get very little and well-off suburbs get assistance they don't need. Some of these programs are linked to a definition of economically distressed central cities. Currently 297 cities quality under this definition, which is based on a modification of the formula for community development block grants. Other programs are specifically targeted, like the mobility for work grants, which can go only to programs in the 20 metropolitan areas where more than 75 percent of the job growth has occurred in the suburbs.

From 1981 to 1992, Federal aid to cities was cut by 60 percent, in constant dollars. We have failed our cities by denying them investment, atten-

tion, and imagination. A lack of money can be remedied quickly, even given our budgetary constraints, as President Clinton has shown by proposing to spend, in 1997, $3.7 billion for Head Start, almost $1 billion for the Women, Infants and Children nutrition supplement, $3.1 billion for community development block grants and related programs, $247 million for the Job Corps, and $1 billion for summer jobs this summer. These are longstanding, well-tested programs that work and never should be abandoned.

But fully funding old programs that work is not enough. We must remedy not just the failure of spending, but the failure of imagination and 25 years ago, the Kerner Commission, appointed to study the riots in Newark and Detroit, called for a constant stream of innovative programs to get at the real problems underlying violence. If we are only talking about fully funding the few programs from that era that have survived and work, we must acknowledge that we are denying the decades-old call to constantly think anew about our cities.

This initiative gives these local programs a national test, so we can see what works and what does not. The cost of the program is $1.44 billion per year—slightly more than the cost of insurance claims of 4 days of rioting in south central Los Angeles last April. The question is not whether we can afford to spend this money in our cities, but whether we can afford not to. Earlier this week the administration said we had no choice but to spend $45 billion more to clean up the S&L's; do we have any less choice in our cities, for $43.5 billion fewer?

At its core, this proposal deals in an interrelated manner with the steps that it takes to become a fully contributing adult in our society. To address the first years of life, these are 15-month houses; to help with education, there are community schools; to provide safety, there is community policing; to create jobs and job training there are neighborhood reconstruction corps, community capital partnerships, and entrepreneurship training; to connect jobs and job-seekers there is mobility for work; and finally, to promote savings and investment, there are assets for independence. Rural, suburban, or urban, these are goals we all share.

That is the purpose of my package. In the absence of funding or imagination from the Federal Government, for 12 years urban heroes have had to figure out how to make the most of what they have. This initiative takes the creativity that has flourished at the local level, and translates it into national programs that can in turn be used as tools for a new wave of creativity. With this initiative, I hope we can begin a new era in which we do not deny the existence of a crisis of race and isolation in our cities, we do not deny resources to cities, and, above all, we no longer deny cities our natural optimism and creativity as a Nation in finding solutions to problems that seem hopeless only because we have not given them our best effort, our fullest resources, or our most creative imagination. Now is the time to seize the moment.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the urban community-building initiative be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEIGHBORHOOD RECONSTRUCTION CORPS ACT SUMMARY

The Neighborhood Reconstruction Corps combines two successful ideas: using community organizations to give disadvantaged workers marketable job skills and real work, and enlisting private enterprise as partners in rebuilding public spaces and public buildings. Program funds will be used to train disadvantaged workers for light infrastructure repair work, and to match private investment in public projects.

Federal grants will be available for nonprofit community development corporations or private business entities at up to a one-to-one match of private funds. Project cannot cost more than $1,000,000 and the Federal match cannot exceed $500,000. Qualifying projects would include enhancing public parks, bringing public buildings into compliance with the requirements of the American With Disabilities Act, graffiti removal, repairing bus shelters, replacement of sidewalks, painting schools, and similar light public projects.

The Department of Commerce will administer the program, but grant applications will be reviewed by a separate peer review panel made up of community leaders with successful experience in similar programs. To avoid the diffusion that has weakened comparable grant programs, only cities designated Economically Distressed Central Cities, under a formula in the bill, can qualify for grants. The formula is based on a modified CDBG formula, and currently 297 cities of 35,000 or more population would qualify.

The Neighborhood Reconstruction Corps has a three pronged effect on urban development: it provides training, work experience, and jobs to economically disadvantaged workers while it encourages private enterprises to invest more in urban communities and improves much needed infrastructure clean up and light construction in historically unnurtured and blighted urban areas by individuals living in those areas. This program combines ideas from several successful community-based, including the East Harlem Action Program and the urban reconstruction programs of the Enterprise Foundation.

This bill authorizes $500 million a year.

COMMUNITY CAPITAL PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1993 SUMMARY

I. COMMUNITY INVESTMENT CORPORATION DEMONSTRATION IMPROVEMENTS

Expands the types of institutions that qualify for assistance under the Community Investment Corporation Demonstration, section 853 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992, from community development banks to the larger number of community development financial institutions, including community development banks, community development loan funds, and community development credit unions.

Increases the amount of capital assistance authorized for 1994 from $26,000,000 to $50,000,000. Increases the amount of development services and technical assistance funds authorized for 1994 from $15,600,000 to $25,000,000. Increases the amount of money authorized for the training program in 1994 from $2,100,000 to $5,000,000.

II. ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CREDIT UNIONS

Increases the NCUA's Community Development Credit Union Revolving Loan Fund from $6 million to $25 million.

Allows the NCUA to invest idle Revolving Loan Fund money to fund technical assistance to community development credit unions.

III. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BANKING TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Authorizes $400,000,000 over four years to assist community development banks expand their activities and help community development loan funds, community development credit unions, and community development corporations that want to become community development banks develop into community development banks.

Gives the Secretary of HUD authority to provide capital and operating assistance to eligible institutions, provided the institutions agree to negotiate certain performance criteria relating to lending volume, portfolio performance, and service to targeted groups with the Secretary. If an institution fails to meet the performance criteria, the Secretary can stop funding of the institution.

IV. ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN AND INVESTMENT FUNDS

Provides $20 million in federal matching grant support to community development loan and equity funds which makes loans and investments of $25,000–250,000.

ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SELF-EMPLOYMENT TRAINING ACT OF 1993 SUMMARY

I. DEVELOP COMMUNITY ENTREPRENEUR TRAINING

Requires the Secretary of Labor to award competitive grants to five community colleges in economically-distressed central cities to develop specialized training curricula for entrepreneurship and self-employment training of disadvantaged, inner-city residents.

Authorizes $10,000,000 for the training curriculum grants.

II. TRAINING GRANTS

Provides $85,000,000 a year for four years to fund 6 to 12 week courses based on the training curricula developed under the program which are taught by the community colleges and community development corporations that serve residents of economically-distressed central cities.

III. LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

Requires the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to guarantee loans up to $25,000 made by community development corporations, community development loan funds, community development banks, and community development credit unions to individuals who have graduated from a training course provided for under the program and intend to start a business.

MOBILITY FOR WORK ACT SUMMARY

This legislation is intended to support efforts to provide transportation to work for inner-city residents in areas where new

entry-level jobs are found primarily in the suburbs. The bill authorizes $15 million for local transit agencies, community-based organizations and governments to explore the potential of mobility strategies to build a permanent attachment between urban residents and the workplace.

Programs funded under this bill must utilize one of the following models:

Expansion of existing job training or job search programs to include transportation.

Improving public transit systems to create links between urban residential areas and outlying areas of high job growth.

Establish regional coalitions to improve central city access to jobs.

The program will be administered by the Secretary of Labor in consultation with the Secretaries of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development. It is intended to encourage similar cooperation among local job training and placement programs, transit agencies, and economic development authorities.

To limit the assistance to the areas of greatest need, eligibility will be limited to metropolitan areas in which 75% or more of the job growth over the previous ten years was outside of the central city. Based on current figures, this includes 20 metropolitan areas, among them Chicago, Los Angeles, Cleveland, Detroit, Washington, DC, Philadelphia and Milwaukee.

ASSETS FOR INDEPENDENCE ACT SUMMARY

Establishes a wide demonstration of Individual Development Accounts (IDAs). These accounts would allow people with incomes up to 200% of poverty to save up to $2,000 a year in accounts specifically designated for (1) higher education, (2) purchase of a first home, (3) retirement, or (4) to start a very small business.

Low-income people who managed put aside savings in an Individual Development Account would receive a dollar-for-dollar match in the account. Community-based organizations, community credit unions or community banks could apply for a federal demonstration grant under this act. The organization would then use the grant funds to match Individual Development Account savings for all low-income participants in the community served.

Participants could withdraw funds at any time for any of the four qualified purposes, without penalty. If IDA savings are withdrawn for any other purpose, there is a penalty comparable to the penalty for early withdrawal from an Individual Retirement Account and all funds and interest attributable to the federal match would be returned to the Treasury.

Individual Development Accounts are intended to remedy the lack of savings and security in poor neighborhoods, to develop a long-term habit of spending, and to match the government's subsidy for asset-development by the middle-class with a comparable, though modest, subsidy for the working poor.

The legislation would authorize $200 million for this demo, or sufficient funds to establish about 200,000 Individual Development Accounts.

15-MONTH HOUSE PROPOSAL SUMMARY

This legislation, to be developed in full and introduced later in the spring of 1993, will fund residential programs that provide refuge and a solid start in life for children who need help during the most vulnerable 15 months of life—the last trimester of pregnancy and the first year of life.

Fifteen-month houses would provide very young or low-income mothers with health care; parenting education; social, psychological or substance abuse counseling and treatment; and educational or vocational training. They would provide the infant with pediatric care, nutrition, immunizations, and extensive cognitive stimulation. There will also be follow-up with both the mother and the child, and efforts to involve absent fathers in the lives of their children at all stages.

Fifteen-month houses are based on several successful programs developed by hospitals, parent associations, and other community groups, such as La Casita, a 12-18-month program for young mothers in the South Bronx. It is also based on a study by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation that compared children who received solid health care and nutrition during the first year of life with children who received all that plus systematic cognitive stimulation. That study found that children who were cognitively stimulated—through exercises with shapes, sounds and colors—in the first year of life were better prepared for school and had many fewer behavior and learning problems later in childhood.

The legislation will authorize $250 million for 15-month houses.

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS PROPOSAL SUMMARY

Community Schools will be the name of legislation that Senator Bradley and Senator Danforth have been working on and intend to introduce later in the spring of 1993. The legislation will provide funds for community groups to keep schools open after hours for purposes the community develops for itself.

Community Schools is based on successful programs in Boys and Girls Clubs, YMCAs, and even in private homes that community leaders have opened up as a safe haven for children after school hours. It is intended to build on those programs by using the most accessible and useful public space in every neighborhood: the school. Community groups could apply for grants to use the school's gymnasium, cafeteria, auditorium, classrooms, or other facilities after hours. Potential uses of funds include mentoring programs in which adults from the community would help young people with homework, athletic programs, drama, or any other use the community developed for the young people of the community.

The legislation will likely authorize $15 million for community schools. Funds might be used to develop the community program or to offset the incidental costs of keeping schools open.

COMMUNITY POLICING ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1993 SUMMARY

Authorizes $200 million in grants for local governments and community groups in economically distressed central cities to establish or expand community policing programs. The goal of the bill is to increase police presence in the community by fostering and strengthening the ties between the community and the police.

Funds can be used for any of the following approaches to community policing, all of which have proven successful in improving safety:

Decentralized police substations in the community.

Expanded foot patrols for police officers and reduced emphasis on squad car surveillance.

Community/police partnerships to target crime, such as citizens patrols and crime detection networks.

Community/police training programs in areas such as cultural diversity, crime prevention, and gang prevention.

Development of model projects to help communities identify drug or gang houses and use civil remedies, such as public nuisance violations, to eradicate such houses, and use mediation techniques to resolve gang problems.

Of the $200 million authorized, 75% is targeted for use by local governments, the balance by community groups.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Chair.

While we have all gathered here to discuss this budget, and I guess we are going to be discussing it for a few more days before we get to vote on it, having served on the Budget Committee, I had a chance to participate in the marking up of this budget, and I must say that I was impressed by the sincerity and the desire of all the members of the Budget Committee to accomplish deficit reduction and economic growth. But there are also obviously within the committee basically along party lines very deep philosophical differences as to how these goals should be accomplished. When you look at the budget which is being proposed by the majority party, which is a modification of the President's budget, you certainly see that there is a clear ideological tilt to it.

In this budget that has been proposed, there are large increases in taxes. In the budget that has been proposed by President Clinton and presented here by the majority party, there are large cuts in defense spending.

In the budget that is proposed by the Democratic leadership and President Clinton, there are on net very few reductions in actual domestic spending.

If you were to summarize the budget in three lines, it would be a budget that dramatically increases taxes, that dramatically cuts defense, and that maintains spending at present levels for the 5-year period.

It does not, in my opinion, accomplish its basic goal, which is to reduce the deficit significantly and generate economic growth.

It does not accomplish this because it puts such a significant new burden on the marketplace with the new taxes and because it passes up the opportunity to make very significant reductions in spending at the Federal level.

The program has in it new spending initiatives which amount to about $124 billion. It has spending cuts on the domestic side which amount to around

$131 billion, for a $7 billion net reduction over 5 years in domestic nondefense spending at the Federal level.

My goodness, just in a bill that was voted through here last week we spent $5.5 billion, which basically is not funded and, therefore, reduces that $7 billion, so actually the cut in this budget is $2 billion—$2 billion—over 5 years in domestic nondefense spending. What a paltry sum that is when you consider the rate of growth of the deficit over this period, because the deficit over this period is going to grow by $1.08 trillion—$1.08 trillion—over this same period of time. And that is debt which is added to our already outrageous national debt, which debt must be paid for by the next generation.

It is cost which we are incurring today but which we are not willing to pay for today, giving the bills to the next generation.

There was, as I said, a sincere effort I believe to try to address the deficit, but it was pulled down by this philosophical belief that you must have new taxes and you must have a lot of new spending, which seems to drive both this Presidency and the Democratic Party in this body. If you look at this budget, a lot more could have been done and done in a positive way, but, unfortunately, sitting on the shoulders of the people who wrote this budget was that little elf who kept whispering in the ears of the budgeteers: Spend, spend, tax, tax. And as a result what we got was a budget that taxes and taxes and, unfortunately, spends a great deal of money.

The chart which has been referred to a number of times already reflects just how much this budget is made up of taxes. The red part of the pie is the new taxes. The orange part of the pie is the new user fees. Fully 79 percent—79 percent—what is represented to be $458 billion of deficit reduction over the next 5 years is accomplished through new taxes or user fees—79 percent.

And what is in this tax package that is so good for America, that is going to help the other side of the equation which we wish to address, not only deficit reduction as a goal but also economic activity? Well, in this new tax package there is something called a Btu tax. Now, this is a unique tax, probably one of the more regressive taxes that this body will ever consider, certainly a regressive tax for New England where I come from, New Hampshire, because this is a tax that is on all energy sources but for some reason it is not on all energy sources equally.

First off, by being on all energy sources is regressive by definition because that means no matter what your income bracket is, no matter who you are, you are going to pay the tax at the same rate, whether you are Donald Trump or Martha Jones who happens to run a small restaurant in Epping, NH. You are going to pay the same rate of tax on the energy you purchase as the wealthy person, middle-income person or the low-income person. All pay the same rate of tax, except that in New England we are not only going to pay the flat rate of tax, we are going to get a little extra kicker under this bill. Somebody decided in the White House—and I hope it was not the President, because certainly he has been to New Hampshire and understands how cold our winters can be, but somebody down there decided well, we ought to double hit home heating oil. And under this Btu tax, which is regressive on its face, it gets doubly regressive for people from New England where 80 percent of our homes are heated by oil—80 percent—because the tax is more than twice as much on home heating oil as compared with natural gas or electricity.

What a terrible thing to do to the people of the Northeast. What a terrible thing to do to the people of this country, to stick them with a regressive tax to begin with, but why pick out New England or the Northeast and say: Hey, we are going to sock it to you and give you a little extra in tax burden. It is estimated it is going to increase the average heating bill in New Hampshire by 8 percent. I think that is conservative, but it is expensive. The theory I am told is that somebody down there in their intellectual genius has decided that oil is not a very good commodity to use as an energy source, especially heating homes, and we should limit the amount of oil used in this country and the way to do it is tax it out of use. For environmental reasons we are told this.

Well, I hope those folks will come to New England, and remember that people have to make a living and survive in New England and that they maybe cannot absorb this little exercise in industrial and environmental policy and that it may have significant downsides because I tell you that the average citizen in New England is going to have to go back, at least in New Hampshire anyway, to using wood, and that has a significant environmental threat also.

There are other taxes in this package. There is a Social Security tax. Now, we are told again that we are not going to have any taxes on low- and moderate-income people in this country, that this package is just going to sock it to the rich. Well, we already know the Btu tax hits everybody, hits people especially regressively in New England. But the Social Security tax, that is a good one. Social Security recipients with more than $25,000 of income will find that their taxes go up on their Social Security benefit.

A Social Security recipient who receives a $43,000 income will find that his or her taxes go up by about $9,000. The effect of this is regressive. It is totally regressive and inappropriate. These taxes and these fees, as I mentioned, total 79 percent of the entire package.

Then we have what is alleged to be spending cuts in the package. We heard a lot in the State of the Union and a lot since about how this is going to cut spending. Yes, it is going to cut defense spending. Everybody agrees defense spending is going to take a $74 billion additional hit over what President Bush represented he would cut defense. He had already planned to cut it by $78 billion over 5 years, but we will add $74 billion on top of that. So be it.

But on the domestic spending items, there is, as I mentioned, no net reduction in spending. There is $124 billion of new spending. It is called investment. Investment in what? To a large extent it is investment in jobs programs, make-work programs, and the paying off of certain political interest groups who happen to have the leverage to come to this body and seek support. There is very little real what you would call infrastructure investment in this $124 billion of new spending, which we cannot afford to begin with anyway.

On the spending cut side, they represent they are going to make spending cuts of $131 billion over the 5-year period. But look at the numbers. Look behind what is stated here because it is illusory. Of that $130 billion of cuts that they claim are going to be made, $48 billion of that, about 20 percent, a little more than 320 percent actually, is going to be made in the year 1998, under their estimates. We do not even appropriate for the year 1998, I do not think, in this year.

Those budget cuts have all smoke as their substance. Will they be made? No one knows. They are a guess, they are a plug number, is what they amount to.

Then, if you look at the rest of the cuts, they are equally backended. Spending is not backended. No, sir. We are going to be spending on all these new programs right up front. We will be out there spending our tax dollars and money we borrow from our kids, aggressively right off fast right out of the chute. But the spending cuts which are alleged to be in this package are not going to occur until the end. In fact, 22 percent of them are not going to occur until the year 1998, and one doubts that they will occur at all in that year.

So, really, this budget has a huge net increase in spending in the short term and a very doubtful reduction in spending and a light one at that, $7 billion—of which, I have said, we have already spent $5.5 billion—over the long run.

What is the practical effect of all of this? According to CBO—this is not my calculation—there are $3.86 of new taxes for every $1 of spending cuts in this package. Over the period of 5 years the deficit will grow by $1.8 trillion.

That really is not going to get to the issues which we need to get to, which involve reducing the deficit and getting the economy going.

The regressive tax package clearly is going to have an extraordinarily negative effect on regions like New England. The Social Security tax is going to have a negative effect on senior citizens, and these are middle-income individuals. And the defense cuts—I agree we have to make further defense cuts—are going to have a negative impact on the economy, too.

But, most importantly, the fact that you have a budget which dramatically increases spending at a time when you are trying to reduce the deficit, I think, is going to have the longest lasting negative impact on the economy, as we will get the spending increases whereas we will not get the cuts.

The problem we have here has to be restated. The problem we have is not that we as a Federal Government are not spending enough money. The problem is that we have been taxing our people too much and we have allowed spending to get out of control.

The deficits which we have today and the debt which we have today were not generated by the fact that we cut taxes in the eighties under the Reagan plan; it was generated by the fact that we have increased spending.

This chart shows that rather clearly. This chart has two lines on it. The red line is spending and the blue line is taxes. It takes those two numbers as a percentage of gross domestic product. If you look at this chart, you will see that taxes since 1960 have pretty much remained constant, even during the Reagan years when we heard so much about how taxes were cut and this is what created the deficit. The taxes that we were taking out of the American population were essentially the same, around 18 percent of gross domestic product.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask to yield another 5 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire. I would also ask that this side's responsibility for allocating time be transferred to the Senator from New Hampshire when he concludes his remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, as I was mentioning, the basic tax burden on the American people arising from Federal activity has been maintained at about 18 percent since 1960. But the rate of growth of Federal spending has increased from 18 percent to almost 24 percent since 1960. When you are talking about this 3-percent gap, that is what creates the deficit. It is 3.5 percent, 4 percent based on a $6 trillion economy, and obviously represents large numbers.

But what this chart also shows is that it is not that we cut taxes in the eighties that created the deficit, it is that we increased spending. As a practical matter, if we wish to address the deficit today, the structural deficit problem, what we need to begin with is the control of spending. How do you do that? Clearly, President Clinton and the Democratic Party have put forth their plan. As I mentioned, it is a plan with three components: raise taxes dramatically, cut defense dramatically, and have basically no change in domestic spending.

I happen to believe the way to get there—and I think the majority of Republicans believe—is by addressing the spending side of the ledger first. You do not backload the spending cuts. Rather, you accelerate the spending cuts to the front of the budget process. You do not add $124 billion of new spending, as President Clinton's plan calls for, as adjusted and presented here, because you cannot afford all of that new spending. And the spending that you are presently doing at the Federal level you address and you start to reduce. For example, you could freeze domestic spending and you could put in place a control mechanism using CPI and population for mandatory spending.

If you followed those steps, you would be able to take another $300 billion out of the deficit over the next 5 years beyond what was proposed in the President's and the Democratic plan without the new taxes which the President's plan calls for and the Democratic plan calls for. You would end up with a budget that would dramatically impact the deficit over the next 5 years and would not have a Btu tax and would not have a Social Security tax and would allow the marketplace to grow rather than to contract as a result of the excess taxation. This should be our goal.

As I mentioned when I began, there have been sincere efforts on both sides to try to address the issue of the deficit and to get economic recovery going, but there are also very deep philosophical differences about how this should be accomplished. It is very clear, if you look at the President's plan as presented to us, that they intend to accomplish this with taxes. Seventy-nine percent of their deficit reduction is done with taxes and fees. This is the wrong way. It is also very clear, if you look at the President's plan, that you end up with a lot of new spending that we cannot afford.

Let us go about this the way we do in your own home, the way American citizens do in their own homes.

The basic goal should be to reduce the deficit not by adding new taxes and new spending but by controlling spending and not overburdening the American population with additional taxes. That is our goal on this side of the aisle, and that is what we will be offering amendments to accomplish over the next few days.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the Senator for the time.

Mr. President, I want to talk about the economy in somewhat broader terms. It is an issue which—as the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee in the last Congress, and the vice chairman of that committee in this Congress—has been the focus of our attention. It is very important as we consider the budget resolution, to see it in the context of the broader trends and developments that have been talking place in the American economy.

First of all, it is very clear that we have had poor economic performance in recent years. In fact, the last 4 years were among the worst on record in terms of the growth of output and incomes in the country. Over the last 4 years, per capita income has risen by less than 1 percent in this country. In other words, people's per capita income has literally been flat.

Since statistics on this question were first kept in 1947, no other 4-year period has had such a meager improvement in per capita income. In fact, I think it is safe to say that during the last 4 years, we have had a fairly average recession, by post-World War II standards. What was unusual was not the recession but the very slow growth in the economy that preceded and followed the recession. Before the recession, growth in the economy averaged 1½ percent. This is compared to about a 3-percent growth rate that had been typical prior to past recessions.

Since March of 1991, which is the date that has been set as when the recession supposedly came to an end, growth of the economy has averaged only 2.3 percent. This compares to growth averaging 5.7 percent for the seven quarters following previous post-World War II recoveries.

Mr. President, this chart contrasts the growth of real GDP, real gross domestic product, following postwar recessions. These lines show the economy as it goes into recessions. As you can see, this green line is the average of the seven previous recoveries in the postwar period. The red line is this recession recovery. Both lines roughly paralleled one another as they went into recession and reached the trough of the recession.

In the previous recoveries, we grew out of the recession at an average growth rate of 5.7 percent. In this recession recovery, we are coming out at a 2.3-percent growth rate. So there is a very large gap between the growth rate of our GDP coming out of this reces-

sion, compared with previous postwar recessions.

The impact of this is dramatized when you look at the lack of recovery of jobs in this recovery from the recession. In the previous recession recovery cycles, we lost jobs, payroll employment, and then we recovered them coming out of the recession. So that by the first 23 months after earlier recessions ended, on average we gained about 2½ times the jobs that had been lost going into the recession. In every instance, we gained well over what had been lost. In the weakest of those recoveries, 160 percent of the jobs lost were gained back. The best was about 400 percent. The average is about 2½ times.

By contrast, in this recovery, we have barely recovered any jobs. We have not yet gotten back all of the jobs that have been lost in this recession. In fact, we have not even gotten half of them back. We have this enormous disparity in the recovery of jobs taking place during this period of trying to come out of the recession, compared with previous postwar recoveries.

Mr. SASSER. If the Senator will yield on that point, I think he makes an excellent point here. In conversations with the President—which I think the Senator was privy to—the President indicated, as has been stated on the floor of this Chamber, that no less a personage than the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the United Kingdom, indicated that there were some concerns about the magnitude of the deficit reduction package that the administration is proposing in this budget, in that this deficit reduction package was so large, reducing the deficit by $502 billion over 5 years—the largest deficit reduction initiative in the history of the country—that according to the President, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom expressed some concern that this would have a chilling effect on our recovery here in the United States; that this would have a contractionary effect on our economic recovery. And the Senator, I think, makes an excellent point that we are simply not producing the jobs in this recovery that we have in previous recoveries. So I say to my colleagues that it is a fine line we are walking here.

The Senator from Maryland, I think, points it out. We are reducing the deficit by a large amount. There is no question about it. But I think we have gone about as far as we can prudently go in doing that without killing this recovery in the cradle, I say to my friend from Maryland.

(Mr. MATHEWS assumed the Chair.)

Mr. SARBANES. I think the chairman's remarks are right on point.

The President I think has done a very perceptive and careful analysis of our economic situation. The President recognizes that we are not only confronted simply with one deficit, namely the Federal budget deficit as pressing as that problem is, but we also face an investment deficit in this country. We are not making the investment in both the public and private sector that is essential to the future strength of the economy, and the President has an investment strategy, an investment program, to try to deal with that problem. That has provoked a lot of complaints, but our competitors internationally are doing exactly that. They are making investments in their physical plant and equipment, in the education and training of their work force, in the Nation's public infrastructure, in research and development. These are all of the things that President Clinton has targeted for investment purposes in the coming years, and they are designed to strengthen our economy.

So we have to deal with the budget deficit on the one hand and bring it down, and on the other hand we have to address the investment deficit. We must undertake the investment of those resources to strengthen our economy for the future and to prepare it for the international competition in which we find ourselves. On top of that we are confronted in the short run with a significant jobs deficit since we are not getting restoration of jobs in the economy.

What the President is trying to do with the stimulus package is give the economy a boost. The stimulus package is not technically a part of this budget resolution, but I will simply touch on its importance. The Prime Minister of Great Britain addressed this subject in his discussions with the President.

The President is trying to give the economy some impetus to keep growing. It is a little bit like an airplane trying to take off and having to clear the trees at the end of the runway.

What the President is projecting is major deficit reduction which in effect will have a contractionary impact on the economy. The President with a stimulus package is trying to give some additional impetus to the economy to get it moving up so that when the deficit reduction attaches itself to it, that extra weight that the economy has to carry will not precipitate an economic downturn.

I say to my colleagues who are concerned about the deficit, a concern which I share, that if you seek to overdo deficit reduction to the point of contracting the economy and precipitating an economic downturn, the consequences of that will be loss of jobs, loss of production, and an increase in the deficit.

If you try to contract the economy too much too quickly, and precipitate it into an economic downturn, the consequence of the economic downturn, amongst other things, will be an increase in the deficit. Every 1 percent added to the unemployment rate is roughly $50 billion added to the deficit.

So the President is trying to develop a very careful balance here. He wants to get the economy moving forward. He wants to restore economic growth, increase job restoration, and have sufficient strength in the momentum of the economy that it can carry the very significant deficit reduction which the President is proposing and which the committee under the very able leadership of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has incorporated into the budget resolution that is now before us.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, if the Senator will just yield, and I thank the Senator for his compliment and his comments, the Senator I think makes an excellent point here. We are never going to dig ourselves out of this deficit hole if this economy falls off into a recession once again and if we lose revenues.

The Senator indicated that for every 1 percent the unemployment rate goes up it raises the deficit by about $50 billion. That is probably a conservative figure.

I would call my colleague's attention to the budget agreement of 1990, and to give President Bush his due and to give Richard Darman his due—and there have been some things said that were not entirely complimentary about Mr. Darman here on the floor—this was a negotiation that was entered into in good faith, and we adopted a budget enforcement act that would have significantly reduced the deficit over the next 2 or 3 years.

What occurred—and I say this by way of illustrating the point of the distinguished Senator from Maryland—is almost precisely with the timing of that agreement to reduce the deficit the economy fell off into a recession and the result of that was primarily and almost exclusively because of loss revenues. The deficits in fiscal years 1992 and 1993, instead of coming down, as they had been predicted to do, simply exploded. Because of poor economic performance, people were out of work, there were no revenues flowing into the Federal Treasury, and on the other side you had outlays going for various unemployment programs, Medicaid going up, because people were not working and then they were coming in to avail themselves of Medicaid or food stamps, and a whole host of things.

So I say this by way of saying that the distinguished Senator from Maryland, who is perhaps one of the, if not the most, knowledgeable Member of this body on economic affairs, and who has so ably chaired the Joint Economic Committee during the last Congress, the distinguished Senator from Maryland raises a very salient point. We cannot get these deficits under control if we fall off into recession again and if the unemployment rates start going up.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I could not agree with the chairman more. It is imperative to understand that if you try to do too much on the deficit reduction front that you contract the economy and cause it to go into a downward nosedive the consequence of that will be larger deficits, not smaller deficits, and at the same time, of course, the consequence will be lost jobs and lost production.

I just want to quote one paragraph from testimony delivered by Lawrence Chimarine, who is the senior economic counselor of DRI, McGraw Hill, a distinguished private sector economist who said on the question of the stimulus, and I am now quoting him.

My own view thus remains that a modest cost effective stimulus package is still desirable, because, as mentioned earlier, it is unlikely that the economy will strengthen considerably on its own. Furthermore, in view of how sharply the economies of Germany and Japan are weakening, the risk of a global recession is increasing. Some insurance against that risk seems appropriate. In addition, as mentioned earlier the job market remains very weak and it appears that some fiscal stimulus might be helpful in producing new jobs. Finally the weakness in the job market is causing significant hardship and pain for many individuals and families requiring some short term actions to ease those hardships.

The extension of the unemployment insurance bill, which this body voted only a couple weeks ago, is a dramatic example of that.

You have people who are about to lose any income support, who have lost their homes and their cars, and found themselves unable to support their families.

Mr. President, I want to turn now from this jobs deficit, and this economic growth deficit that we are experiencing to talk for a moment or two about the investment deficit.

The President has made as a major part of his economic package—and this is incorporated in the budget resolution—significant investments in certain programs that will contribute to the future strength and vitality and competitiveness of the American economy. I first want to point out how we are lagging in a number of important respects.

I literally defy anyone in this body to counter the assertion that we are not doing what needs to be done with respect to investment in this country, in both the public and the private sector. Of course, the President is trying to address both sectors.

This chart shows your real net investment as a percent of your real net national product. In other words, it is a relative comparison to take into account a growing economy. The economy gets larger, by definition, almost, as the population grows.

I am really struck by those who assert that there are more jobs today than there were in 1980. Of course, there are more jobs today. There are more people today. Consistently, as the population grows, the number of jobs grows. The relevant measure is, what is the unemployment rate; what percentage of your work force is unemployed? And, of course, today it is at 7 percent. It was at 5.3 percent at the beginning of the recent recession.

This chart shows real net investment. Real net investment has fluctuated since World War II, but it has really decreased significantly over the last 4 years.

Someone may say: That this chart shows what has happened in this country. But the United States has always been ahead of everybody else. And even if we do not have such a good performance in recent years—actually a very poor performance compared, historically, with what we have done in this country—we are still way ahead of everybody else.

This statement would be incorrect. This chart shows fixed investment as a share of GDP in the 10 largest economies. The United States has the lowest amount of fixed investment compared to these other countries. Japan, Spain, Australia, Germany, all invest more than the United States.

Obviously, there is an investment deficiency. These other economies are doing things that we are not doing, which enhance their competitive position.

Shortly I am going to show the trade charts which illustrate the bitter fruits of this discrepancy in investment.

But before I do that, let me just make this point a little further.

This chart shows nondefense research and development as a percent of GNP, compared to the United States, Japan, and West Germany. In 1971, there was something of a gap, but not terribly significant.

Then West Germany and Japan increased their funding for research and development while the United States failed to keep pace creating a large gap. An essential part of the Clinton program is to try to do something about this gap. That is part of the investment strategy.

Mr. President, what happens if we do not do these investments?

It has been happening to us. We have not been doing them. One consequence of failing to do them is that we lose our economic competitiveness.

We are not doing the things that contribute to the future strength and vitality of the economy. We are not educating and training our work force. We are not making the same kinds of investment in modern plant and equipment. We are falling short in terms of being at the very cutting edge of new technologies. Our Nation's infrastructure is deteriorating so that our transportation systems and our communications systems are no longer the best there is.

All of that has an impact on our ability to compete in the world environment and, therefore, an impact on our trade deficit and our net international asset position. In addition to the budget deficit and the investment deficit, there is another deficit, the trade deficit, that we have been experiencing.

As we can see in this chart, we have been running large current account deficits.

These large deficits led to a deterioration in our net international asset position. Ever since World War I, the United States has been a creditor nation. In other words, we held more claims on people overseas than they held on us.

As we started running these large trade deficits, that position began to deteriorate. And in the mid-1980's, our position worsened and we went from being a creditor nation to a debtor nation.

I submit to you, very simply put: The President's investment program is designed, in part, to help reverse this trend, to make us more effective competitors. That is why he has talked about research and development; that is why he has talked about infrastructure; that is why he has talked about education and training; that is why he has talked about measures in the private sector to encourage investment in new plant and equipment, all of which are needed to strengthen our economy and make it work for the future.

Mr. President, I have talked about the jobs deficit, the economic growth deficit, the investment deficit and its relationship to the trade deficit.

Now let me talk just briefly about the budget deficit.

The United States came out of World War II with a very heavy debt load, larger in relative terms than we are experiencing now.

We then were able to work it down. The absolute figure of the debt did not come down, but the economy was growing at a pretty good rate so the debt as a burden on the economy was diminishing.

People always tend to look at the debt and say what is the absolute number of it? But to put it in individual terms, would you rather be someone with 5,000 dollars' worth of income and 1,000 dollars' worth of debt or 50,000 dollars' worth of income and 2,000 dollars' worth of debt? I think most people, if they stop and think about that, even though the latter person has more debt, he has $2,000 rather than $1,000, he has 10 times as much income, $50,000 rather than $5,000. So I think most people would say No, I would rather have 50,000 dollars' worth of income and 2,000 dollars worth of debt rather than 5,000 dollars' worth of income and 1,000 dollars of debt.

Our economy was strengthening and growing and we were bringing the debt down as a percent of the gross domestic product. But beginning in the early eighties, this started going back up again.

Of course the President is committed to bringing this line down. That is what this deficit reduction program is about. A lot of objective observers have called this the most credible deficit reduction program that has been presented to the public and to the Congress in the last two decades.

Will the chairman yield me an additional 8 minutes?

Mr. SASSER. I would be pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maryland an additional 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is so recognized.

Mr. SARBANES. The consequence of this increase in debt is that the interest charge on the Federal debt, the net interest charge, has risen markedly over this last decade. That is partly because interest rates went up. They are now coming down which should ease that burden. But it is also because the debt went up by such significant numbers over the last 10 years. The national debt in 1980 was less than $1 trillion. The national debt when President Bush left office was over $4 trillion. So it grew from $1 trillion to $4 trillion, over a 12-year period.

Mr. President, the effort by President Clinton to bring this deficit under control is very important. And the President has put out a strategy, a balanced strategy of spending cuts and revenue increases in order to accomplish his deficit reduction objectives. In other words, we have a program here that is trying to do deficit reduction. It has room in it to address the investment deficit, thereby strengthening our economy for the future so we are better able to compete internationally. It has a short-term stimulus designed to get the economy moving sufficiently that it can continue to grow as we undertake this very serious and substantial deficit reduction which is part of the President's economic program.

I want to address just one other point and that is the complaint from those who say we like a lot of this but we do not think the President ought to try to raise additional revenues. Some say in order to avoid increasing revenue let us not have any investment. Let us drop the investment dimension of this economic package.

I say to them, if we fail to make these investments, if we do not educate and train our work force, if we do not upgrade our physical infrastructure, if we fail to do research and development to put us on the cutting edge of technology, and if we fail to encourage new plant and equipment to make us more efficient producers—how are we going to be able to compete in the new world economic environment? We have to do those things for the sake of our own economic survival in the world competition in which we find ourselves.

Let us look for just a moment at the major place where the President wants to go to get his revenues. Actually, the President's revenue increases will fall most heavily on high-income people. The 2 percent of families in this country who make more than $200,000 will pay about 60 percent of the additional taxes. Actually in excess of that.

Let us just look for a moment at what happened at the top end of the income scale over the last 15 years or so.

People say we do not want you to talk about that because that is class warfare. It is not class warfare. It is really a question of whether people are going to carry a fair share of the burden. What happens, of course, is people reap major rewards and then they want to freeze the situation that way. The pretax income for the top has increased 85 percent, and their after-tax income has increased 105 percent since 1977.

Now, their taxes went up 50 percent. Because people are always asserting that the very wealthy are paying more taxes. Yes, they are paying more taxes because they have more income—much, much, much more income. In fact their income grew at a significantly higher rate than their taxes.

Look what has happened to the change in share of incomes by income groups during this period. Everyone has lost in share of income until you get to the top 10 percent of the population and they have gained. And the top 1 percent gained 60 percent, in terms of income share.

I do not think it is unreasonable in order to try to work the Nation out of this economic situation in which we find ourself to ask those who have benefited so enormously over the last decade—who have had these tremendous increases in income and in after-tax income—has asked, to share in trying to meet the situation in which we find ourselves in order to address these deficits: The investment deficit, the budget deficit, the trade deficit which has made us a debtor rather than a creditor. How can we be a world leader and be a debtor nation?

The President has put a package together to meet those problems. The chairman of the committee has reported out a budget resolution to implement the President's program. I very strongly support it.

Again, in closing, I commend the chairman of the committee for the extraordinary leadership he has provided on this critical issue.

This is an opportunity to move this Nation forward, to put the economy on a basis upon which we can build for the future. I strongly urge the support of this budget resolution.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maryland for his comments and for his very eloquent and persuasive discourse here this afternoon on our economy, how we got where we are, and how we propose to extricate ourselves from this problem.

I yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

A CLOSER LOOK

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, as we begin debate on the budget resolution, it is important that the American people clearly understand what the debate is about. Let me say at the outset, that contrary to their expectations, contrary to their hopes and dreams, that the plan put forward by President Clinton is not about reducing the deficit, it is not about putting our Nation on a path to prosperity.

No, the President's plan is about Government—big Government. It is about increasing the role of the Federal Government in our everyday lives, about increasing America's dependence on Federal largesse.

And it should be well understood that the course on which we are headed will be increasingly difficult to alter. By substantially broadening the base of Federal programs, by significantly increasing the number of American's who will come to rely on Federal handouts, by increasing the number of constituencies and special interest groups with vested interests in Federal programs, it will become more difficult with each passing year to actually eliminate the budget deficit.

When the President introduced his economic plan some weeks ago, announcing an economic call to arms, he clearly tapped into a vein of deep frustration and discontent among the American people. The taxpaying public are almost desperate for some sense of direction from Washington, some demonstrated commitment to fiscal sanity and reducing the deficit.

Unfortunately, however, the plan put forth by the President cannot, will not, meet the American people's raised expectations. While the President's proposals are still quite sketchy—I commend my colleagues attention to a Washington Post article this morning discussing the mysteries of the President's proposals—the information which has come to light during the past 4 weeks indicates quite compellingly that the President's plan is not a serious attempt at cutting Government spending and reducing the deficit, but rather a sweeping shifting of national priorities to bigger Government and more Federal spending on an astonishing array of social programs.

Mr. President, while rhetoric and political posturing have dominated the debate thus far, it is possible, indeed vital, to apply objective criteria to consideration of the President's proposals. Any credible and serious plan to eliminate a budget deficit and begin to reduce the national debt, while laying the framework for future economic

growth and an improved standard of living for our children, must meet six basic criteria:

First, Government spending must be significantly reduced. Not at the margins. Not just reductions in the growth of spending. Unneeded or unaffordable Federal programs must be significantly reduced or eliminated.

Second, the plan must provide for long-term deficit reduction, moving toward a balanced Federal budget and creation of surpluses to reduce the national debt.

Third, the plan must contain budget enforcement mechanisms to ensure that deficit targets are met and promised spending cuts in out years actually materialize. No longer can we promise and fail to deliver.

Fourth, the plan must promote savings and investment and thereby provide the framework for long-term structural, economic, and job growth.

Fifth, the plan must be fair. It must not unduly burden any one segment of the taxpaying public, especially those who are least able to shoulder additional financial hardship.

Sixth, the plan must be honest. It must be bereft of accounting gimmickry and the smoke and mirrors ploys which have for too long been part of Federal fiscal gamesmanship.

I think any Member of this body, and, more importantly, any taxpayer, would agree that these are the essential elements of a credible, long-term deficit reduction and economic growth plan. Every one of these criteria must be met; none can be sacrificed.

A closer look at the President's plan, however, reveals that not a single one of these criteria are met—not one. It simply does not cut Government spending, it does not reduce the budget deficit over the long run, it does not contain any budget enforcement mechanisms, it will inhibit economic and job growth, it unduly burdens certain segments of our society, and it relies on accounting gimmicks and budget legerdemain. The conclusion is inescapable that the American people are once again being sold a bill of damaged goods.

Mr. President, since some have accused myself and my Republican colleagues of nitpicking and partisan sniping, I will demonstrate in some detail exactly how the President's plan so completely fails to meet its stated goals.

DOES THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN CUT GOVERNMENT SPENDING?

The answer, quite simply, is "No," it does not. Despite some claims to the contrary, under President Clinton's plan, government spending will actually increase substantially during the next 6 years over current levels.

The simple fact of the matter is that, even using the numbers provided by President Clinton, Government outlays will rise from $1.475 trillion in 1993 to $1.767 trillion in 1998, for a total of $758 billion in new Government spending over the next 6 years, above 1993 spending levels. Stated another way, the Clinton plan will increase Government spending by $758 billion more than if we froze Government spending at 1993 levels.

All the talk about cuts in spending is just that—talk. The only thing that is being cut is defense. At best, there will be modest reductions in the expected growth of Federal spending. While some programs may be scaled back modestly, these cuts are more than offset by new spending increases.

However, before jumping into the intricacies of the Federal budgetary process, I think it is appropriate at the outset to emphasize that the Federal deficit is the result of too much Government spending, not a lack of tax revenues. President Clinton is proposing the largest tax increase in history, $360 billion, when he should be proposing the largest cut in Government spending in history.

Since 1974, Federal revenues, that is tax receipts, have remained relatively static in relation to our national output—approximately 18 to 19 percent of gross domestic product. During that same period, however, Federal outlays have steadily increased to approximately 24 percent of GDP. Cutting Government spending is the answer to the budget deficit, not raising taxes.

Mr. President, as you will recall, we were originally promised that there would be $2 in spending cuts for every $1 of tax increase. That promise was quickly jettisoned. When the President's plan was unveiled, the administration was insistent that there were $1 in spending cuts for every $1 of tax increase.

Now we find out, thanks to CBO figures released recently, that there are $4.85 in tax increases for every $1 of spending cuts. When is President Clinton going to play straight with the American people?

A closer look at the so-called spending cuts in the Clinton plan also demonstrates that they are largely illusory. For example, the administration's proposal is to save $8 billion by streamlining Government—without specifying how Government will be streamlined, what programs will be affected, and how the savings will be achieved. Similarly, the administration hopes to save $35 billion over 4 years by managing Government for cost effectiveness.

These laudable goals have been attempted, and claimed as budgetary savings, by virtually every Presidential administration. But unless the President has some new magic elixir that he hasn't told us about to squeeze fraud, abuse, waste, and mismanagement out of the Federal Government, it is extremely doubtful that savings of this magnitude will ever be achieved. And if they are not, I can assure you that they won't be substituted with new cuts—the deficit will simply increase further.

Even if these savings could be realized, they still don't represent real cuts in Government programs, as promised by President Clinton during his campaign. In fact, the President promised that 150 programs would be eliminated. However, the President's plan dealing with programs that don't work or are no longer needed lists only a handful of programs which are reduced in scope, and only one, the State Justice Institute, which is actually eliminated, for a total savings of $6.5 billion over 4 years.

Mr. President, these are hardly the serious cuts in Government spending that the American people are expecting.

Moreover, most of the cuts come on the back end of the Clinton plan, while the tax increases and spending increases come on the front end. For example, the Clinton plan contains $36 billion in tax increases for 1994 with only $2 billion in spending cuts—a 13-to-1 ratio. Past experience tells us that back-ended spending cuts never materialize.

DOES THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN REDUCE THE DEFICIT IN THE LONG RUN?

The answer is "No." Again, accepting for a minute the validity of the President's own budgetary numbers, the deficit will fall to over $200 billion in 1998, and then immediately begin rising. By 2003, the annual budget deficit would be over $400 billion annually. The economic plan offered by the President will actually increase the level of the national debt by nearly $1 trillion during the next 4 years.

As economist Paul Craig Roberts has noted, that's $183 billion more than the cumulative deficit of President Reagan's first term and $238 billion more than his second term.

It is imperative that we craft an economic plan which will not just reduce the size of the deficit in the short run, but which will also eliminate the deficit in the longer run and enable us to begin reducing the national debt. The interest on the national debt now exceeds $200 billion annually. By reducing the national debt, we can actually free up scarce Federal resources that could be spent on those most in need.

DOES THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN CONTAIN ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS TO ENSURE THE DEFICIT TARGETS ARE MET AND SPENDING IS ACTUALLY CUT?

The answer is "No," the President's plan does not contain any mechanisms to ensure that what we promise, we will deliver. Time and again we have committed to the American people that we will increase their taxes and cut spending in order to reduce the deficit. And time and again we have failed on that commitment.

When push comes to shove, we pass the tax increases, we pass new spending

increases, the tax cuts never materialize and the deficit goes up. And Congress slinks away into the night mumbling that there was an emergency or that circumstances had changed. It's the same old song and dance.

One of the individuals who continues to speak out on these issues, of course, is Mr. Ross Perot, who was able to get 19 percent of the vote nationwide, 20-some percent of the vote in my State. Mr. Ross Perot said the other day, and he continues to repeat it, that if you do not have a balanced budget amendment and you do not give the line-item veto to the President of the United States, it is like giving a friend who has a drinking problem a liquor store; Congress will find more ways to spend the money.

Mr. President, the last time I was on this floor, I had some charts that showed the results of the budget summit agreements. Each time there was a commitment, as there is today on this budget we are considering, there was a commitment to cut taxes, for $1 or $2 or $3 or $4 for every increase in spending and to cut the deficit. The result of each one of these over the last 12 years has been the opposite. The spending has gone up, the taxes have gone up, and the deficit has gone up.

Our problem in America, Mr. President, is not the fact that we have not spent enough money; the fact is we have spent too much money, and we are continuing to do that under the President's plan, which has been well described by my colleague from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, and others.

Only in this body perhaps, Mr. President, is there a majority of Americans who oppose a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. There may not be. I hope there is not. I think we are going to find out, at least I hope we find out as soon as possible as to whether this body, like about 75 percent of the American people, supports a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

Why has this support, and I see my friend from Illinois who has been a leader in that effort on the floor, why is it this support for a balanced budget amendment has gone up so dramatically over recent years? The answer is simple, Mr. President: The American people do not have any faith or confidence, nor should they, that the Congress of the United States can effectively control spending.

We spent a lot of time and heard from our friends from Maryland and Tennessee about the previous Presidents did this, the previous Presidents did that, these Presidents did that. Let us not ignore the basic fundamental fact of the Constitution of the United States, and that is, there is only one body who can spend money and that is the Congress of the United States. The American people want, demand, and deserve a balanced budget amendment.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, I predict to you now that the results of this budget agreement will be no different without a balanced budget amendment and a line-item veto than any other budget agreement in the last 10 or 12 years.

I would certainly prefer that Congress make the tough decisions when necessary to bring the deficit under control. However, I am convinced that the necessary institutional discipline is lacking and without a balanced budget amendment, Congress will continue to spend away our children's standard of living. Similarly, I believe we must give the President the line-item veto. Congress simply lacks the institutional willingness to stop spending billions of taxpayer dollars on wasteful, pork-barrel projects.

DOES THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN PROMOTE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION?

The answer is "No." The evidence is overwhelming that tax increases, especially of the magnitude being proposed, will seriously impair prospects for continued economic growth. In addition, while President Clinton has said that jobs are his No. 1 priority, his plan is likely to result in slower job growth than might otherwise be expected.

Americans are already struggling under the heaviest tax burden in their history. Combined Federal, State, and local taxes now account for more than 35 percent of our total national economic output, compared to just over 30 percent in 1970. Yet this 20-year trend of rising taxes has also seen the greatest surge in Federal debt and a general decline in the growth rate of the economy.

While the Bush recovery is now well underway, with growth in GDP up to 4.8 percent, significantly increased productivity rates, and the unemployment rate steadily, albeit slowly, declining, the Clinton administration's tax and spend policies could imperil the prospects on long-term economic recovery.

President Clinton would like to call himself the "jobs President." He says he plans to create 8 million new jobs during the next 4 years—put aside for the moment that fact that 19 million new jobs were created during the Reagan and Bush Presidencies. He says that he wants to create 500,000 new jobs this year—put aside the fact that 345,000 new jobs were created during the month of February alone.

What is of real concern is that economists believe that the Clinton plan will result in a net loss of jobs. We already know that the President's proposed defense cutbacks will result in as many as 400,000 military job losses, and hundreds of thousands of additional defense related civilian job losses.

In addition, businesses faced with higher tax rates will have less capital to be able to invest in new plant and equipment and worker hires. The significantly higher personal income tax rates will directly reduce the cash flow of the many small-business owners who file as individuals, and who were the biggest job creators during the past decade.

A recent economic analysis of the President's proposals by the National Association of Manufacturers predicts that it will cause a net loss of 1.2 million jobs, more than half accounted for by the Btu and energy-related taxes. These have a sharp contractionary effect on the economy because of their simultaneous impact on the price level and the production function.

Moreover, most of the jobs which would be created by the Clinton proposals are either short-term, or make-work Government jobs. For example, the President proposes to pump more than $1 billion into summer jobs programs to bolster his new job creation numbers, although as the Washington Post reported recently, the plan "has drawn critical reviews from many labor economists, who say it will provide little more than fire insurance for the Nation's cities, rather than long-term job creation."

Similarly, much of the President's anticipated job growth comes from Federal make-work projects, such as highway construction. Again, these are short-term jobs, which will quickly be eliminated after the Federal funding of these projects runs dry.

IS THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN FAIR?

The answer is "No." While the President has called for sacrifice—code for more taxes—on the part of all Americans, he is, in fact, proposing that certain segments of our society make a disproportionately larger sacrifice.

During his campaign, President Clinton assured the American people that he would only tax those who made more than $200,000 per year. When President Bush pointed out that his proposals could raise the tax burden on families making as little as $36,000 per year, candidate Clinton called President Bush shameless.

Many senior citizens were thus understandably astounded to wake up the morning after the President announced his plan to find out that those elderly in our society that make as little as $25,000 and elderly couples making as little as $32,000 would not be classified as rich because they will have an increase in their taxes. I do not think that is fair. I think it is very important for us to recognize that the seniors in this country are getting a triple whammy. With the Btu tax, seniors and elderly citizens in my State are very much dependent in the summertime on air-conditioning and other essential utility bills. The fact is that they are going to have a tax increase, and, Mr. President, I do not believe that we are treating them fairly.

I want to again state that when I first came to the Congress of the United States, we made a deal with the sen-

ior citizens of this country, and we did it for the purpose of saving the Social Security system from financial disaster. We made a deal, and we increased their taxes, in return for which the senior citizens of this country were assured that they would receive the benefits from the Social Security system, a contract that they entered into with the Federal Government. Now we are going back, and we are going to tell them we are going to tax them more and the taxes that were taken from them are not going into the Social Security trust fund. They are going into general revenues so Congress can find another way to spend them.

Mr. President, when the senior citizens of this country find out what is being done to them, I think they are going to understandably be disturbed, to say the least.

There are many other unfair elements to the President's plan. The inland waterways tax has the potential to put barge carriers out of business. The mining and grazing fees will disproportionately affect certain industries and Western States. The Btu tax will hit especially hard on energy-intensive industries, such as the airline industry, which can ill-afford additional financial setbacks.

I think one of the most unfair, and disturbing, elements of the President's proposal is the burden that would be placed on married couples, as contrasted with couples who may be living together but are not married. A recent Wall Street Journal headline is illuminating, "Living in Sin to Cut Tax Bill Would Look Even Better to Some Under Clinton Plan."

As the accompanying article notes, "some low income taxpayers who marry can find that their new combined tax liability, including Social Security taxes, leaps to more than 45 percent of their taxable income. And couples with two high earners can pay tens of thousands of dollars more than they would owe if they were single." Exactly what kind of message is the President attempting to convey?

IS THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN FREE OF SMOKE AND MIRRORS?

The answer, once again, is "No." Although President Clinton promised to adhere to "truth in budgeting," his proposals are chock full of accounting gimmicks, sham program cuts, and other budget legerdemain.

In fact, the smoke and mirrors were apparent on the first day the President's plan was unveiled, when the administration was forced to acknowledge the following day that the planned deficit reduction needed to be reduced by $178 billion to account for new spending. More recently, the Congressional Budget Office determined that the plan would fall another $60 billion short of its targets.

What can one expect, however, from a budget in which higher taxes on Social Security income, user fees, and price controls on doctors and hospitals are all counted as spending cuts? What can one expect when the planned for revenues from the various tax increases assume that there will be no change in taxpayer behavior? It's simply not realistic.

Most telling are the conclusions and comments contained in an article appearing in this morning's Washington Post entitled "At Agencies, Clinton Budget Cuts Still Mysterious to Many." As noted in the article, "A month after President Clinton announced his economic plan, many Federal bureaucrats are still scratching their heads over proposed spending cuts that some described as ill-defined, sometimes arbitrary, occasionally misleading and, in many cases, incomprehensible."

The article continues, "Some officials complained that they do not understand the administration's calculations. Other said some of the cuts were not cuts at all, but simply new ways of calculating spending. Still others expressed confusion about the administration's vague instructions to cut something without advancing any clues about how to do it."

Mr. President. It is absurd, and unconscionable, that we are being asked to consider a budget resolution which remains a mystery to Members and those who must implement its provisions.

CONCLUSION

In the final analysis, the budget debate boils down to what is best for the country. The Clinton plan, with $360 billion in tax increases and $180 billion of increased Federal spending on a wide array of social programs, will not only not reduce the deficit in the long run, it will discourage savings and investment, and likely impair economic performance and structural job growth. This will be especially true, if as I fear, Congress enacts the spending increases and tax cuts now, while putting off the bulk of the spending cuts until 1996 and 1997.

This is not the path to prosperity. This is simply a continuation of the fiscal insanity which has for too long plagued Washington. In this case, the proposed cure will only worsen the disease.

Mr. President, President Clinton tells us that the only way to reduce the deficit is to raise taxes. He has apparently succeeded in convincing a significant percentage of the American populace of this. The fact is that Republicans have offered detailed, specific alternatives which provide more overall deficit reduction than the Clinton plan, without raising taxes. These plans focus on cutting Government spending, not increasing it. While it may ultimately be necessary to consider tax increases in order to completely eliminate the budget deficit, tax increases should be a last resort—not a first resort.

Rather than debating how best we can grow Government, and involve Government ever more deeply in Americans' lives, we must first determine what the role of Government should be, what can it afford to do. Ultimately, the only way we can control the budget deficit is to reduce the level of Government spending. It's that simple. Otherwise, we will be in a never-ending spiral of new tax increases to pay for ever expanding Government programs.

This is not a path to prosperity. It is a course that will ensure that our children's future standard of living will be worse than ours.

An additional 2 minutes, Mr. President.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I grant an additional 2 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Finally, Mr. President—I appreciate the indulgence of my colleague from Iowa—I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Washington Post be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 18, 1993]

AT AGENCIES, CLINTON BUDGET CUTS STILL MYSTERIOUS TO MANY

(By Guy Gugliotta)

A month after President Clinton announced his economic plan, many federal bureaucrats are still scratching their heads over proposed spending cuts that some described as ill-defined, sometimes arbitrary, occasionally misleading and, in many cases, incomprehensible.

During the past two weeks, Washington Post reporters discussed Clinton's plan to cut about $250 billion in spending over four years with officials from 11 government agencies. Most had a general idea of what was going to happen to them, and some showed detailed understanding of the package.

But with less than three weeks remaining before the formal budget is to be presented, officials from several agencies expressed mystification about large chunks of money they are supposed to cut from their budgets.

Some officials also complained that they do not understand the administration's calculations. Others said some of the cuts were not cuts at all but simply new ways of calculating spending. Still others expressed confusion about the administration's vague instructions to cut something without advancing any clue about how to do it.

Take, for example, "streamlining," a catchall that very few people understand, but which is supposed to save $7.9 billion between fiscal 1994–1997.

MAGIC BUDGET-CUTTING BULLETS

Streamlining is the greatest magic bullet in the spending cuts. One Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) official said "we will take seriously" $1.4 billion in streamlining, and suggested freezing some unspecified programs and reducing rents paid to some owners of subsidized housing.

But many other departments appear to have no idea what streamlining means or what it entails.

The Department of Health and Human Services is supposed to shed $2.7 billion over five years, but the number was the only thing HHS officials knew about; no other details were available.

The other magic bullet—also expected to save $7.9 billion by the end of 1995—is the federal government-wide elimination of 100,000 jobs. Everybody is supposed to contribute a "fair share."

The Department of Veterans Affairs has found that its fair share is 9,000 jobs, a tough hit for VA hospitals. "That's obviously something we're negotiating," a VA budget officer said. It would be especially problematic because VA Secretary Jesse Brown is proposing that the system handle a large increase in the number of patients.

At the Office of Management and Budget, the number of employees is supposed to decline by 1 percent, or about five of the roughly 500 positions. "If that includes people who die at their desks," said one overworked OMB official, "I'm sure we'll make it."

At HHS, where the fair share is supposed to be 4,000 to 5,000 positions, nobody there knew whether that meant cutting the roster of current employees or cutting the authorized positions. If it is the latter, outside analysts contend, the savings are theoretical, not only in HHS but in every other agency.

This problem—trying to find the starting point or baseline—was causing bureaucrats throughout the government to throw up their hands.

Another headache arises when budget analysts try to figure out whose estimates of savings are accurate. Democrats regularly ripped into Bush administration budget director Richard G. Darman for sunny predictions that never came true. Clinton is supposed to be more conservative.

The new puritanism can be confusing. In one proposed Medicaid program change, the Clinton plan relied on Bush administration figures that forecast savings of $1.9 billion in 1995. The Congressional Budget Office, however, pegged the figure at $850 million. What's $1 billion between friends?

Not to worry, said HHS Deputy Assistant Secretary Ken Thorpe. Next month's detailed budget proposal for fiscal 1994 will rely on new estimates putting savings close to CBO, or even lower.

Once into baselines and estimates, it's only a short step to deficit-cutting's favorite ploys: spend now, but count it next year; cut a program in one place, but pick it up elsewhere.

The Energy Department, for instance, intends to spend less each year on the Superconducting Super Collider than planned by the Bush administration, but doing it Clinton's way adds $2 billion to the projected total cost, with completion in 2003 instead of 1999.

And at first blush, the Clinton plan also suggests a $4.1 billion savings over five years at the Environmental Protection Agency through the expiration of a federal revolving fund used by local governments to help finance waste water treatment projects.

But a closer look shows that the savings will be more than offset by Congress's expected approval of a new revolving fund, plus a new safe drinking water revolving fund—adding about $4.8 billion over five years. "The bottom line is you've added it right back," said a Senate Budget Committee aide. "So you can't really call it savings."

A TOUCH OF WISHFUL THINKING

The Clinton plan also relies heavily on wishful thinking, always number one on the budgetary hit parade. This gambit can take several forms, and one of the most popular is simply to declare that something must be cut, period, spare me the details.

The Small Business Administration is supposed to eliminate "certain programs" to save $315 million over four years. But, with one exception, SBA has no idea what certain programs Clinton has in mind: "We are as much in the dark as to what these numbers mean as you are," said SBA acting Administrator Dayton Watson.

So is the Justice Department, which is supposed to trim the Bureau of Prisons' new construction budget by $331 million between 1994 and 1998—this for an agency that expects the federal prison population to jump from 82,000 today to more than 104,000 by 1997.

Justice Department spokesman Frank Shults said, "My understanding is that they have said, 'You have this money. How you spend it is going to be up to you.'"

Another subject of wishful thinking is to make extraordinary claims on behalf of a particular deficit cut: Thus, the Treasury Department hopes to pick up $3.8 billion in revenue from a "compliance initiative" to ensure that the prices of oil imports are reported accurately—billions through better bookkeeping.

And the new "farmer friendly" Agriculture Department plans to save $739 million over four years by consolidating the department's three biggest subsidy and assistance programs into one new Farm Service Organization. This is 3½ times as much savings as any previous structural reform estimate, but the administration insists it can be done.

Details, however, to come later.

Perhaps the administration's biggest leap of faith comes in its apparent certainty that Congress will cooperate, either because the Democrats control everything for the first time in 12 years, or because the Clinton administration is pure of heart.

Most of the suggested Medicare and Medicaid changes at HHS (designed to save $62.6 billion over five years by slowing program growth) were proposed by Republican administration but rejected by Congress. So were nearly $1.9 billion in cuts to the Agriculture Department's farm programs.

A PINCH OF DEMOCRATIC UNITY

Clinton is hoping Congress will like his cuts because he's a Democrat, but Congress doesn't seem particularly anxious to cooperate in all cases. The House Agriculture Committee chairman and ranking minority member have already registered bipartisan objections to a number of big ticket items.

Grumbling is also rife at the U.S. Postal Service, where the Clinton plan hopes to save roughly $1.2 billion by cutting the government subsidy for nonprofit mail and cutting payments for retirees' health insurance.

Both strategies were proposed by the Bush administration and rejected by Congress. Arthur B. Sackler, managing director of The Mailers Council, a group composed of large mailers, predicted that passage of the measures—which the Mailers call a "stamp tax"—would make a postal rate increase inevitable.

Meanwhile, at HUD, the administration intends to cut $565 million by eliminating "Special Purpose Grants," used to finance special projects written into HUD's annual appropriation by Congress.

Clinton is thinking bigger at the Transportation Department, which is supposed to cut $1.3 billion in "low-priority transportation programs and projects," including all "demonstration projects" tacked onto highway bills by Congress's appropriations committees.

Anyone who has been around Washington for 10 minutes or so knows that items labeled "special purpose" or "demonstration" give off a pungent odor of pork. Presidents have been trying for two centuries to keep Senators and Representatives away from the public trough. Clinton may succeed where others have failed. But maybe not.

Mr. McCAIN. Finally, Mr. President, I certainly was interested in the analysis of my distinguished colleague from Maryland of the budget and its situation. He also mentioned that the President's analysis was thorough and in depth. I would appreciate it if the Senator from Maryland would read this morning's Washington Post article, with the headline, "At Agencies, Clinton Budget Cuts Still Mysterious to Many." I hope he will be able to clear up some of the mysteries that apparently exist throughout the agencies as to what we are talking about, especially where it says "streamlining" is "supposed to save $7.9 billion between fiscal 1994–1997."

This article goes on to say:

The other magic bullet—also expected to save $7.9 billion by the end of 1995—is the Federal Government-wide elimination of 100,000 jobs. Everybody is supposed to contribute a "fair share."

The Department of Veterans Affairs has found that its fair share is 9,000 jobs. * * * It would be especially problematic because VA Secretary Jesse Brown is proposing that the system handle a large increase in the number of patients.

At HHS, where the fair share is supposed to be 4,000 to 5,000 positions, nobody there knew whether that meant cutting the roster of current employees or cutting the authorized positions. * * *

The Small Business Administration is supposed to eliminate "certain programs" to save $315 million. * * * But, with one exception, SBA has no idea what certain programs Clinton has in mind.

I am quoting from the Washington Post, Mr. President.

"We are as much in the dark as to what these numbers mean as you are," says SBA acting Administrator Dayton Watson. * * *

Another subject of wishful thinking is to make extraordinary claims on behalf of a particular deficit cut: Thus, the Treasury Department hopes to pick up $3.8 billion in revenue from a "compliance initiative" to ensure that the prices of oil imports are reported accurately—billions through better bookkeeping.

I am very, very interested in hearing how we are going to save $3.8 billion through better bookkeeping. In fact, I think the National Association of Accountants would be very interested in that information.

Clinton is thinking bigger at the Transportation Department, which is supposed to cut $1.3 billion in "low-priority transportation programs and projects," including all "demonstration projects" tacked onto highway bills by Congress' appropriations committees.

I am quoting from the Washington Post. These are not my own thoughts here.

Anyone who has been around Washington for 10 minutes or so knows that items la-

beled "special purpose" or "demonstration" give off a pungent odor of pork. Presidents have been trying for two centuries to keep Senators and Representatives away from the public trough. Clinton may succeed where others have failed. But maybe not.

Mr. President, I am looking forward to explanations to this and other questions that have been raised, and I am also very interested in hearing the specifics of the proposed defense cuts, which are the most draconian and far-reaching than any time since the end of World War II. As to exactly what those specifics are, I am very interested.

I have one specific concern in the defense area, Mr. President, and I will have an amendment later on concerning it, and that is President Clinton's proposal to freeze all military pay. I noticed that many of my colleagues were very upset about base closings and the dislocation of military personnel and civilian workers at the bases. However, I have not heard any complaints about freezing the military pay.

Mr. President, many men and women who serve in the military are eligible for welfare and are eligible for food stamps—how can the administration justify freezing their pay for 5 years? Mr. President, if that is indeed the priority of the administration and the majority of the Members of this body, then we are doing a great disservice to those men and women who serve in the military, and we are going to put the national security of this Nation in danger, because we are not going to be able to attract and keep the kind of quality men and women who have made this All-Volunteer Force the finest and most efficient fighting machine that this world has ever seen. The basis and backbone and fiber of that All-Volunteer Force is adequately compensated men and women. So what are we going to do? We are going to freeze their pay for 5 years. Outrageous, Mr. President. Outrageous.

I think that if I had to pick tree planting, which is in the President's stimulus package, the ballyhooed stimulus package my friend from Maryland was just talking about, that is, $260 million for tree planting versus freezing the pay of the members of the military, I think most Americans would choose to abandon tree planting and give the pay raise to the men and women who serve in the military.

I think many of these proposals need to be ventilated and, frankly, a lot closer attention paid.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Budget Committee, he has asked me to yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Illinois. Before I do, he has also asked that I respond to the Senator from Arizona, and I would ask that I have the time to do that.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I would like to say to the Senator before he leaves that his statement about military pay is completely wrong. Nothing like that has ever been said by this President. And when you look at the documentation which I am putting into the RECORD, I would say to my friend, you will see that in essence there is, in fact, a 1-year pay freeze asked for by this President for all Federal employees.

Now, it is true that this President is treating the military and civilian employees alike. And I say to my friend that both of these categories have received 9 percent pay increases in the last 3 years. So as we look to bring down this deficit, this President is saying for the first year, for the first year let us have a sacrifice in behalf of Federal employees. And I would add that this President's call for sacrifice has been responded to by most people. To stand here and assert that President Clinton has called for a pay freeze for our military men and women for 5 years when this is not the case is quite astounding to me.

So I ask unanimous consent I enter into the RECORD the CBO assumptions that are based on the President's policies and as a matter of fact the Budget Committee's work.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAY ASSUMPTIONS

[Total 1994–98=$26.3 billion]

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Bush, January 1992	4.7	4.7	4.5	3.5	3.5
Bush, January 1993	2.2	3.0	2.7	2.6	2.3
Clinton	0	2.0	1.7	1.6	2.3

Mrs. BOXER. At this time I would like to yield 15 minutes to my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. I thank my colleague from California and am pleased to have a chance to speak about this budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SIMON. I thank the Chair.

I would like to commend the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator SASSER, who really has worked hard, together with his staff, in producing this budget.

Second, I want to applaud the President of the United States for being honest with us and presenting a budget that is really a solid budget. For example, he has said we will use CBO numbers and assumptions, so that we are all working off one set of numbers. Historically, CBO estimates in terms of growth of our economy have been more conservative than OMB's—and much more accurate. This is a conservative budget in terms of what it projects.

I have heard many say that there is too much spending in this budget. But the great spending item increase is interest on skyrocketing national debt. In fiscal year 1980, the gross interest expenditure—that is the figure we ought to use, this net interest figure that we use occasionally is a fraud—the gross interest expenditure was $74 billion. The estimate for fiscal year 1994 is $307 billion. That is one of the fastest growing items in the budget, not the other things that are talked about.

There is only one way to ever get interest on the debt under control; that is, to get hold of the deficit. I agree with my colleague from Arizona, who just spoke, that we need a balanced budget amendment. I think it is clear we simply do not have the discipline. If we could be assured that year after year we are going to have a Bill Clinton for President of the United States and that Congress would have the courage to follow through, we would not need a balanced budget amendment in the Constitution. Unfortunately, we have illustrated over and over again that we need it.

In terms of what the financial markets think about the Clinton budget proposal, it is very clear, from the drop in interest rates in the bond market and what the stock market has done, that the financial markets applaud what the President has done. My guess is this is purely hypothetical because no one can know—but my guess is that the increased taxes requested will not be as much money as the drop in interest rates that we have already achieved in terms of what it is going to cost the American public. If we can follow through—that is going to be the tough part in the years to come—by passing the taxes and cutting spending in certain areas, if we follow through in future years and get that deficit down, you will see interest rates come down.

I hold a seat that was once held by Senator Paul Douglas. And the Presiding Officer, if he will forgive me, is old enough, along with me, to remember Paul Douglas well. Paul Douglas was not only a great U.S. Senator, he was a great economist. Some of his economic theories are cited today by economists. He was president of the American Economic Association. In 1949, he made a speech saying we have to watch that Federal deficit; it is climbing up. At that point—that was fiscal year 1950—the federal deficit was $3.1 billion. Do you know what the prime rate was then? Believe it or not, it was 2 percent. We can get back to those kind of numbers if we face the problem. That is what the Clinton budget does.

I wish—and I hear talk that we should not have tax increases. Believe me, as a politician I wish we did not have to have tax increases. But let us just take a look at the budget that we have. If you eliminate interest—we

cannot eliminate that—if you were to eliminate any cuts in defense, if you were to eliminate mandatory spending—that is primarily Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid—and eliminate foreign aid—that is 1 percent of the budget—if you were to eliminate all of these things, everything else that is left in the budget totals $243 billion. So, if you were to eliminate the agricultural programs, eliminate education, eliminate the FBI, the air controllers, eliminate Congress, and everything else, we would still be about $65 billion shy of balancing the budget. The reality is we have to have additional revenues.

(Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN assumed the chair.)

Mr. SIMON. I wish that were not the case. But if we are going to serve the future of this National well, we are going to have to reduce the Federal budget deficit so that these pages have a decent future and so my 3-year-old granddaughter that the new Presiding Officer saw the other day has a future. We have to do that, and we can get started with the Clinton budget.

CBO's economic outlook, released in January, indicates that if we do not pass this budget, if we continue on the present course, by the year 2003, 9 years down the road, fiscal year 2003, the deficit will be $650 billion. The Clinton budget will get us started on a deficit-reduction path. If we can stop the skyrocketing increases in health care spending, which we hope the President's health care proposal will address, that will provide a great deal of additional deficit reduction down the road.

This suggests that even with this program, the deficit is so great that more deficit-reduction will be needed in the future. The President has launched us in the direction that we need to go, but we have to do more.

In terms of savings, the budget that has been presented by the Budget Committee and by Senator SASSER has substantially increased savings over the President's proposal.

There are other savings I would like to make. I would vote—and if there is an amendment offered, I will vote—to get rid of the space station. I do not think we need it. I think the evidence is overwhelming.

My friend from Arizona called the defense cuts draconian. I do not happen to believe that at all. The reality is our defense needs have changed dramatically. The Clinton budget makes some much-needed cuts in defense. I believe we can cut even more. Finally, there are so many positive things in the budget. In the field of education, for example, we are finally getting Head Start. We need that. We have been talking about it. Everybody says we ought to have Head Start for everybody. We finally have a budget that does it.

Pell grants. Pell grants are $2,300, and unless we vote this $2 billion that makes up for shortfalls in previous years, Pell grants are going to go down. I am old enough to remember the GI bill after World War II. If you take that and put the inflation index on it, a grant to veterans, regardless of income, today would be $8,100 per student. Today, we have the Pell grant where, if you are impoverished enough, you get $2,300. We are not doing what we should. But the Clinton budget says let us at least keep up with this. And then he moves into the direct lending program, which will provide appreciably more assistance for these pages and for future students.

The budget, Madam President, is a solid step in the right direction. I am pleased to support it. I think President Clinton is to be commended. I hope we do the responsible thing by passing it and then following through and doing the tough things that need to be done to get this deficit down gradually for the future.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator GRASSLEY.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield myself 2 minutes, and then I understand the Senator from Texas wants the floor.

Madam President, I have had an opportunity to listen to three or four speakers from the other side of the aisle just today. I hear a lot of talk about history and the past, but I do not hear much about the essential element and the bottom line of this budget; that is, that the debt over a 5-year period of time is going to increase from $4.4 trillion to $6.2 trillion—over the course of the Clinton Presidency. I want to hear somebody on the other side of the aisle defend that increase in that debt.

I know you can talk about what it might have been—if. But I am saying and what I did say in my remarks is that what this administration is proposing to be a debt of $6.2 trillion is just a start because that is what is proposed. In reality, we always end up at a higher figure.

The last 16 years, I think, have been horrible. That includes one Democrat and two Republican Presidents. We have to do something different than we have in the past. We cannot just be talking about the history. I would like to hear how anybody can defend adding to the debt $2 trillion. I agree with my colleagues that we added too much debt over the last 12 years, but we are about to increase that debt by 39 percent.

Would anyone care to defend that? The debt will increase 39 percent over the terms of this budget. That translates into—the current debt per person is $17,600. At the end of the Clinton administration, that debt is going to go up to $24,400.

The current debt per family of four is $70,400. When the Clinton debt is all done, family debt for a family of four is going to go up to $97,600. That is an increase of 39 percent in debt, an increase in the national debt at the rate of 8 percent a year when we are only having inflation in this country during that period of time estimated at 3.8 percent a year.

I hope we can hear some defense on the other side. I think we ought to remind them that we had a Democratic Congress during that entire 16 years.

Mr. SASSER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, my distinguished friend from Iowa expressed a wish that he would hear a defense of the Clinton proposal here, and I am going to try to fulfill his wish.

The number he cites of an increase in the deficit over the next 4 years of $1.2 trillion, were it not for the Clinton proposal, that number would be $1.7 trillion. So the budget that is proposed by President Clinton, over the next 5 years, will reduce the deficit by $502 billion from what it would otherwise be.

The question is asked: Well, why do you not do more? Interestingly enough, those who are asking that question have no proposal themselves. They have no solution. They are the cohorts of the past three administrations, which have driven this country to the edge of fiscal bankruptcy. As my friend from Iowa, for whom I have the greatest respect, indicated earlier today, when Ronald Reagan took office, the national debt stood at about $900 billion. It took this country 200 years, Madam President, to build up a national debt of slightly over $900 billion.

Most of that came in the 20th century, as we fought wars because, make no mistake about it, wars are very expensive propositions. But even though we fought four major wars in the 20th century, World War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, the national debt still stood at $900 billion; and as a percent of gross domestic product, as my friend from Maryland pointed out here, which is really the most accurate measure of that indebtedness, it was continuing to come down as a percent of GDP.

Let us see what happens when President Reagan is elected to office and when he is succeeded by President Bush. You see this line of debt held by the public as a percent of gross domestic product coming down. It stops coming down and it reverses itself and goes back up.

That is the mess that President Clinton has inherited. He did not create this problem. He has only been President and in this town for about—frankly, less than 2 months.

So he has come up with a proposal, a balanced proposal to reduce this debt by $502 billion over the next 5 years. As

the distinguished Senator from Maryland so ably and persuasively pointed out here earlier, if he tries to reduce this debt any faster, if he puts the brakes on any faster, if there is any more fiscal contraction in this economy that President Clinton is proposing, or any more fiscal contractions with regard to the Federal Government than President Clinton is proposing, we run the very grave risk of killing this recovery in the cradle.

As has been stated earlier on this floor, this is a matter of concern to our allies, such as our great friends in the United Kingdom. The Prime Minister of Great Britain expressed concerns directly to the President that we might be putting the brakes on too fast here. Europe is in recession; Japan is in economic trouble, and our trading partners and trading adversaries are looking to the United States to provide the economic engine to ignite a worldwide economic recovery. They are afraid we are cutting too much.

What do our friends on the other side have to say about that? You are not doing enough. You are letting this deficit go up higher. You are letting the national debt go up even more. But when you ask them what is their solution, they have none.

The Senator from Arizona stood on the floor and criticized the President of the United States for freezing military pay for 5 years. Well, of course, that is not accurate. The distinguished Senator from California quickly corrected him and said that military pay, just like the pay of all Federal employees, will be frozen for 1 year. They will make their contribution to reducing the national debt just like all other Government employees will do, including the President and including Senators.

After that, military pay will rise just as the pay of other Government employees will, at the Consumer Price Index minus 1 percent. So they will continue to make their contribution and their sacrifice to reducing this national debt just like everybody else. But complaints, complaints, Madam President, that we are freezing military pay for 5 years. Where are the solutions? What are their solutions? I think the American people have a right to ask that question. What would they do about it?

There has been a lot of criticism here of the President's proposal. We have seen many multicolored charts. I see some more over here. You would think this was a Cecil B. DeMille production, the amount of money being spent on charts around here. But let us just look at a couple basic facts. The net spending cuts in the President's budget is $220 billion. There is not a dime of spending in this package that is not fully and completely offset by spending cuts. No question about it.

With regard to taxes, much is being made of taxes here. There are $295 billion in net revenues and every dime, every dime goes to deficit reduction. Every dollar of revenue goes toward a better standard of living for our children by reducing this debt.

Why are we in this mess? We all know why we are in it, because of something called the 1981 Kemp-Roth tax cut adopted by President Reagan that made the rich in this country richer by giving them an enormous tax cut and left the rest of us to pay the bill. And that is what we are out here trying to do today, trying to find a way to pay the bill for 12 years of abuse.

What do we hear from these people on the other side? What do we hear from our colleagues over there?

Well you cut military pay. Well, you are freezing military pay. Well, you are not cutting enough here. Well, you are raising some revenues here.

Yes, we are, because we have cried in this body for 12 years for leadership. The American people want leadership and they have got a leader. A young man has come into this city and said "enough."

We are going to tell the American people it is time to do something about what is happening here. We are going to change it. And he told them last summer and last fall he was going to change it, and they believed him. So he has brought to this body a budget of change. A budget that does something about this deficit, a budget that brings to us the largest deficit reduction package in the history of this country.

Yes, I say to my good friend from Iowa, for whom I have the greatest respect and affection, and he knows that, yes, the national debt does go up. I regret that. I regret that. But it is coming down. It will come down as a percentage of gross domestic product, and if we adopt this Clinton proposal, which uses the most honest numbers of any Presidential budget I have seen in the past 12 years, it starts out with CBO assumptions, if we adopt this Clinton budget we are going to see the deficit as a percent of gross domestic product cut in half, cut from 5 percent of gross domestic product in 1993, to 2½ percent of GDP in 1998.

So that is where we are, I say to my friends. I would hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, yes, we welcome your constructive criticism; yes, if you have some specific suggestions to make that would improve this package, we want to hear them. But simply to come out and criticize, and carp and continue to point the finger of alarm here, that just will not get the job done.

That will put us right back in the soup of gridlock and that, Madam President, is what we have to do. We need action and not gridlock.

I yield to my friend from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, let me engage in a little very brief colloquy with the chairman.

Madam President, I say to Chairman SASSER, I want to yield right soon here. I think we have an opportunity after the Senator's discussion to speak, and I am going to yield 20 minutes to my friend from Texas. Could I ask a question about process?

Mr. SASSER. I will be pleased to answer my friend's question.

Mr. DOMENICI. I mean this very frankly. The Senator has challenged us as to what we proposed. Let me tell him, we have five amendments that we know of and many more that will tell the American people what we propose. We have to offer them in order for anybody to know. We are not getting a chance, and I am not critical yet, but pretty soon it seems to me if the Senator has an amendment, that is an opportunity to discuss anything one wants, but at least the time runs on the amendment. I wonder if we might stipulate here a time and maybe agree on it that the Senator could take up his first amendment by—is 3 o'clock satisfactory?

Mr. SASSER. I think we have two Senators over here that still wish to speak. And how many on your side still wish to speak?

Mr. DOMENICI. We would be ready to go to amendments right after Senator GRAMM talks. There are many Senators who want to speak. I told them not to come to the floor. We do not want to use all the time speaking and no time on amendments.

Mr. SASSER. Right.

Mr. GRAMM. If the Senator will yield, if I could offer the amendment now I would simply speak on the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. We all know that.

Mr. GRAMM. I am eager for the Senator to know what we propose.

Mr. SASSER. Here is what I would suggest. I earlier suggested to my friend from New Mexico that perhaps we could set a time of 2:30 for moving to amendments. I think now we can undo that, because we have too many Senators on the floor wishing to speak—but I would suggest that—may I inquire of the Senator from North Dakota how long he might wish to speak?

Mr. CONRAD. Fifteen minutes would be satisfactory.

Mr. SASSER. The Senator from California has been on the floor waiting to speak for some time. May I inquire how long she might wish to speak?

Mrs. BOXER. About 15 minutes.

Mr. SASSER. So I would suggest to my friend from New Mexico that we would be in a position then just given a little latitude we would be in a position then, just given a little latitude, to go to amendments say by no later than 3:30.

Mr. DOMENICI. That is better than not knowing. Let me ask a question.

Mr. SASSER. I say that in order to give the Senator's time on his side.

Mr. DOMENICI. Is the Senator ready to go with the so-called Harkin amendment so we would know?

Mr. SASSER. At the appropriate time we would be ready to go, and I assume it would be the Harkin amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Then I would suggest, unless there is no agreement on secondary amendments or second-degree amendments which we propose, that you get your amendments and we get out amendments. Like Senator HARKIN, he will get his amendment with no second-degree amendment. If that could be adopted, then our first amendment would be a Nickles-Shelby amendment on the Btu tax.

Madam President, I assume I have the floor, and I am going to yield it right quick to the Senator.

Mr. SASSER. Would the distinguished ranking member let me counsel for just a moment?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. SASSER. I am advised—and we were not agreeing—I am advised I am not in a position to agree on any second-degree amendment until I can take this up with the majority leader. It was my understanding earlier we were going to discuss this with the leadership on both sides.

Mr. DOMENICI. Sure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if out of Senator GRAMM's 20 minutes he could give me 3 minutes and he will have 17, if that is agreeable.

Mr. GRAMM. I say to the Senator no time limit is set. Since we have twice as much time as we would have if everybody on the floor spoke, may I suggest the Senator yield to me 23 minutes and I will yield the Senator back 3.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will yield 23 minutes to Senator GRAMM at this point, and I am glad to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I am very fearful some listening this afternoon, listening to my friend, the chairman, Chairman SASSER, would really buy the argument that we should not be talking about the shortcomings of the President's plan, because we have not offered our plan or our amendments. We are being precluded from offering amendments, because we are talking. But let me assure the American people and Senators that before we have a chance to win a plan that we have, whatever it is, the truth has to be known about the Clinton plan, and frankly the truth is not known about the Clinton plan by the American people.

Let me just suggest that there is probably not 10 percent of the American people who would believe that the way to prosperity is to tax the American people more. I will bet if we ask anybody do you think we are going to create jobs and have a vibrant America by putting on more taxes, I think some of them would think you are so whacky; they would probably kick you in the shins.

This plan does this. Americans are going to pay $295 billion dollars in new taxes and hold on to your wallets, because part of them are retroactive to January 1 this year. And you know what you are getting for it, I say to Americans? You are getting the net tremendous total of $7 billion in cuts, in domestic programs of all types.

Who would believe in supporting this plan? And they are saying we want a plan. But who would believe that the American people are supporting a plan for $295 billion, including more Government and more taxes, for the total of $7 billion in cuts in domestic programs over 5 years? If that is a plan for growth, a plan to get us out of whatever we are in, then I have never seen a plan.

That is an invitation to continued recession and slow growth, because business cannot create jobs with this kind of new burden.

I thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

Mr. GRAMM. I thank my dear colleague from New Mexico.

Madam President, our dear colleague from Tennessee said, "Where are the Republican proposals?"

Well, in committee, we offered 34 different amendments. We debated each one of them. They dealt with a myriad of issues—from health care to Social Security taxes—where we were trying to sheer off some of the add-on spending in the President's program and not tax Social Security recipients, where we were trying to reform health care.

But in 34 amendments on a myriad of subjects, how many Democrats in committee do you think cast a single vote for any one of these ideas? Not one. That is how interested our colleagues on the left are in Republican ideas. That is how interested the President is in our input.

Madam President, the Bible says, "You shall know the truth and the truth will make you free." The problem is, it does not tell you how you find out about the truth.

And I must say to my colleagues and to the American people who are watching—and my guess is, with the NCAA on television, most people are watching basketball—but let me say this: In my 14 years in Congress, I have engaged in many debates and a lot of debates about budgets. But I have never, ever seen a debate where there was such a gulf between the rhetoric of the debate and the reality of the proposal.

I remember vividly, when the President gave the State of the Union Address, I stood and applauded 14 times. I led the applause on several occasions. It was a great speech. I could have given 90 percent of the speech.

The problem is, there was as much of a gulf between the rhetoric of that speech and the reality of the budget that we are actually debating here as there is between the President's promise to cut middle-class taxes and his proposal now to raise those taxes.

What the President has basically done—and I have taken this from Newsweek magazine—is basically given us a plan that is mostly taxes. The second largest element in it is spending; and a tiny little element of it has something the American people are adamant about and that is cuts in spending.

Let me start by defining the program in, I think, the fairest possible way to do it. What happens if everything the President says works? What happens if we adopt the program exactly as it is written? What happens if every cut is made? What happens if the economy responds exactly as the President says, and not by anybody else's estimate but by estimates of the Congressional Budget Office, which the President has set up as judge and jury?

Madam President, let me first start by going over what the Clinton plan actually does. It is a 5-year plan. And I want to use what I call the Dicky Flatt baseline, which is what happens relative to what would happen if we did nothing.

In other words, starting right here at ground level zero, what happens relative to today?

Well, what happens, I think, is pretty revealing about where we are going. Relative to today, over the next 5 years, if everything in the Clinton budget is adopted and the whole world works out perfectly as he says it will, revenues, taxes—money taken out of the pockets of the working men and women of America—go up $1.332 trillion.

Second, nondefense spending, spending on everything but defense, goes up by $840 billion; and defense goes down by $154 billion.

In other words, if we do everything the President asks us to do, if everything works out exactly as he promises, what do we get? More taxes, $1.3 trillion; more Government, $840 billion; less defense, $154 billion.

Now, what do we get in terms of the priorities of the Nation?

I want to talk about something that I call the Clinton vision. I am not talking about the vision when we hear those beautiful words in those great speeches. I am talking about the vision of the numbers. I am talking about the vision embodied in the budget. Because a budget is a plan about a future, in this case the future is that of America.

It defines the kind of relationship we are going to have between our Government and our people.

If all of Bill Clinton's budget is adopted, let me compare it with two things I think people will understand. First of all, I want to talk about nondefense spending, social spending, as compared to when Lyndon Johnson was President. At the peak of the Great Society, when Lyndon Johnson was President, social spending, as a share of the overall economy, was 10 percent. At the peak of the Great Society, Government spending on nondefense social programs took 10 cents out of every dollar earned by every American.

If President Clinton's plan is adopted and implemented and everything goes exactly as he says it will, exactly as he wants it to, social spending, nondefense spending, will take 19.3 cents out of every dollar of income earned by every American. In other words, the Clinton vision in social spending, nondefense spending, is twice what it was at the peak of the Johnson Great Society Program.

Let me talk about defense. In Jimmy Carter's last defense budget, defense, as a percentage of the economy, was 6.1 percent. Defense was taking 6 cents out of every dollar of income generated by the American economy.

If the Clinton budget is adopted, defense will be taking 3.2 percent out of every dollar of income of the American public. In short, the Clinton vision is twice as much social spending as a percentage of the national economy as we had at the peak of the Great Society and half as much defense spending as we had when Jimmy Carter was President.

Madam President, what do we get for all that? What do we have when we get through?

Well, in the way we normally keep the numbers, what the Clinton budget does is it raises taxes by $295 billion relative to all the taxes that are already growing. It has user fees of $18 billion. So, in terms of this overall Clinton plan, how much of it is taxes?

Well, when we were listening in the campaign, then-Governor Clinton said, "$3 in spending cuts for every dollar of taxes. That is what I will deliver."

Then, when Congressman Panetta was before the Senate for confirmation and Senator Bentsen was before the Senate, they said $2 in spending cuts for every dollar of taxes. That is what they promised.

Then when President Clinton delivered the State of the Union Address, he said $1 in spending cuts for every dollar of taxes.

Now, when you look at what would be spent and what would be taxes if we adopt President Clinton's plan, what did the final number turn out to be? It turns out that 79 percent of the deficit reduction in the Clinton plan comes from taxes and fees, 19 percent of it comes from defense cuts, and 2 percent of it comes from reducing nondefense spending.

In other words, we went in the campaign from $3 in spending cuts for every dollar of taxes, in the confirmation, $2, in the State of the Union, $1.

We now have $3.86 of taxes and fees for every dollar of spending cuts. And those spending cuts are basically all in defense.

That is the CBO assessment of the Clinton plan.

What do we get for all that? Other than double LBJ's social spending and half of President Carter's defense spending, what does it produce in deficit reduction? And this is where the most startling result of all occurs.

When President Reagan was in office in his first term, this yellow part on my chart shows us what his plan promised in deficit reduction. And then the yellow plus the red shows us the actual. As you can see in dealing with politicians, Democrats or Republicans, after all is said and done, more is said than done. Reagan's second term, promised and actual. President Bush's term, promised and actual.

The Clinton plan, if adopted, if enforced, and if everything works exactly as President Clinton proposes, promises a larger deficit in 4 years than any other President in American history has ever produced, including the President that President Clinton defeated, running against him for having the biggest deficits in American history, and this is just the promise. What is the reality going to be?

Let me talk very briefly about the reality. If the American people agree on anything it is cut spending first, before you raise taxes. Or cut spending before you increase any new spending.

On the floor of the Senate in the next 2 weeks, we are going to raise the deficit by $21.5 billion. We are going to pass an emergency spending bill called a stimulus package, and our colleagues and President Clinton have created a new double speak. They call this spending investment. We also are going to spend $5.5 billion on unemployment compensation extension. So we are going to increase brand new spending, $21.5 billion in the next 2 weeks.

Madam President, how long do you think it will be—if we adopt the Clinton plan, and if everything happens the President says will happen—how long do you think it will be before we cut spending by that much? It will not be until the end of 1997 that, in spending cuts on a cumulative basis, we make up for the new spending we are going to approve in the next 2 weeks. It will be the end of 1997 before cumulatively we have cut defense enough to make up for the new social spending that we are going to undertake in the next 2 weeks. And the story gets worse.

Over 80 percent of all the savings in this budget are promises of spending control we are going to employ in the sweet by-and-by. Almost all of the spending control measures in the Clinton plan are in 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, where we say we are going to control the growth of spending.

Never has Congress lived up to those commitments except when we had binding constraints that set specific figures as spending caps.

Madam President, our dear colleague from Tennessee forgot, when he said we had no plan to offer, that in committee I proposed having it the law of the land that these spending levels in his budget be established as spending ceilings so we could not spend more money than that, and we would have to live up to the savings commitment. Our dear colleague from Tennessee opposed that, and every Democrat on the Budget Committee voted against it, which suggests to me they do not intend to live up to those promised savings. They intend to get the $295 billion in net taxes; they intend to cut defense dramatically. But my guess is, come 1996 and 1997, when all these special-interest groups are looking over our left shoulder, sending letters back home telling people whether we care about the old, the poor, the sick, the tired, the bicycle rider—the list goes on and on—my guess is those promises are going to be forgotten and we are going to spend that money.

Let me tell you why I am disturbed about this budget. First of all, I am disturbed because it is not going to work. We are going to end up with a great big deficit. In fact, I would like to predict right here that in the midst of the 1996 campaign, the deficit will be bigger than it is today. I want to make that prediction right here on the floor of the Senate.

Second, this program is not going to work. There is no way you can raise taxes by $295 billion and cut nondefense by $7 billion—you are promising to do that 4 years from now, and you have the figure that small because you are promising to lay off all these Government employees—do all these things that have been promised before and never done before. But basically, the problem is, even if we do everything the President says, we are going to have a recession. You cannot raise marginal tax rates to 41 percent; you cannot tax every small business and family farm at that rate; you cannot seize all of this income from all these working people and have jobs created.

The Clinton economic plan assumes that nobody responds to these taxes. It assumes that the 1.4 million small businesses that will have their marginal tax rate go up from 31 to 39 percent are not going to respond to it at all. They are going to invest exactly the same amount; they are going to hire exactly the same number of people. Who really believes that? The American people are going to respond to these higher taxes. That is clear.

The second thing that worries me about this is nobody ever voted for this plan. What candidate for President, running in 1992, said: If you elect me, I will raise taxes by $295 billion and I will cut nondefense spending by $7 billion? Nobody said that.

Who, running for President in 1992, said: If you elect me, I will tax up to 85 percent of the Social Security benefits of individuals who have W-2 form income of $18,000 a year? Who said that? Nobody.

Who campaigned for President saying: I will tax every working family, and I will fund the largest spending increase in American history? Who said that? Nobody. Who voted for that? Nobody.

When Bill Clinton was asked in the first debate about taxes, he was asked the following question. Ann Compton said:

> Governor Clinton, can you lock in a level tonight where middle-income families can be guaranteed a tax cut; or, at the very least, at what income level they can be guaranteed no tax increase?

Governor Clinton:

> My plan triggers in at gross income, family income of $200,000 a year and more. And we want to give modest middle-class tax relief to restore some fairness, especially to middle-class people with families with incomes of under $60,000 a year.

Madam President, if the President that night, in that first debate, had said: Well, I am going to tax every family in America on an energy tax that by my figures will be $320 a year, and most outside groups are going to estimate $500 a year, and I am going to tax every Social Security recipient with an income of $18,000 or more if they own their own home, because I am going to count what they would have to pay in rent as income, he would not have been elected President.

Let me give you the second one. When the Bush campaign ran an ad saying that the Clinton plan would require that people be taxed at least at income levels of $36,600, let me tell you what Candidate Clinton said. He said:

> It is blatantly false. It is a disgrace to the American people that the President of the United States would make a claim that is so baseless, that is so without foundation, so shameless in its attempt to get votes under false pretenses.

And yet here, today, we are debating taxes on Social Security recipients who earn $18,000 a year. We are debating energy taxes on every family in America. We are debating raising taxes on family businesses and family farms by over 30 percent in terms of the marginal tax rate.

Who voted for that program? Nobody voted for it. I am sure some of our colleagues, after Ronald Reagan was elected and we adopted his programs, felt bad about it. They did not think it was a good idea. They were against it. They were against spending cuts; they were against building up defense; they were against tax cuts. But at least Ronald Reagan ran for office on that platform. Everybody alive in 1980 who was not hiding under a rock somewhere heard Ronald Reagan say: Elect me and I will cut domestic spending, raise defense, and cut taxes.

So our colleagues on the left may not have liked it, but they were not surprised by it. What is so frustrating to me——

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRAMM. I will not yield because I have a limited amount of time.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator yield on my time?

Mr. GRAMM. What is so frustrating to me is that no one was elected on the platform of this program, nor could they have been elected on this platform. No one who told the American people that this is what they had in mind could have been elected. So there is no mandate to do this. No one ever voted for it. No one ever ran for office on the basis of it. So we are implementing a plan that nobody voted for and nobody thought was a good idea.

What are the alternatives? First of all, we are going to offer an amendment, and the first Republican amendment will say drop this Btu tax and drop a corresponding amount of new spending add-ons in the Clinton budget; do not spend on new programs and do not impose this tax.

The second amendment will be: Drop the Social Security tax and drop the corresponding increases in domestic spending. Then we will have an amendment that shows that by not adding any of the new programs that President Clinton wants to fund unless there is a dollar for dollar offset in other spending programs, that you can delete new taxes—the Social Security taxes, the energy taxes, and the income taxes—because every one of those new taxes is going to fund more spending. That is what the debate is about, and I thank the Chair for her indulgence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I thank my distinguished budget chairman. I certainly commend the chairman of the Budget Committee for his patience, for his intelligence, for his grasp of the issues, for his very clear explanation of where this Clinton economic plan is going to take this country, and, Madam President, it is going to take this country in the correct direction, in a good direction, in the right direction.

It is certainly my pleasure to be a member of the Senate Budget Committee, having served in the House of Representatives in that capacity, and to be able to speak for the first time in my career in strong support of the President's budget. This one was made even better by the Senate Budget Committee. The deficit reduction is even greater. Madam President, there is more deficit reduction in this package than ever before under any other President, $502 billion over 5 years, the biggest cuts in history. So let us set the record straight on that.

Let us set the record straight on a couple of other things. When the Republicans took over the Presidency in 1980, the national debt was $900 billion, and when they handed over the reins of Government to President Bill Clinton, that national debt was more than $4 trillion. Yet we see in this very Chamber today, on the most beautiful charts, figures that would lead you to believe that this budget will do nothing but make matters worse.

Madam President, it was Alan Greenspan who said it; that this budget is credible when it comes to deficit reduction, and Alan Greenspan, the head of the Federal Reserve, was not appointed by a Democrat but was appointed by Ronald Reagan and reappointed by George Bush. We see what is happening with interest rates in this Nation. We have seen them go down a point already, putting more money into the pockets of the American people because of this plan, no matter how much it is derided by those on the other side of the aisle.

When the Republicans took over the Presidency, I will never forget this as long as I live, Madam President, when Ronald Reagan looked at Jimmy Carter and said, "You have a $50 billion deficit. You ought to be ashamed of yourself," and the Republicans said, "We will balance the budget in 1 year," and then it was 2 years and then it was 3 years, and when they handed over the reins of Government to Bill Clinton, this budget deficit was about $300 billion, from $50 billion to $300 billion; from $900 billion to $4 trillion on the national debt. And my colleagues and my friends on the other side of the aisle stand up and deride the first plan that would really address this deficit without the smoke and mirrors that we have seen before and the rosy scenarios and everything else.

Madam President, last night I was fortunate enough to be sitting where you are when this budget debate opened up. The best that we Democrats had to offer, our chairman from Tennessee, presented this budget plan, and the best that the Republicans had to offer, the very articulate and able and intelligent Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] had a very good debate on this budget.

I listened very carefully. I watched my chairman lay out the economic strategy that our President has put forward to this Nation. Then I watched and heard the leaders from the Republican side tear down this budget, tear

down its deficit numbers, tear down its tax numbers, tear down its investment strategy, tear down its deficit reduction, and we have seen Senator GRAMM, of Texas, today continue to do that.

It is easy to tear things down. It is easy to do that. I want to know where is the Republican budget? We have not seen it. In the committee, all we saw were a series of amendments that were so transparent, it was obvious that they were making us look at some very tough votes; that, if these amendments had been adopted, it would have torn apart the entire strategy, because what our President has done for the first time is to put together a very carefully crafted plan that gives you just enough deficit reduction, just enough investment. It is very carefully done.

Yes, there are taxes. There are taxes on the wealthiest among us, the top 1 percent who saw their incomes go up 115 percent since 1977. I do not cry bitter tears for our fellow Americans who have been so successful, and I will tell you that they are willing to pay their fair share. Yet when you listen to my colleagues on the other side, they want more spending on defense, even after the cold war; they want no taxes on the rich, even though we have seen these incomes go up to astronomical levels. They want to only cut, Madam President, the things that our people need, education, health care, cleaning up this environment, transportation, science and technology funding, all the things on the domestic side of the budget. That would destroy America, because we will not be able to compete if our budget does not reflect the needs of a country like America in a global marketplace.

So I say to my fellow Republicans: Where is your budget? Show it to us. I want to see it. Do not give me amendments that do something here and there, because that is not constructive. That is going to lead us back to gridlock.

President Clinton's budget will give us a healthier and more secure and competitive America, one that has a leaner, meaner defense. That is right. We always have to be the strongest military in the world, and under Bill Clinton's leadership we will be. And we will have an America in which children receive their immunizations. Do you know that a baby born in Cuba has a better chance of surviving than a baby born in Washington, DC? That is an outrage. It is a shame upon us, and President Clinton understands that. Those kids are our hope. It is not just the right thing to do, it is the smart thing to do because when they get those immunizations, when they get the Head Start, when they get a quality education, when they are able to go to college through that wonderful new program our President has presented us with, then they will be productive. We as a nation will be productive. We will win this new war we are in, which is called the economic war. We won the cold war. Now we must win the economic war.

We will have an America in which child care is widely available so parents can go to work without fear, a family-friendly Government, if you will; an America in which there are more police officers on the beat, community policing so our neighbors can feel safe; an America that retrains our workers because, as President Clinton has told us many times, the average American will change jobs seven and eight times.

It is a new economic world out there and we have to get our people ready for it, Madam President. We will have research and development on the civilian side of the budget so we can keep up with our competitors, and budget deficits that are no longer raging out of control.

It really is amazing to me again, Madam President, how our Republican friends, who are no longer in the Senate Chamber at this moment, can talk about the need for greater deficit reduction and greater deficit reduction when they had their chance. They brought this country almost to its knees. President Clinton is trying to rescue this country from economic ruin, and his plan deserves our support. He understands how it all fits together. He has given us a plan that looks at the short-range stimulus so we make sure we do not have a triple dip recession, Madam President, but that we in fact are jump-started out of this recession.

I come from a State that is falling behind—California. We have been thrown into a morass. We have lost many jobs. We are in an economic transition. This plan is crucial to the State of California, and I want to make a point to my colleagues: California's recovery is crucial to the sustained recovery of this American economy. We need these investments. And, yes, I am tired of hearing my Republican colleagues deride the word "investment."

In a former life, I was a stockbroker, Madam President. Let me tell you what a good investment is. It is one which yields dividends. You put your money into something and it pays dividends. You give a child a $1.14 vaccination and it pays dividends when he or she does not get the measles, so you avoid having to spend almost $1 million to rescue that child's life later. You put $1 into Head Start and, Madam President, you save $3 because that child is off and running and becomes productive.

We know we need an economic conversion plan. This President has it in his budget. It is crucial for us. I am one who happens to believe we are going to be more prosperous than ever when we make this conversion, because when you produce military weapons, thank goodness, we do not use them. But when you invest in things we need, in housing, in schools, in health care, you create many more jobs, Madam President. Your work force is trained and prepared and healthy, and your children are prepared and trained.

So we need this stimulus. We need this budget. I am pleased that the President has released the conversion funds on which we voted last year. It all fits into the puzzle.

I say again no package is perfect. If the Senator from Illinois, who is presiding now, was the President and wrote the package, it might look a little different. If the Budget Committee chairman started this project from start, the budget might look a little different. If this Senator or my colleague from California, the senior Senator from the State, wrote the budget, it might look a little different.

But there is one President, Madam President. He ran on a very clear platform. He said to the American people, I am worried about jobs. I want to create jobs. I want a short-term economic recovery and a long-term deficit-reduction strategy. He said yes, I am going to tax the wealthiest among us. He laid it out there and the American people stand by him. I think it is important that we stand by him and give this a chance.

Madam President, in closing let me say this. The National Conference of Republican Mayors endorsed this plan in its entirety. Let me repeat. The National Conference of Republican Mayors endorsed this plan in its entirety.

Let us get beyond the partisan bickering. Let us not see a party-line vote on this budget. Let us look at the American people, Republicans and Democrats alike, men and women alike, and let us say to this Nation we in the Senate are ready to join with our colleagues in the House of Representatives to move this very important package along and give the President a chance to have his plan acted on, and then we will all be held accountable.

Madam President, I look forward to voting on this budget.

I yield back the remainder of my time to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, may I inquire of the Senator from North Dakota how much time he wishes?

Mr. CONRAD. I had indicated that I could use 15 minutes. I could use more than that if the chairman has it.

Mr. SASSER. I was hoping the Senator might be able to use less than that because we have Senator MURRAY on the floor, and also the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. Why not yield 10 minutes to my friend from North Dakota and see how we get along. He is known for his conciseness and ability to say much in a few words.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield so I might make an inquiry, without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. CONRAD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I am very concerned again here that there are a lot of amendments on both sides, and I would very much like to get an agreement that an amendment is going to be called up at a time certain on that side and then maybe we would say it would be followed by one on our side at a time certain. Can the Senator discuss that with me a bit?

Mr. SASSER. I can. Let me say to my friend from New Mexico, a moment ago or some time ago I said we were shooting for 3:30 to begin calling up amendments. I am still shooting for that time. If the Senator will give me a little flexibility, 5 or 10 minutes on each side, it would be helpful. But I am still shooting for 3:30, and I think we will make it.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, could we have an understanding maybe that would permit us to talk off the floor and see if we could get a unanimous consent later. We would like to offer the Nickles Btu tax amendment following disposition of the Harkin amendment. We very much would like to do that as soon as possible, but obviously we understand that the Senator from Tennessee has the right to go first. Can we be looking at that with our leadership in terms of perhaps agreeing?

Mr. SASSER. We can, I say to my friend from New Mexico. We can discuss that with the leadership, and I am hopeful we can work out that accommodation.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FEINSTEIN). The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair. I thank the chairman as well.

Madam President, I rise as a member of the Senate Budget Committee in support of the budget resolution.

For the first time in the 7 years that I have been a Member of the Senate we have before us a plan to reduce the Federal budget deficit based on honest numbers—not phony projections of the future, not a wish list, not some idea that is cooked up in some back room and brought before us and we are told that it will reduce the deficit by some magical formula. No, Madam President, we have been presented with a plan to reduce the Federal budget deficit $500 billion over the next 5 years based on honest projections, honest numbers, honest assumptions. That is a remarkable breakthrough.

Madam President, just moments ago we were treated to generous portions of Texas hokum. We heard from the Senator from Texas really a remarkable rewrite of American fiscal history. Madam President, we heard that Ronald Reagan ran on a program that no one could be confused about. We were told that Ronald Reagan ran on a program to cut taxes, to increase defense, that no living American could possibly not have known what Ronald Reagan intended to do.

What the Senator from Texas left out was that Ronald Reagan never told the American people he intended to increase the Federal deficit fourfold. Ronald Reagan ran on a program of cutting taxes, of increasing defense, but what the Senator from Texas left out was that Ronald Reagan also told the American people he would eliminate the Federal deficit. That was the full story.

The Senator from Texas left out that last element, left it out for very good reason. Because when the Senator from Texas talks about a program that might fail and predicts that this program will fail he comes to us as an expert on programs that failed. The Senator from Texas was the author of a program that failed. The Senator from Texas was the author of a program that failed, and failed completely, and for him to stand on the floor as an expert on deficit reduction is so farcical that it must be answered.

Madam President, the Senator from Texas authored a plan that said we are going to eliminate the deficit in 5 years. We have a plan. We have a magic formula. And if only you pass it, we will reduce the Federal budget deficit in 5 years.

That plan was passed in 1985, Madam President. Do you know what happened? The deficit was not reduced. The deficit was certainly not eliminated. In fact, the Federal budget deficit exploded. When the Senator from Texas comes before us and says that somehow he has a better plan, Madam President, I am a little bit suspicious.

Here is the record. Here is the record of what happened when that crowd was in control. This is the Federal debt growth that has happened from 1980 through 1997. Madam President, we will recall that in 1980 Ronald Reagan took over; the national debt was $900 billion. Today, the national debt is $4 trillion. And we are headed for a national debt of $5.5 trillion in the next 5 years, unless we change course.

Madam President, just to review the record, the Senator from Texas was the author of a plan back right here, 1985, that said you pass that plan, the deficit is going to be eliminated in 5 years. Instead, the deficits and the debt skyrocketed.

So for the Senator from Texas to come to this floor and say to the American people that he is some expert on plans that might work, I suggest he is rewriting history. Some of us recall very well the plan of the Senator from Texas was a disastrous failure in terms of deficit reduction.

Madam President, we have to act. Bill Clinton was elected President on a program of change. Bill Clinton was elected President with a promise that he would move this country in a different direction.

Madam President, he has presented us with a budget blueprint to do precisely that. This is the debt growth. We talked about that. What are the other things that tell us we have to change?

This chart looks at the growth of the debt in a little different way. It is not in dollar terms. It is a percentage of our gross domestic product. This chart looks at the last 50 years. What one sees is that after World War II, we had a level of debt in comparison to our gross domestic product of 113 percent. In every year, for 40 years, the debt in relationship to the size of our economy was reduced, from Democratic administrations, to Republican administrations, back to Democratic administrations. This country reduced its indebtedness in comparison to the size of our economy.

Then we had the election of Ronald Reagan. The debt as a percentage of our gross domestic product started growing. Now it has exploded.

That is the reason, Madam President, we must act. Not only have we taken on enormous debt in terms of our national debt but this country has also become an international debtor.

This chart shows the past history, from 1977 through 1991. Our position in the world.

Madam President, we have gone from being the world's largest creditor nation; more countries owed us more money than any other country on the face of the Earth. That line was crossed in 1986, and today we are the largest debtor nation in the world. America owes more money than any other country in the world; an incredible turnabout as a result of a failed economic policy, and a failed economic plan.

For the architects of that plan to stand on this floor and tell the American people that somehow this President who tells us we have to change direction is moving in a way that makes no sense, that ought to be measured against the test of history. What did they do when they were in charge? What did they do when they were in a position to set a course for the economic future of this country?

The result of these failed policies was that economic growth collapsed in this country. We show growth in the fifties, growth in the sixties, growth in the seventies, growth in the eighties. Look what happened in the 1990's. Economic growth collapsed in this country. As a result, average annual job growth also collapsed in this country. In the fifties we had modest job growth, healthy job growth in the sixties, seventies, and eighties; the 1990's, job growth absolutely evaporated in this economy.

This perhaps is the most important chart of all, because we have heard much from the other side that we are

spending too much, and we have heard over and over in debate that the United States is spending about 24 percent of its gross domestic product, and historically we have spent about 20 percent of our gross domestic product. The other side says there is the proof that this is tax and spend. There is the proof that this country is spending too much. There is the proof that what we have is a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

Madam President, I think it is important to analyze precisely where the spending increases have occurred. As this chart shows, if we look at the last 30 years of economic history, it is absolutely true that spending has gone up from 19.2 percent of our gross domestic product, to 23.5 percent of our gross domestic product in 1992. Spending has clearly gone up as a percentage of our gross domestic product.

Here is what has happened on the other side of the ledger. Revenue. Revenue 30 years ago was 18 percent of our gross domestic product. Today it is 18.6 percent. We can see the substantial gap that exists here between revenue and spending.

But let us look where the increases in spending have occurred because I think this is very instructive. Thirty years ago Medicaid did not even show up on the chart. Medicaid was a brand new program. There was virtually no spending. Thirty years later, that is 1.3 percent of gross domestic product. Medicare, 30 years ago was zero. There was not a Medicare Program 30 years ago. Today that is over 2 percent of gross domestic product.

Thirty years ago, Social Security was about 2½ percent of gross domestic product. Today it is 4.9 percent of gross domestic product. Perhaps the most interesting is interest on the debt because it is skyrocketing, from just over 1 percent of gross domestic product to 3.4 percent of gross domestic product today. All other Federal spending has actually declined in comparison to the size of our economy, declined from 15 percent of gross domestic product to 12 percent of gross domestic product.

So when we hear people say, well, it is clearly spending, it is absolutely correct that spending has gone up. But it has gone up in just four areas: Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, and interest on the debt.

Madam President, that is the reason the budget before us has put us in a position in which we simply must cut spending and raise taxes in order to make progress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CONRAD. I ask the chairman for 1 additional minute.

Mr. SASSER. I yield the distinguished Senator from North Dakota an additional minute.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, let me just conclude by saying that the budget before us does reduce the Federal budget deficit $500 billion over the next 5 years.

This chart, I think, tells a story that we must pay careful attention to. This chart shows the cost of inaction.

Madam President, if we fail to act on this budget resolution, we will face these gridlock deficits that grow and grow and grow. We see no end in sight. If, instead, we enact the Clinton plan, we will see a sharp reduction in those gridlock deficits.

No, it does not bring us to a balanced budget but, Madam President, it makes progress. Unless we see a plan on the other side that actually does a better job, then we ought to enact the Clinton plan, because the Clinton plan reduces those budget deficits, devotes every penny of tax increase to deficit reduction.

Madam President, it also changes the priorities of the country. It says, yes, we must cut spending, but there are certain areas that deserve more money, such as educating our children, training our workers, investing in America, rebuilding our infrastructure, and research for the future.

Madam President, those are not only the priorities of President Clinton, they are the priorities of the people of this country. That is the reason I am proud to stand in support of this budget resolution.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] is recognized.

Mr. ROTH. Madam President, the No. 1 challenge facing our Nation——

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, may I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Delaware how long he wishes to speak?

Mr. ROTH. I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, let me say I welcome the request, and I yield 15 minutes to Senator ROTH.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, if I may make an inquiry. Are we on a time schedule anticipating amendments to come before the body?

Mr. SASSER. I say to the distinguished Senator from Alaska that we have plenty of time, in one sense. We probably have about, at this juncture, 42 hours left on this bill. But we have not heard a single amendment. An amendment has not been introduced yet.

The Senator from New Mexico is pushing, as he should, to get amendments up. We continue to have Senators coming to the floor wanting to speak on this budget resolution. That is as it should be. It is a very important piece of legislation. But if we are going to get to amendments, we are going to have to try to cut this off at some juncture. The Senator from New Mexico and I had hoped to be able to begin amendments by 3:30 or certainly 3:45. But why do I not counsel with my friend from New Mexico and see where we are?

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, let me say to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] we are trying hard to move ahead with an amendment that is very dear to the Senator's heart and try to get it disposed of today. To the extent that we cannot make such an arrangement, I will be back to the Senator, or he can wait here a few minutes, and we will decide whether we are going to go on indefinitely and not get the Btu amendment up today. Then the Senator can speak about it.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. It is my intention to speak briefly at a later time, following the sequence that the Chair would order, pending the introduction of the amendment. I have been here for some time. I want to make sure that I have an opportunity to speak before the amendment. I am generally assured of that.

I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. ROTH. Madam President, the No. 1 challenge facing our Nation is the creation of good secure jobs for the American people. Soon after the President Clinton announced his budget package, I expressed my concern that the large tax increases in his plan could hurt the economy rather than help it. I expressed my concern that the President's package failed to reduce Federal spending. I also stated my intention to return to the Senate with an alternative plan which would meet the President's challenge to reduce the deficit.

The American people are demanding that the Federal Government cut spending first. Unfortunately, the President's plan fails to cut spending until 1996. That's why I have brought forth this alternative. According to the Congressional Budget Office, which the President stated he would use in estimating the impact of his budget plan, the President's package would increase spending in 1993, 1994, and 1995. The first real spending cuts do not take place until 1996.

As CBO numbers make clear, the President would raise almost $5 in new taxes for every dollar in spending reduction over the next 5 years. This is vastly different from the $2 in spending cuts for every dollar in tax increase promoted by Budget Director Panetta during his confirmation hearing.

As we begin consideration of the budget resolution, I would like to inform my colleagues of this proposal, which reduces the Federal deficit by $558 billion without asking the American taxpayer to pay higher taxes. I know President Clinton is sincere in his desire to cut the Federal deficit, but I am convinced raising taxes will only lead to higher spending. Unfortu-

nately, the increased taxes and spending that President Clinton suggests does not promote long-term U.S. competitiveness and jobs.

Madam President, my plan meets the challenge posed by President Clinton to drastically reduce the Federal budget deficit with specific spending cuts. This plan demonstrates that it is possible to achieve real, long-term deficit reduction without the tremendous tax increases contained in the President's plan. I am deeply concerned that the $266 billion in tax increases will lead to the loss of millions of jobs, just as the tax increases in the 1990 budget agreement did. I voted against the 1990 budget agreement advocated by President Bush because of my concern that increased taxes would deepen the recession and lead to more Government spending. Unfortunately, this turned out to be true.

Raising taxes on the American people now, just as we are seeing some signs of improvement in the economy is, at best, economically risky and at worst, economically disastrous.

This proposal has more than $263 billion in cuts beyond those proposed by the President. These cuts, when added to the President's, would reduce the Federal deficit by $558 billion. In addition, it is important to point out that this plan would not affect Social Security. It is also important to point out that many of the reductions included in the President's budget are cuts that I called for in 1991.

For example, the President's proposed Medicare secondary payor reform and his reductions in national defense and in the Federal work force are similar to proposals that I first recommended in 1991.

This budget, is comprised of nine components:

First, it would reduce the President's stimulus package by $12 billion. It is far from clear that more Federal spending is going to create the types of permanent, secure jobs that the American people are seeking and deserve.

Instead, a great portion of the President's stimulus package will not lead to new jobs, but simply the enlargement of Government. The President's package provides increases for programs which already received full funding in the regular appropriations process. While my alternative would provide funding for unemployment compensation and other high priority items, it would reduce the overall stimulus package by $12 billion.

Second, this budget reduces the additional spending in the President's investment package. While I agree with the President that certain high priority programs such as Head Start and worker retraining provide tremendous benefits to our Nation's well being, I must also ask whether we can really afford more than $145 billion in new spending above the increases already provided for inflation for such Federal projects as highway construction, rural development, and energy research.

For example, instead of increasing Federal research and development spending by more than $13 billion, as the President proposes, we should focus on making better use of the $75 billion we spend annually. This is three times what all other countries combined spend on research and development.

Third, this budget provides almost $60 billion in additional cuts in domestic discretionary programs beyond the President's budget.

Some of the extra cuts in my proposal include: additional reductions in executive and legislative branch personnel; canceling the superconducting super collider; eliminating highway demonstration projects; eliminating Federal mass transit subsidies; eliminating the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Appalachian Regional Commission. Madam President, I am calling for a 20-percent cut in the Federal work force. These reductions, which would come from both the executive and legislative branches, would be achieved not by firing Federal workers, but through the process of attrition and limiting rehires over the next 5 years.

Fourth, this plan adopts many of the President's changes in domestic discretionary spending. This includes reductions in many projects and grants specifically earmarked by Congress which have failed to go through the competitive bidding process. In addition, I agree with the President that Federal agencies can be streamlined and significant administrative efficiencies can be achieved.

Fifth, this budget provides more than $70 billion in additional entitlement changes beyond the President's budget, without changes to Social Security, Federal, or military retiree pension benefits. This includes terminating certain agriculture subsidies for wool and mohair, as well as terminating export enhancement programs for our agricultural products. In addition, it calls for accelerating the elimination of State donation schemes in Medicaid, and the elimination of disproportionate Federal payments in the Medicare Program.

Sixth, the plan incorporates many of the President's reductions in mandatory spending, including difficult choices that the administration made with regard to health care and the civil service.

For instance, I support the proposal put forth by the administration to eliminate the lump sum retirement option for Federal employees.

Seventh, I would reduce foreign aid by $1.5 billion a year, for a savings of $7.5 billion over the next 5 years. Clearly, foreign aid should be directed to those areas which involve the security interests of the United States. By refocusing aid to those areas where direct interests are concerned, foreign aid can be reduced.

Eighth, this budget will reduce defense spending by $100 billion over the next 5 years. I have long maintained that the Defense Department must be right-sized for the post-cold-war era in order to maintain an effective military while achieving such savings. The savings of the level that I suggest are achievable if true reform is brought to the Pentagon, including such steps as cutting out inefficient management hierarchies, streamlining procurement practices, getting rid of the widespread duplication of equipment and organizations, and killing cold war weapons programs.

Ninth, I would adopt some of the increased user fees outlined in the President's budget.

Madam President, taken together, these changes will produce more than $558 billion in deficit reduction over the next 5 years without the tremendous tax increases proposed by President Clinton. The budget reductions outlined in this plan are far from easy—difficult choices were made. But if we are going to be serious about reducing the deficit, difficult decisions must be made.

This package represents the starting point for demonstrating that we can significantly reduce the deficit without large new tax increases which will stifle job growth.

Madam President, as we begin consideration of the budget resolution, I am anxious to work with my colleagues in the Senate to present a budget alternative that produces meaningful reductions in spending without the economically damaging tax increases that are included in the President's plan. I look forward to working with my colleagues to present a constructive alternative to the President's budget, which I believe will hurt, not help the economy.

Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, might I inquire of the Senator from Washington how much time she will require?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, if I could request 10 minutes.

Mr. SASSER. I am pleased to yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, today I stand here on the floor of the U.S. Senate to be part of the debate of one of the most important budgets of our time. The passage of this budget will mark a turning point for our Nation.

Not so long ago, I sat in the gallery as a part of the audience, or at home in

front of my television set 2,300 miles away from here watching legislators debate budget resolutions. I know that the citizens of this country are listening intensely, the way I listened, to here how the decisions of legislators could affect my family's well-being.

Madam President, I vowed that if the people of the State of Washington would allow me to represent them in the U.S. Senate, I would not forget how it felt to be part of the audience, and I would always try to speak with simple common sense. I promised them I would not talk to them with the jargon of Washington, DC, but to my colleagues with the common logic of Washington State.

I stand here, Madam President, as a mother, who is raising two children, caring for disabled parents, going to work every day, and balancing my own checkbook. It is with that perspective that I approach the budget resolution.

We can disagree on the floor on this budget. That is how our system works. My family works in much the same way. First, we pay our bills. We meet our financial obligations. We pay our rent; we buy food and clothing. And we save something in case of emergency. Then, if we have any left over, we have to decide how to spend it. My children do not always agree with my husband and me on how our family income should be spent.

Like most American parents, we tend to think in the long term, and we spend accordingly. Otherwise, my house would have termites and a leaky roof, and would be full of toys and video games, ripped jeans, and music tapes. Frankly, that is the way our economy looks today: The infrastructure is badly in need of repair. We have misallocated. And our spending priorities are out of whack.

So, we can disagree in this Chamber, but certain principles should guide us in this important task. We should not obstruct. I would not tolerate that behavior from my children and the American people will not put up with it from us.

We have to reduce the deficit. We have to cut out wasteful programs that are no longer useful. Our spending must be oriented toward investments in our future. Above all, we must be honest with the American people.

The President's budget fulfills all these criteria. We are investing in programs that national commissions have recognized as exemplary for a decade. During the Reagan administration when these deficits were growing, I was teaching preschool and serving on our local school board. I know how important Head Start is. And, I know how important the Immunization Program is. We can immunize children today, or we can watch juvenile diseases run rampant throughout society tomorrow.

We must fully fund effective programs such as WIC. WIC provides food and nutrition education to low-income pregnant women, new mothers, and children under age 5. We can invest $1 on women in this program today or we can spend $2 to $4 in Medicaid on them tomorrow.

We must fully fund the Ryan White CARE Act. We can help bring about an end to the AIDS epidemic and ease the suffering of those with HIV disease today, or we can continue to watch large segments of population die away tomorrow.

We must invest in infrastructure, transportation, and high technology. Too many programs have been neglected or ignored for too long. Our roads and bridges are in serious disrepair. We can repair them and use them today, or we can stay the course, watch them collapse, and leave them for our children to rebuild tomorrow.

I know that this budget has some elements that will be tough on the people of the State of Washington. In the agricultural arena, there are things that will require Washington farmers to change the way things have been done in the past. The President has proposed eliminating specific directives for agricultural research. This is troubling because our aggressive research program has enabled our farmers to become the most productive and competitive in the world.

Likewise, for years, Northwest families have enjoyed consumer-friendly energy rates because of our proximity to the world's finest hydroelectric power system. The new energy taxes will translate into more pressure on family budgets and our vital industries throughout the Pacific Northwest.

We need to manage the inland waterways, salmon protection, agricultural programs, and energy conservation in a way that protects business and consumers, and preserves the quality of life in the Pacific Northwest.

I know my friends and neighbors understand the country is in trouble, and they know—because they have common sense—that we all must contribute to set this country on the right path. It is not just the President's job, it is not just Congress' job, it is not a Democrat or a Republican job, it is everyone's job. We have got to pull together—that is our mandate from the American people in the last election. The President campaigned on cutting the deficit, on investing in people, on making those who got rich during the Reagan years contribute something back to the country. People across this country, people in my State, heard and understood that message.

I believe this is a budget which straightens out our priorities and can get our Nation moving again. During the 1980's, I saw my neighbors and friends grow cynical and disappointed. We watched our legislators bogged down by gridlock and inertia. We watched as Congress failed to deal with issues facing real people, and speak a language real people do not understand. For 12 years, this country has been overspending, living way beyond our means, and not investing in people, in infrastructure, in our future.

Madam President, I am very patient on the Budget Committee. I have listened to the testimony of all the witnesses and the questions and concerns of my colleagues. I have heard wisdom from both sides of the aisle.

Now is the time for action. We must reduce the deficit. We must invest in our future. We must be honest. The American people will tolerate nothing less, because everyone in this country knows what has gone on in the past. Let us not fool ourselves. American families cannot survive if they overextend their credit or make false promises about their household budgets the way the Government has done with ours. The American people know that. And I know the people of Washington believe I will listen to them during this budget process, and that is why they moved me from the gallery to the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Thank you.

Mr. SASSER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I will yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Let me just note that we want to get to the amendments as quickly as possible. But the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has been waiting on the floor here for a couple of hours, just to get a few moments to speak. I would like to accommodate him, if at all possible.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, just so the two Senators who are on the floor—and both have been patient and I am very willing to be accommodating—will know, what the chairman is going to do right now is ask unanimous consent that we proceed at 3:45 with the Harkin amendment, 2 hours on that, 1 hour equally divided, and that it be disposed of; and then we would take up the Nickles amendment, 2 hours, an hour on a side, and dispose of that.

So we would have two amendments disposed of tonight, including the Btu tax.

I am willing, if the two Senators are, to divide the 10 minutes that he remain equally, 5 minutes each, and we will still stay right on the time schedule, if that is agreeable.

Mr. SASSER. Is that agreeable to my friend from South Carolina?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I would agree.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I would agree.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] be recognized to offer an amendment regarding the barge tax, and that he be recognized at 3:45; that upon disposition of

the Harkin amendment, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] be recognized to offer an amendment regarding the Btu tax; that no second-degree amendments be in order to either of these amendments; and that the Senate vote on or in relation to both amendments before adjourning today.

Mr. DOMENICI. We have no objection, Madam President.

Mr. HOLLINGS. How about 3:46?

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me make sure the chairman and I understand. The Harkin amendment, it is still a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, is it not?

Mr. SASSER. That is my understanding, and the Senator from Iowa indicates that that is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection to the request.

I would ask the chairman to add 2 minutes to the time before it comes up.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I would amend this unanimous consent to insert the time of 3:48.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. May I assume that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and I each have 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, much has been said about the issue of fairness, the issue of equity, and the application of meaningful deficit reduction. This is something that all Americans believe that this body should address with dispatch.

The obligation that we have, Madam President, is to know what we have when we are through with the process: Have we created a significant reduction in the deficit?

Well, you have heard our side of the aisle express its collective opinion that by the time we are through with this exercise, we will have brought about the largest increase in taxation on the American people in the history of America.

We support the concept of cutting the deficit. The people in my State of Alaska are urging me to support a meaningful deficit reduction program. But they want equity, Madam President.

I only have a few moments here, but let me give you some idea of what is not equity, and that is the Btu tax.

Madam President, the administration is looking at the energy industry of this country, which contributes almost 10 percent of the gross national product, for 22 percent of the new tax revenues. Is that equity?

They are looking at the gas, the coal, the nuclear, the hydro, and the oil industry to contribute a tax of about 25.7 cents per million Btu, which sounds equitable on the surface. But then they come back and they say that oil is going to bear a surtax, a surtax of an additional 34.6 per million Btu. Is that equitable?

Why has oil become a sin tax? Is is like liquor and tobacco?

What happens if you have no other alternative but oil? You have to pay a penalty.

Now, there is some theory out there that suggests that we are going to save oil as a consequence of putting this surtax tax on.

Well, to get to my State of Alaska, I am going to have to fly back up there. There is no practical alternative. I am not going to save any oil, but the airlines, which are under a tremendous burden now, obviously are going to have to absorb this Btu tax or pass it on to the consumer.

Another difficulty with this whole package is there is no consideration given for the inflation factor. We are adding a stimulus to the inflation of this country at a figure that nobody can guess. How the potential of unemployment in our energy industry, as a reality of this Btu tax, will affect our economy, nobody knows. It is not equitable. It is not well thought out.

But, yet, we are expected to support this kind of a sacrifice.

Let me talk in the minutes I have about the mineral industry, a 12.5-percent royalty on gross—not net, but gross production. The mineral industry in this country competes with lead, zinc and so forth, production from Australia, Africa—we either are competitive in that marketplace or not. But our industry is being asked to share this burden so we can generate more revenues. The White House is telling industry look, we do not care where you get it as a user tax, just make sure you get it.

They are going to drive them out of business.

How many job losses are we talking about under the Clinton proposals? That is 27,500 lost jobs, if our mining industry moves out of the country as a consequence of this kind of a tax on royalties—not on net, Madam President, but gross.

What have we accomplished by the time we have made the complete circle? We have not accomplished anything. We have simply driven the industry overseas.

That is not what we want to happen, obviously, but that is what industry simply tells us is the harsh reality associated with this. And we are supposed to, somehow, rely on the Finance Committee or somebody else to make these cures. This should be debated within this body relative to the impact it is going to have on jobs, the tax base associated with the contribution.

As a consequence, Madam President, I simply point out, in conclusion because I think my time is up, that as we go through this, the conviction of deficit reduction is real. But let us make sure that we examine the ramifications associated with what this means. It means $124 million in new spending over 5 years. The budget only cuts $80 billion. In 1998 the deficit would be $228 billion per year. Yet the President promised $140 billion in deficit reduction.

His budget simply does not deliver and we have to recognize that.

Madam President, I believe my time is up. I thank the Chair and thank the floor managers for allowing me 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SASSER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, very quickly, and I will try to encapsulate it, I was listening to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas. There is one thing we can agree on that he commented upon, his projection that we could have as big a deficit in 1996, when the President is running again for reelection, as what we have right now. There is no doubt about that. The President understands it. He hopes to lower it further with health cost containment. There is no doubt about that. And maybe we will need some additional revenues for that health plan. That is why I talked earlier this morning about a VAT.

Otherwise, let me talk about the duplicity of the Senator from Texas. He comes and starts with a chart, says here are the promises and here are the actual, what they did. Here is what they promised—Reagan, Bush—and actually what they did.

But then when he gets to the Clinton one he gives him the entire yellow line and he blames President Clinton for promises made by the Republican Presidents that were not kept. That is our dilemma.

I mean that is not promises not kept by the distinguished President of the United States today. The fact is we have $1.3 trillion in revenues, actually in these figures here that he used—President Clinton can only be responsible for $295 billion of those new revenues. Not the $1.3 trillion the distinguished Senator from Texas claims. To blame Clinton for all $1.3 trillion in new revenues, you would have to blame him for passage of the income tax back in 1913. In other words, most of the new revenue will be generated by taxes already on the books.

Look at the baseline and look at what taxes we already had. He has not passed a tax yet. Look at what we have and he adds all that together and puts it on the back of the distinguished President.

He says more spending than LBJ. I was there. The budget, of outlays in 1968–69, was $178 billion.

Do you know what the interest cost is now? The interest cost, net is $198 billion. The gross interest cost is $295 billion. That crowd has given us bigger interest costs due to the quadrupling of the debt than the budget for the Great Society and the Vietnam war combined. That is what President Clinton inherits.

The promises and actual—well, there is very little actual, he says here. Well the promises made, they never vetoed a single spending bill, Presidents Reagan and Bush. And Bush had 37 vetoes. I voted against much of the spending. He had a right, title and interest—but he did not veto spending. He vetoed appropriations spending bills with the doctor's counseling with respect to family planning, but not the actual spending. He always signed the spending and so did President Reagan, except for one little supplemental bill.

So Reagan and Bush have been leading the charge, getting exactly what they wanted, increases in defense, increases in domestic, we gave them separate budgets and they signed them all.

Finally the Senator from Texas says you cannot get the job done except by binding constraints. When he recommended the binding constraints in committee, the chairman of the Budget Committee and all Democrats opposed it. He says the promises, by 1996 are going to be forgotten.

That is what cuts keenly this particular sponsor of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. At 12:41 a.m., October 19, 1990, we had Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, truth is budgeting. And I made the point of order to let us maintain it, let us maintain the spending targets and the spending restraints. And the distinguished Senator from Texas voted against, on the point of order. He voted for doing away with Gramm-Rudman-Hollings and spending constraints.

So do not come now, after he has offloaded all of this on President Clinton in his address here today. We know what his intent is. The distinguished Senator's intent was quoted in the Wall Street Journal on October 5. "We are going to make it hard for them to stick with Clinton," said Senator PHIL GRAMM.

There is no genuine attempt on the other side of the aisle to get a budget. It is just political applesauce.

I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. How much time is remaining? Is any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 20 seconds before the Senator from Iowa is due to be recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. In the 20 seconds I have, let me just say: Be wary of economists. I have been listening to them up here for 26 years and you can see where we are. Watch out for the economists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. DOMENICI. Is there 10 seconds left so I would not be using anybody's time?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield it back. I yield it to you.

Mr. DOMENICI. You yield it to me? Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is actually gone.

Mr. DOMENICI. Would he yield 15 seconds? Senator HARKIN is not quite ready. Can we do that?

Mr. SASSER. I yield 15 seconds off the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 15 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Speaking of quoting people as to what they might be doing, might I quote this one? I think it is of interest.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. 1988, Bill Clinton, Newsweek. "There is a lot of evidence that you can sell people on tax increases if they think it's an investment."

Mr. HOLLINGS. Right. And that is exactly where our Republican colleagues and I voted in 1987 for a value added tax. We did that in the Budget Committee that you were on there. In the particular vote which was sold us as an investment.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the views and estimates from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation on the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 1994 and beyond be printed in the RECORD as part of the Senate debate on Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION,

Washington, DC, March 12, 1993.

Hon. JAMES SASSER,
Chairman,
Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Ranking Republican, U.S. Senate Committee on the Budget, Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM AND PETE: This letter comprises the views and estimates report of the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation on the President's Fiscal Year (FY) 1994 budget proposal and economic package.

The Committee will address several areas of concern during the 103rd Congress. The budget for FY 1994 and beyond for agencies handling these issues will be scrutinized carefully to ensure adequate resources for implementing Committee initiatives and policies. The following is a discussion of major issues of interest, which are reviewed in the context of what the Committee understands to be the President's budget for FY 1994 and beyond.

AVIATION

The Committee is committed to ensuring that the programs of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) within the Department of Transportation (DOT) are funded at levels to ensure as safe and efficient an air transportation system as possible. The Committee notes that all the funding for the programs of the FAA, with the exception of a portion of its operations budget, comes from amounts collected from the travelling public and deposited in the Airport and Airway Trust Fund (Trust Fund), and that those amounts are to be used to maintain and modernize the air transportation system.

Aviation is critical to the economic prosperity of the Nation, and thus modernization of its airports and the air traffic control system must continue. The Committee is aware that many of the modernization projects being developed for the air traffic control system are seriously delayed and over-budget. This is troublesome to the Committee, particularly in an era of reduced resources, and such projects thus must be carefully monitored.

The President's FY 1994 request of approximately $4.7 billion for the Operations and Maintenance account is virtually the current services level. This amount is needed to enable the FAA to operate the air traffic control system and consolidate where necessary. The Committee in the past has expressed its concerns over the need for additional controllers. The Committee notes in this regard that the President's budget indicates that the air traffic control system has been rebuilt, which the Committee will monitor carefully. The Committee also wants to ensure that the requested level will provide sufficient funding for other critical support areas, such as air carrier safety inspector training and support for the technical workforce.

With respect to FAA Facilities and Equipment, the President's FY 1994 request represents inflationary increases over the FY 1993 appropriated levels, plus an additional $120 million in budget authority for air traffic control modernization. The total of approximately $2.5 billion is less than the $2.9 billion which Congress authorized in the FAA reauthorization legislation passed last Congress (P.L. 102-581) and is needed to fund the necessary equipment procurement and installation of that equipment for the modernization of the air traffic control system. FY 1994 funds are needed to continue the multi-year Capital Investment Plan, formerly called the National Airspace System Plan, and other projects critical to the FAA's effort to handle safely projected increases in air traffic. Examples of projects to be funded in FY 1994 include the Advanced Automation System, which will upgrade the air traffic control system's computer technology; the Voice Switching and Control System, designed to modernize the system's communications network; and the Terminal Doppler Weather Radar, which will improve hazardous weather detection in terminal areas. Installation of airport surface detection radar also continues to be a critical effort.

Regarding budget authority for the Airport Improvement Program (AIP), and also the use of passenger facility charges (PFCs), the Committee is interested in ensuring that all funds spent for the development of airports are needed to respond to the increased capacity needs of the air transportation system. AIP funds are clearly critical to continued improvement in the air transportation system, and the Committee will be reauthorizing the AIP program this year.

The President's budget request calls for inflationary increases above the FY 1993 appro-

priated levels for the Research, Engineering and Development account of roughly $237 million, which is within the amount of $297 million for FY 1994 authorized by Congress in the FAA reauthorization bill passed last year. Research is a critical aspect of the mission of the FAA. The United States must continue in its efforts to be a world leader in developing and testing new technology to make the air transportation system safer and more efficient, such as in the areas of aircraft safety technology, human factors, aviation medicine, and new transportation technologies.

The Committee is committed to appropriate funding for aviation capital development programs from the Trust Fund. However, because of the increase in the ticket and other taxes paid into the Trust Fund, and because appropriations for these programs generally have fallen far below authorized levels, the Trust Fund continues to have a significant surplus. The surplus at the end of FY 1993 is projected to be more than $4.3 billion. The Committee continues to believe that this surplus must be spent and for the purposes for which it was intended: aviation safety and capital development programs.

COMMUNICATIONS

The Committee will continue its oversight of the various sectors of the communications industry, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), and will be considering reauthorizations of these programs. In this regard, the President has submitted proposals to increase certain portions of the NTIA budget and raise funds through spectrum auctions.

With respect to spectrum auctions, the President has proposed that radio spectrum now used by the Federal Government will be reallocated and assigned by the FCC to private users. The budget assumes that auctions will be used to raise revenues of $374 million in FY 1995, $1.623 million in FY 1996, $2.083 million in FY 1997 and $340 million in FY 1998. Members of the Committee are currently considering an alternative auction proposal.

The President's budget includes an investment proposal for "information highways" which allocates: $6 million for FY 1994, $42 million for FY 1995, $98 million for FY 1996, $129 million for FY 1997 and $150 million for FY 1998 for a total of $275 million for FY 1994 through FY 1997. The Committee understands that this funding will be added to the Public Telecommunications Facilities Program (PTFP) and is intended for trial projects to enhance the communications capabilities of schools, hospitals, libraries, and other similar groups. The Committee will be considering PTFP reauthorization this session. S. 1504, the Public Telecommunications Act of 1991, which was enacted last Congress, authorizes appropriations of $42 million per year for the PTFP for FY 1992, 1993 and 1994. The Committee understands that the President's investment proposal would be in addition to the funding authorized in S. 1504, ensuring the continuation and improvement of the Nation's public broadcasting stations and other educational and non-profit telecommunications services.

The Committee is not certain whether the President's budget includes funding for the Pan-Pacific Educational and Cultural Experiments by Satellite (PEACESAT) program; for the creation of and studies by the advisory panel on rural health and telecommunications needs; or for the National Endowment of Children's Educational Television, all three of which are administered by the NTIA. The Committee will consider authorizing funding for these programs in FY 1994 and future years.

COAST GUARD

During the past several years, the Coast Guard has demonstrated the capability to undertake a number of diverse and important missions across the United States. Adequate funding will be necessary if it is to continue to fulfill these national responsibilities. The Committee will be considering reauthorization of the Coast Guard this year and estimates that the Coast Guard will require $3,738 million in spending authority for FY 1994 to maintain current services and implement Administration proposals.

With respect to the Coast Guard's Operating Expenses (OE) account, $2,558 million in spending authority was appropriated in FY 1993. This OE budget emphasized funding for the Coast Guard's marine environmental protection and drug law enforcement efforts, while maintaining the Coast Guard's strong commitment to maritime safety, fishery law enforcement, and search and rescue. Such activities must be continued in FY 1994, requiring increased spending authority of $90 million after adjustment for inflation and Government-wide administrative and personnel reductions. Of the total funding level for operating expenses, $33 million can be transferred from the Boat Safety account, and $26 million can be transferred from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to the OE account. Thus, new budget authority of $2,648 million for the Coast Guard's OE account in FY 1994 would be required.

The Coast Guard's Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements (AC&I) account, also will require a small, but significant, increase in funding from the FY 1993 level. Under the AC&I account, $389 million for capital improvement of the Coast Guard's vessel, aircraft, shore facilities, information management resources, and aids-to-navigation is recommended. The CBO baseline is $349 million for FY 1994. The baseline includes $36 million to be transferred from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. In addition, an increase of $40 million will be needed to fund two important safety and environmental-protection projects proposed by the Administration. The first project is a new vessel traffic system to be implemented in busy ports and harbors to reduce maritime accidents and the threat of hazardous materials and oil spills. The second project is the replacement of seagoing and coastal buoy tenders, many of which are over fifty years old.

In other Coast Guard accounts, the Committee supports adequate funding to continue existing programs at current levels, including: $76 million for reserve training, of which $52 million may be transferred from the Department of Defense; $29 million for environmental compliance and restoration, of which $6 million may be transferred from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund; and $550 million for retired pay. The Committee anticipates that such funding levels would be consistent with CBO baselines and with the President's budget request.

OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE

The Committee remains committed to the advancement of the atmospheric, oceanic, and fisheries programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA). In addition, the Committee has focused on three priorities for strengthening the agency's infrastructure: (1) implementation of modern weather observation systems and technology, while maintaining current public weather forecasting and warning capabilities; (2) continuity of weather satellite coverage; and (3) modernization of the NOAA oceanographic fleet.

The Committee will be considering the reauthorization of various NOAA programs and in general supports continuation of NOAA's current activities, which CBO estimates will require spending authority of $1,850 million to cover base operations, construction, and ongoing procurements at FY 1993 service levels. In addition, an increase of $366 million may be required to address infrastructure priorities. The increase is composed of the following: $147 million in equipment and training for weather service modernization in line with Administration investment proposals; $150 million for NOAA geostationary and polar-orbiting weather satellite systems; and $69 million for the oceanographic fleet consistent with the 1992 NOAA authorization bill. In total, new budget authority of $2,151 million for NOAA in FY 1994 will be needed.

MERCHANT MARINE

This year the Committee will continue its examination of the state of the maritime industry and in this regard will continue its oversight of the activities of the Maritime Administration (MarAd) within DOT. MarAd's activities are essential to the maintenance of a strong U.S. Merchant Marine and the national defense of the United States.

In this regard, the President's FY 1994 budget does not appear to propose major reductions in MarAd's programs. Therefore, it appears that MarAd would continue to be funded at current levels. The Maritime Administration's FY 1993 appropriation included: $71.7 million for operations and training (including funding for the merchant marine academies); $440.5 million for the Ready Reserve Force; $52 million for Title XI loan guarantees (of which $4 million is for the administrative costs for the new loan guarantees); and $225 million for operating differential subsidy (ODS) obligations (ODS is a permanent, indefinite appropriation). The total appropriation for MarAd for FY 1993 was $789.2 million.

It is not clear whether the President's FY 1994 budget proposal includes funding for any possible maritime reform legislation. Last year maritime reform legislation was proposed by the Bush Administration, but was not enacted due to concerns about unavailable funds and other issues. The Bush Administration proposal would have required funding of $1.1 billion, and a recent industry proposal would cost $4.7 billion. The Committee will continue its review of this issue.

The Committee also understands that the FY 1994 budget proposal has no funding identified for Title XI loan guarantees. The Credit Reform Act of 1990 requires that the cost of any new loan guarantees under this program be appropriated. Without an appropriation, no new loan guarantee applications can be approved in FY 1994.

SPACE, SCIENCE, AND TECHNOLOGY COMPETITIVENESS

The Committee continues to focus on issues relating to technological competitiveness, as America's industry faces the challenges of a global marketplace.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION (NASA)

The President is expected to request an increase in funding for NASA above the current funding level of $14.3 billion, perhaps even more than the current services budget.

The Committee will be developing an authorization bill for FY 1994 for NASA.

Funding for NASA is needed to support a variety of space and aeronautical research and development programs, the construction and maintenance of critical aerospace facilities, and a civil service workforce. Of particular interest this year will be NASA's efforts to redesign the space station program. The President has announced his intent to continue development of a space station, one that is more affordable in the outyears. It may be necessary in FY 1994, however, to increase slightly spending on the space station program in the short term, in order to gain control of this program in the long term.

The Committee supports many of the programs funded by NASA, although it will be reviewing carefully funding allocations for individual programs in its authorization bill. In establishing funding priorities for NASA for FY 1994, it is important to highlight funding initiatives proposed by the President for enhancing NASA's civil aviation research and development program, including research into High Speed Civil Transport aircraft, advanced subsonic aircraft, and short-haul aircraft. In addition, funding of NASA's Mission to Planet Earth is important, as it is a major component of the U.S. Global Change Research Program.

TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION AND NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY (NIST)

The Technology Administration at the Department of Commerce (DOC) contains four key technology agencies—the Office of the Under Secretary for Technology, the Office of Technology Policy, the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), and NIST.

NIST is the largest of these four agencies. The Technology Competitiveness Act (sections 510 1–5164 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, P.L. 100–418) upgraded DOC's National Bureau of Standards into NIST and gave the agency new authorities to help U.S. industry speed the commercialization of new products and improve manufacturing. Under the 1988 Act, NIST assists industry in three ways: (1) continued in-house research and technical services, which provide industry with precise measurements, quality assurance techniques, and new process technologies; (2) technology extension activities, including Manufacturing Technology Centers and the State Technology Extension Program; and (3) the Advanced Technology Program (ATP) which provides seed money, on a matching basis, to industrial consortia and individual companies to help develop new precompetitive, generic technologies.

In an era when U.S. leadership in commercial technology is eroding, and when major trading partners spend a far higher percentage of their gross national products on commercially-related research, the Committee believes that targeted expansions of NIST programs are important to the future prosperity and security of the Nation. In this regard, on January 21, Senators Hollings and Mitchell, with Senators Rockefeller, Robb, Kerry, Bryan, Breaux, and Burns as cosponsors from the Commerce Committee, introduced S. 4, the National Competitiveness Act, a bill to upgrade NIST programs and provide FY 1994 and FY 1995 authorizations. The President's budget proposal also includes substantial expansion in FY 1994 and beyond. The document entitled "A Vision of Change for America," which accompanied the President's proposal, states: "the Federal Government has an important role to play in promoting economic growth, in part by supporting research and development. This proposal provides aggressive growth for NIST. NIST is the only Federal laboratory with the principal mission of supporting U.S. industry and has provided a steady stream of technology support to U.S. firms for over 90 years." The President proposes during FY 1994 to increase NIST by $138 million above the $384 million FY 1993 level. The Committee supports expansion of these DOC programs and is expected to act expeditiously on S. 4.

HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING INITIATIVE

In November 1991, Congress passed the High-Performance Computing Act (P.L. 102–194), which creates and authorizes a major new multi-agency computing initiative. The law creates a program, which is to be implemented by the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP). The Administration strongly supports the program and proposes funding increases for high-performance computing for FY 1994 and outyears.

The Committee has strongly supported the high-performance computing initiative and will give the President's proposals very careful consideration. At a time when computers are more important than ever to scientific research, national security, and industrial competitiveness, it is essential that the United States maintain its leading-edge computer technology. By spurring the development and use of more powerful supercomputers and creating a national high-speed computer network, this law can ensure that American scientists, engineers, and students have access to the best computer hardware and software available.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION (NSF)

This year, Congress will consider a new authorization bill for NSF as well as the President's budget proposals to expand funding for NSF programs. The President's budget proposal would add $2.3 billion to NSF during the four fiscal years from 1994 through 1997. The plan states: "Studies show that investments in research and development (R&D) tend to be the strongest and most consistent positive influence on productivity growth. Most of NSF's investments are in university-based R&D programs which . . . contribute to the Nation's productivity by generating new scientific and engineering knowledge and contribute to the training of the next generation of scientists and engineers."

The Committee shares jurisdiction with the Committee on Labor and Human Resources over six of NSF's seven budget accounts—research and related activities, the U.S. Antarctic Program, academic research facilities and instrumentation, salaries and expenses, the Critical Technologies Institute, and the Office of the Inspector General. The agency's seventh account, education and human resources, remains under the sole jurisdiction of the Labor Committee. Therefore, the views and estimates regarding NSF that are submitted by the Committee address all of the agency's accounts except education and human resources.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

The Committee will monitor surface transportation spending under the FY 1994 budget in light of the various authorization measures enacted last Congress, including reauthorization of the pipeline safety programs, the rail safety program, the Local Rail Freight Assistance program, funding for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak), and the motor carrier safety programs and other surface-related programs funded in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA). In addition, during FY 1994, the Committee will consider reauthorization of the hazardous materials transportation safety program.

With regard to the President's FY 1994 budget request, the Committee notes with particular interest funding proposals for high-speed rail and magnetic levitation transportation (maglev). According to "A Vision of Change for America," released February 17, 1993, $27 million is proposed to be spent in FY 1994 on high-speed rail and maglev, with a total of $646 million to be spent in the period FY 1994 to FY 1997. The United States must continue to focus on technology competitiveness and advanced transportation systems, and efforts to promote U.S. high-speed rail and maglev technologies are critical to this end.

With respect to highway safety, the Committee will continue its oversight of related programs. The highway safety programs administered by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) were last authorized in ISTEA. The Committee continues to be committed to ensuring adequately funded programs with particular respect to vehicular safety and impaired drivers. In this regard, the Committee notes with interest the President's proposal to add budget authority of $67 million in FY 1994 and $100 million per year in the outyears through FY 1997 for improved highway safety.

In conclusion, this Committee remains committed to responsible deficit reduction while maintaining adequate funding for those priority programs under its jurisdiction.

With warm regards, I am

Sincerely,

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
Chairman.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield back my time. We are ready.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, I think the Senator from Iowa is due for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized to offer an amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. And I believe, if I am not mistaken, Madam President, there are 2 hours now, an hour on each side on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, that is true.

Mr. DOMENICI. There are 2 hours equally divided; 1 hour on each side.

Mr. HARKIN. Exactly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 hours evenly divided. The Senator from Iowa, please proceed.

AMENDMENT NO. 181

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the barge tax)

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, at the conclusion of my remarks I will be sending to the desk my amendment that provides that it is the sense of the Senate that the inland barge fuel taxes should not be increased beyond those increases already scheduled in current law and nothing in this resolution should be considered to assume such a tax or fee.

First of all, Madam President, I would like to thank Senator SASSER

for his help and for his leadership in working with me on getting this amendment drafted and offering it today.

Madam President, there is a proposal that was offered by the White House to increase the inland waterways fuel tax, properly known in rural America as the barge tax, by 525 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I am informed that technically you have no time under the Domenici amendment. The amendment is offered. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, proposes an amendment numbered 181.

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

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE BARGE TAX.

It is the sense of the Senate that the revenue figures set forth in this resolution does not assume an increase in inland barge fuel taxes beyond those increases already scheduled in current law and nothing in this resolution should be considered to assume such a tax or fee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, again I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. WELLSTONE, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, and there may be others.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator be kind enough to add me as a cosponsor? I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor.

Mr. HARKIN. And Senator NICKLES also as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, this sense of the Senate says the inland barge fuel tax should not be increased beyond those increases already scheduled in current law; that nothing in this resolution should be considered to assume such a tax or a fee.

Madam President, again I say there was a proposal to increase the inland waterways fuel tax, which is obviously known as the barge tax, by 525 percent. Under current law, the tax is scheduled to increase by 19 cents a gallon in 1994. This new proposal would add one whole dollar per gallon on top of that totaling $1.19 per gallon by 1997. I do not imagine too many people outside rural America are too concerned about barge taxes. It is not exactly a household word and I am sure not discussed over the dinner table very often. In fact in the Midwest, the success or the failure of hundreds of thousands of households could hinge on the outcome of this decision. Again, I think it is worth a few minutes of our time to reconsider the impact of this proposed tax.

In America today, barges transport 15 percent of the Nation's freight, including more than half of U.S. grain bound for export, a fourth of coal deliveries and about a third of petroleum shipments bound for export. So if the case is such that the barge industry will be put in peril by this new tax, then just think what would happen to the transportation of these goods on our highways. If you think there are a lot of trucks on our highways now, you have not seen anything until we do away with the barge industry in this country.

In 1989, over 1.28 billion bushels of corn were shipped by barge. That is equal to the entire corn production of Kansas, Ohio, Michigan, and Indiana all combined. Wheat is about half that amount. The farmers and shippers rely on these barges because the relatively low cost of shipping by barge helps them stay competitive in the global market. But with a 525-percent increase in the barge tax, that competitive edge would end. Just to cite a few examples, by 1997, the per-ton fuel cost of grain shipped to gulf ports from Pekin, IL, would rise from the current $1.71 per ton to $3.99 per ton. From Dubuque, IA, it would go from $2.35 a ton to $5.47 a ton and from St. Paul, MN, it would go from $3.13 a ton to $7.33 a ton.

Fuel costs of a typical barge movement on the Mississippi River would increase by $70,000. This is hardly the path to economic competitiveness. Again, this is barge traffic that goes to our ports of exit so that our products can be transported overseas and sold in foreign markets.

Here is how the so-called barge tax would shake out. First of all, the price of grain is set in the world marketplace based on supply and demand, which means that not much of the increased costs of the inland waterways fuel tax can be passed on to foreign buyers. So faced with this increased cost, it will be passed on to the barge companies who operate the barges. They cannot pay it. And I will ask unanimous consent, Madam President, to print an article in the RECORD recently in the Washington Post dated March 12 in which the chairman of the head of one barge company said that the increase in the taxes would be more than their pretax profits. So how can you tax someone more than what they even make? That means if you do that they might have to shut their doors. Most of these barge lines would have to shut their doors simply because the pretax profits of the industry would be less than the taxes they have to pay and they would have difficulty passing the tax on to their customers. You talk about a confiscatory tax, this is a confiscatory tax. I know that no one intended to do that. But that really is the result of it. I tend to think that those who may have proposed this tax did not fully look at the barge industry and what this tax would mean.

So since the barge companies cannot pay this tax, what do they do with it? They cannot pass it on to the foreign buyers because we compete on supply and demand in the marketplace, so what would happen is they would try to pass it on to the grain elevators that deliver the grain to the barges. A fraction of a cent either way for them could mean success or failure in the market. The grain elevators would try to pass it right back to you know who, the farmer. A 1985 study by the Department of Agriculture found that 70 percent of such costs, in terms of shipping, would indeed be passed on to the farmer. The National Grain and Feed Association estimates that the administration's current proposal would reduce the price farmers receive for grain by about 7 cents a bushel for grain that is shipped from my State of Iowa to the gulf for export. Other States would be more, some less of course depending on how close they are to the ports.

For many farmers in my State, that 7 cents would be the difference between making a profit or taking a loss, between keeping a farm or losing a farm.

Madam President, right now grain prices are about as low as they have ever been, not only in corn but also in wheat. All told the $1 tax would cost farmers about $431 million a year which would be devastating. The prices would go down and at the same time, costs for inputs like fertilizer would go up. In the end part of the bill would be picked up by the taxpayers in the form of higher deficiency payments to farmers. And, the farmers' grain would simply no longer be shipped by barge in many cases. Volume shipped by barge would go down.

So, Madam President, a 525-percent increase in a barge tax is confiscatory. It is strongly opposed by a wide array of agricultural groups, including the National Grain and Feed Association, the National Corn Growers Association, the American Soybean Association, the National Association of Wheat Growers, the Agricultural Retailers Association, the American Corn Millers Federation, the American Feed Industry Association, the National Agricultural Chemicals Association, and many more that I will not read but I will put them in the RECORD. Not to mention the many coal and barge organizations. I am just listing the agricultural ones.

They oppose it because they know the devastating impact this would have on rural America.

The Joint Tax Committee estimates that this proposal would raise $329 million in revenues in 1998, but those assumptions I believe, do not fully reflect the reality that many shippers will be priced out of the market, barge traffic will fall and revenues will fall far short of the projections.

For example, if the barge owner to whom I just referred who was in the Washington Post article, if his taxes are indeed more than his pretax profits, there is no way he can operate; he

is out of business. So the assumptions used to say there will be more revenues from that shipper are totally fallacious because there will not be any revenues because he will be out of business. That is what a 525-percent increase in the barge tax will get us.

The direct result will be an underutilization of barge transport which is our most energy-efficient form of transportation. There are those who say maybe we do not get all the user fees and things out of the barges. But again I remind Senators that we have developed this system of locks and dams on our major waterways not only for the purpose of barge use but for the purpose of flood control, for the purpose of recreation, and for other purposes.

Madam President, I can tell you in my own State and all the States up and down the Mississippi River, those locks and dams have saved million, I would say billions of dollars in property damage, avoided property damage because of the flood control aspects of those locks and dams.

Now, if you can get another use out of those, which is the barge traffic, all the better. And so to those who talk about this, I say you have to look at the other aspects of the locks and dams. We have the dams there anyway because we have to control the floods, we have to have some release point for the water. We have a shared use for flood control, recreation, and for barge traffic also.

So once you assume that we are going to have to control floods—which we have done and which I think, as I said, has saved us literally billions of dollars—then why not use the facility that you have for the most energy-efficient form of transportation, which is to float those barges down river and get them to ports of exit so that we can ship those goods overseas and be competitive in the foreign marketplace.

So again this tax would cause an underutilization of an already existing transportation network that we have developed and built up in this country over the last 200 years.

Madam President, Iowans and I am sure people in Oklahoma or Washington State or Illinois or Minnesota or anywhere else, Tennessee, do not mind paying their fair share to make America a better and stronger country. We are willing to sacrifice. We have sacrificed many times before. The 1990 farm bill cut the commodity programs by 25 percent. The President's program cuts another 11 percent. On top of that, we have the new Btu tax being proposed that adds about 8 cents a gallon for diesel fuel. And then finally you add a $1 per gallon barge tax scheduled increase on top of the 19 cents to be charged in 1994—what we have is a confiscatory tax.

We are willing to pay our fair share, but a 525-percent increase to the barge tax on top of all the other sacrifices that rural America is making is not fair and it does not make sense.

I urge the administration to reconsider this proposal. This is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that basically says the figures in the budget resolution do not in fact assume that there is a barge tax, an inland water tax increase of a dollar, and that there would be no increase assumed over and above the amounts that are already in law which is 19 cents a gallon by 1994.

Madam President, I yield such time as she may require to the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KOHL). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY].

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Chair. I thank my colleague from Iowa for offering this very important amendment.

I rise in support of the amendment on the inland waterway user fee. I know that the inland waterways are some of the most heavily subsidized forms of transportation in our country. The taxpayers have paid to construct and maintain them and the people who operate on them should pay to use them. However, I have strong reservations about the way this user fee is levied at this time.

My primary concern is that it is poor policy for the environment and for energy conservation. A major emphasis in the overall budget is for environmental cleanup and energy conservation. To clean up our air and conserve energy, it is important that we support clean modes of transportation such as barges.

On the contrary, the proposed tax in this budget would increase energy consumption by forcing our farmers to ship their wheat on trucks. Another concern I have is that the budget cuts be fair and equitable. The proposed fuel tax on inland waterway users does not meet that test.

As my colleague from Iowa stated, it would impose an increase of 525 percent on the current inland waterway fuel tax. This would hurt Washington's farmers. It would hurt our barge operators. Some 85 percent of Washington's soft white wheat is exported, and our farmers depend on the Columbia River to ship their wheat, peas, lentils, and other crops overseas. Combined with the proposed Btu tax and cutbacks in agriculture generally, we would be asking people in eastern Washington to make an unfair sacrifice in this budget-cutting effort.

Mr. President, I did not support cutting the user fees in the Budget Committee because the amendment offered there was not equitable. It would have sought offsets in the account in which the Public Law 480 program and the Export-Import Bank are funded. This would hurt our farmers as well as our aerospace workers who are facing a time when more than 20,000 Boeing employees will be laid off. I do not think we should be cutting one account in order to help someone else. But the amendment in front of us today is a good amendment.

I thank my colleague from Iowa for offering it, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment today.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. SASSER. Will the Senator from Iowa yield me about 5 minutes?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield whatever time the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee requires.

Mr. SASSER. I thank my friend from Iowa.

Mr. President, frankly, I want to express my sense of support for the sense-of-the-Senate amendment offered by my friend from Iowa and ably cosponsored by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY], on the proposed inland waterways fee. It just makes sense.

Let me say at the outset that I share the concerns of my friend from Iowa regarding the undesirable impact that this proposal would have on the inland waterway industry and the agricultural sector which relies so heavily on our waterways for delivery of its products.

The truth is that the proposed increase in the tax to be levied against inland waterway operators does, I think, impose an unfair burden on one industry.

This proposal recommends increasing the tax on fuel used by these operators by a whopping 525 percent over 5 years, as has been alluded to here earlier. Now, to increase the tax that sharply I think would be unwise both from an economic and equity standpoint. Frankly, I've been told that perhaps this thing went further than some in the White House really fully realized at the outset.

It seems quite clear to me that such a dramatic rise in the tax level would unfairly punish one of our most efficient transportation modes. It could lead, I fear, to the eventual financial failure of many members of the waterway industry.

As my colleague from Iowa has so clearly pointed out, this proposal would have a most undesirable impact on the agricultural sector as well as on the coal industry—two sectors of our economy which have a history of export success in the world markets. Of course, we do not want to do anything that will diminish our competitiveness in world markets at this particular time when we have such an unfavorable balance of trade. It is estimated that such a steep rise in the tax would increase the cost of export coal and grain by as much as $3 a ton.

Now, I need to be candid with my colleagues. Industry in my own State of Tennessee relies heavily on inland waterways. Major companies that use the waterways in my State have indicated

to me that they are willing to support the President's budget. They are willing to support the President's proposal. But they think this goes too far. They say they are willing to do their fair share. Some of the owners of these companies have called me saying they want to do their fair share in getting the country's economic house in order. They say as barge operators they are willing to support the Btu tax, for example. But they quite properly draw the line on this new tax that we have before us because no single industry should have to absorb so dramatic a rise in its costs as the one that would occur if the proposed inland waterway user fee were put into effect.

So I conclude that the sense-of-the-Senate—that is what it is—resolution offered by my colleague from Iowa first makes it clear that the Senate will neither limit nor change the revenue number of the budget resolution reconciled with the Finance Committee. In other words, this will not reduce the overall deficit thrust of the President's package.

What the amendment does is, it clearly puts the Senate on record in opposition to this increased tax, which would have such a disproportionately adverse impact on one of the most important transportation sectors used by a wide variety of industries all across the Nation.

This is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution which says the Senate wishes and desires that the Finance Committee look elsewhere to raise these revenues other than by an increased waterways tax.

It in no way diminishes the overall deficit reduction thrust of this budget resolution before us. And the Finance Committee, if it follows the dictates of the Senate and if this amendment passes—I hope and I believe in good conscience—will look elsewhere for these additional revenues other than by levying an inland waterways tax, at least to the extent that it is assumed here in this budget resolution.

I thank the Senator from Iowa for yielding.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, again I want to thank Senator SASSER, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, for his kind remarks, for his support for this amendment, and for his help and leadership in assuring that we were able to draft the proposed amendment that would put us on record here in the Senate as saying that we want the Finance Committee to basically not impose this kind of a barge tax on us.

I think the Senate is going to speak with a very strong voice on this, Mr. President, because this would be a devastating tax.

The Senator from Washington State, I think, said it best when she talked about how it would impact her people in Washington State, and what it means in terms of the impact on our ability to sell our goods and products overseas in a competitive market.

The Senator from Washington has been most helpful. I appreciate her help and her support in pulling this amendment together and getting support for it.

Again, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee for all of his help and for his support on this amendment.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. President, I would like to inquire of the Senator from Iowa whether he proposes to ask for a rollcall on this issue. If he does, I defer to him on that account.

If not, I will do so myself.

Mr. HARKIN. The Senator, I know, is also a strong supporter, and I know he is about to speak on this, because he has worked on this issue himself. Again, I want to thank him for his support and for his interest in this amendment.

I would defer to the Senator. If the distinguished chairman wants a rollcall vote, we could discuss it.

Mr. SASSER. It appears we will have a rollcall anyway, because if my friend from Iowa does not ask for the yeas and nays, then it is obvious the Senator from Washington will.

Mr. GORTON. I simply wanted to defer to the sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. I appreciate the Senator's kindness. Yes; I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator for his kindness.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am delighted to agree wholeheartedly—on my own behalf, for the Republican members of the Budget Committee, and I believe for every Senator on this side of the aisle—with the distinguished Senator from Iowa, and to express our support for his proposal.

It is a very good one. It is one which ought to be adopted. I will say toward the end of these remarks that we will have a better one later on the same subject, but that in no way lessens our agreement with the views which have been expressed by the Senator from Iowa.

In fact, of course, the campaign to get rid of perhaps the single most iniquitous tax, certainly the most iniquitous relatively small tax in this bill, started with the Members from this side of the Chamber in the debate in the Senate Budget Committee just last Thursday.

We felt at that time that this proposal was on its deathbed. It is breathing very shallowly now. Even though this may be a deathbed conversion on the part of the Members on the other side who voted unanimously against taking this tax out of the proposal last Thursday, they are nonetheless welcome to this cause.

The whole issue, Mr. President, gives a magnificent illustration of the lack of attention paid by certain elements in the administration to the way in which this budget was put together. It was a gratifying surprise, on the morning after a proposal like this, though more enforceable, was turned down on a party-line vote last Thursday, that the Washington Post had a principal article in its Business section on this subject bitterly criticizing the proposal, and discovering that it was a proposal that had no parentage. No one in the administration, in the Office of Management and Budget, no one up to the level of the President of the United States himself, would claim to be the author or to have thought up the idea that we should increase by 525 percent the fuel tax on the use of our inland waterways.

The President himself was quoted as saying, and I am reading his quote:

> I am not sure that, the way the structure, the plan, was originally designed, that it was supposed to go up that much. I think that should be reexamined.

That is a direct quote from the President of the United States.

The group of Senators on the other side of the aisle now see it the way in which the President did, the way in which we saw it on the day on which this budget proposal was made in the first place.

It is a particularly important illustration because this is not a major portion of the budget. If this tax were imposed, and if it had absolutely no impact on the use of our inland waterways—which, of course, would not be true—it would be devastating to the companies in this field, and greatly decrease the use of waterways. But if it got the full amount that it was supposed to get, shown in the budget resolution, it would amount to $800 million; that is to say, less than $1 billion out of the $295 billion in net new tax increases included in this budget.

Yet, the proponents of this sense-of-the-Senate resolution now recognize how devastating it would be. As modest as it is with respect to the numbers we bandied around in this Chamber, it is far more than the total profit of all of the inland waterways companies in the United States—far more than that entire profit.

The Post article last Saturday quotes one of the eastern barge lines as saying that this is some 3.5 times as great as its annual profit. One of the organizations in my own State, the largest barge line on the Columbia River, re-

ported to me very early, within 48 hours after the proposal, that the cost to it would be far greater than its annual profit; and, of course, it would make it uncompetitive with respect to many of the commodities which it carried.

Its impact on the agricultural community is almost as serious, particularly on that portion of the agricultural community which uses waterways for transportation to ports for export overseas. Most of the agricultural produce which would be affected by this charge is produce which is designed to be sold at export overseas, in competition with wheat and other commodities from other States.

This would add, of course, to the cost of selling that wheat. It would make us less competitive when we already compete with heavy foreign subsidies, from Canada and the European Community. It would reduce sales of wheat overseas. It would, as the distinguished Senator from Iowa has said, add to the cost of agricultural supports for unsold and otherwise lower priced wheat, corn, and many other supported commodities.

It is, in other words, a very mistaken notion that you can take an industry which pays now an average of 60 cents a gallon for the fuel which it uses and add well over $1 to the already existing tax on that fuel and not have a devastating effect on that form of transportation, not have a devastating effect on the customers of that form of transportation. It was simply an idea that should never have appeared in the budget in the first place, and it is a delight to see that it is now going to be abandoned. That is most gratifying, and we certainly agree.

In fact, this form of transportation is perhaps the most environmentally benign form of transportation by which we move commodities from one place to another. This is a very efficient form. It uses fewer gallons of fuel per-ton-mile moved than perhaps any other form of transportation. It does it in a way that produces relatively little pollution and, obviously, no traffic jams on our highways or with respect to our railroads.

So there is now unanimity on the floor of the Senate, as far as this Senator can determine, that this tax should not be imposed.

That leads us to the final question and the only quarrel or caveat that I have with the way in which this proposal is set up. Unlike the amendment which was rejected in the Senate Budget Committee, this proposal is a pure sense-of-the-Senate resolution. It has no real impact on the guts, the substance of the budget resolution, no impact, of course, on the House of Representatives, which I understand has not taken this tax out of its budget proposal. It is a mere statement of sentiment on the part of the Members of this body, as far as we can tell at this point.

Moreover, even though it is less than 1 billion dollars' worth of this budget over a 5-year period, the implication is that it will be paid for by taxing someone else $800 million more. Even with total gross taxes of close to $360 billion, even with net taxes of $295 billion, the sponsors of this amendment could not find it in their hearts to lower spending by less than $1 billion, thereby making this a true amendment to the budget resolution, changing figures, cutting spending to this amount, cutting taxes to this amount. But the clear implication—as a matter of fact, the necessity—if we do nothing more than to pass this amendment is that some other poor group in the United States of America is going to have to come up with the $800 million that will not be levied against the users of our waterways.

The proposal which we made and which was rejected in the Budget Committee said merely, let us take it out of one of the three departments which the President did not subject to administrative cuts—to the State Department. What was the answer of the other side? It will not come out of the State Department. If you take it out of that function, it will come out of aid to Israel, or it will come out of the Export-Import Bank, or it will come out of some absolutely vital function of Government. What an abysmal failure of faith in President Clinton that argument represents.

To think that the Democrats would say that this President would not cut any of the bureaucracy out of the State Department at all, but would take this right out of programs vital to the United States of America. That is certainly not a lack of faith which this side would have shown in a Republican President had we gotten the same kind of proposition.

In order, however, to remove any concern that this might come out of such programs as that, later on in the course of this debate, we will offer a formal amendment to this budget resolution lowering both the tax side and the spending side by the amount of money of this user fee, taking it out of the general increases, the hundreds of billions of dollars of increases in domestic spending and giving an instruction that this tax is not to be a part of the ultimate budget.

So people on this vote are getting to vote their sentiment. And we fully agree with the sentiment expressed by the Senator from Iowa. But we do need to put the Senate on notice that it will get an opportunity, really, to get rid of this tax later by getting rid of a modest $800 million of spending rather than simply adding another $800 million of taxes on the backs of the American people.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. GORTON. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank Senator GORTON for managing this part of the bill and for his superb work on the Budget Committee. He has been of invaluable help. The Budget Committee on our side worked as hard as we ever have, and that is a testament to each one of the Republican Senators. I find them freely expressing themselves on the floor, because I think they truly have participated and understand precisely what is going on.

Having said that, this particular amendment, although it is a sense of the Senate and really carries no real effect, points up one thing: If you put your heart to it and put your soul to it and put your thinking cap to it, you can find a direct relationship between taxes and loss of jobs. We keep getting asked: What are you talking about, Republicans? You say $295 billion in new taxes is going to cost jobs. This is a great example. This one, we can pinpoint, to go from 19 cents a gallon to $1.19 a gallon, clearly proves the case that you can tax a business enough so they either go out of business, or they do not produce jobs.

So I rise to tell those who are listening that is exactly what is happening to American business in this whole budget, in this entire economic recovery plan. By the time we are finished putting on the energy tax, the marginal rate tax increases on small businesses, an increase in corporate taxes, how in the world can business respond with more jobs? It is impossible. It is sort of like this: You are starting to say you cannot make enough money, so maybe you do not hire anybody. That is what worries me when I say I cannot support the President's plan, as much as I would like to support the President, because I think when we are finished, we have more Government and more taxes, and I fail to understand how that is a plan for economic prosperity or recovery.

Some think we ought to tax and spend because the Government will create all of these good things so America will have jobs. Frankly, I do not believe that. I do not believe it has anything significant to do with whether the American economy grows that we spend $124 billion more in new programs in the name of restraining the deficit.

Having said that, let me suggest that I know a little bit about the barge tax. They very first bill I ever passed, Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate was the first inland barge user fee. Obviously, I am from New Mexico, and we do not have many barges or inland waterways, but it was a great cause. It took me forever to get it done against all kinds of odds, but it was right. It was a little tiny tax. And even then we were worried about the impact on the business community that uses the inland system and its dikes and dams for commerce.

I think it was less than 10 cents and implemented over time.

So I compliment my friend and the other Senators who are going to take to the floor and do it not by way of a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. We will all vote for that. But then we are going to offer one to take that $1 billion tax right out of this and may provide for that cost by cutting some Government spending someplace. That will be a test of whether we want a barge industry or not.

I will limit whatever time so we can move on to the next one.

I appreciate the Senator's comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington and thank him for leadership on this issue. I am proud to have been a cosponsor of the amendment offered in the Budget Committee to take out this tax. I also thank my friend from Iowa, because he and I come from a part of the country where we really do understand the importance of a healthy barge industry.

I want to express my appreciation to the Senator from New Mexico as well. We can tell him what barge traffic means. I also would agree with him very strongly on the broader point that I tried to make earlier today on the Senate floor.

Imposing taxes on business activities has an impact. I cited this morning the impact of the so-called luxury tax on boats. As we all regrettably know, that tax did not raise revenues. It stopped people from buying the boats. The wealthy people who could have bought the boats either did not buy or bought abroad. As a result, we did not get the revenues we expected from the tax on luxury boats, but what we got was significant and deeply troubling unemployment among those who had built the finest boats in the world.

This inland waterways fee is another example of what can happen if we impose unthinking burdens of taxation on economic activities.

I spent Monday morning in Kansas City, MO, meeting with representatives of the terminals, the barge industry, and agriculture. The people from agriculture were telling me about the burden that this would impose on the farmers. Some say 7 to 8 cents, others say as high as 10 to 12 cents per bushel more for transportation to take a bushel of corn or a bushel of soybeans down the river to New Orleans for export.

Let me tell you something about the market for agricultural crops. A farmer cannot go to the buyer in the export market and say: Excuse me. They just increased my fuel tax, or inland waterway user fee, by 525 percent. So if you will just give me that extra dime on the bushel of corn or bushel of soybeans I can break even. Obviously, this does not happen. Farmers do not control the market. Thus, this tax comes right out of the farmers' pocket.

The Mississippi River system which is comprised of the Missouri, Ohio, Arkansas, and Illinois Rivers is the core of about 25,000 miles of inland and intercoastal waterways, and they annually transport almost 1 billion tons of raw materials involved.

I am advised that under the original proposal, the 525-percent increase, the dollar increase in tax, the fuel cost per ton for grain shipments from St. Paul, MN; Quincy and Pekin, IL; Dubuque, IA, to the gulf would increase by 130 percent, 126 percent, and 125 percent. Over half of all grain destined for the overseas markets is shipped by barge. Overall, agricultural products comprise nearly 35 percent of all products moving on inland waterways.

The cost of this tax, if the barge companies stayed in operation and if they could continue to operate, would be very severe on agriculture. It would hit the farmer in the pocketbook. The family farmer trying to earn a living for his and her family would pay. But let us not make any mistake about it. They would not be in business.

My colleague from Washington has already pointed out that this would put the barge companies out of business with all those jobs lost, and no revenue from the waterway fees. That is why I think it is vitally important that we not only support this resolution, but I look forward to joining with my colleague from Washington to put specifics in this resolution that will take that fee out, because we cannot afford it. We cannot afford to impose mindless taxes which are going to take away jobs we badly need.

I appreciate our Budget Committee leader's admonition that we need to get on about the business, as I could say many more things.

I only say thanks to my colleague from Iowa and my colleague from Washington for their leadership on this issue.

I urge the strongest support from the Members of this side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle on this resolution, and then again ask please help us when Senator GORTON and I move specifically to take out this tax and related spending items in a later amendment which we will offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, I join with Senator HARKIN and others in supporting this amendment. I hope that when we come to a real vote on real tax cuts we have more than just a sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

As to this particular fivefold increase in taxes, you picture yourselves in any business and you are paying a dime, suddenly you are going to pay 50 cents; or you're paying 19 cents and suddenly you are going to pay $1.19 for the use of one factor, oil, or diesel, for transportation, and you realize what it does to your costs.

Mr. President, you used to be able to barge on the Columbia River in Portland, OR, no farther than the Dalles River, about 180 miles upriver, and then there was a large falls and that was the end of navigation. Today, you can barge to Lewiston, ID, about 400 miles. There are ports along the Oregon and Washington side of the Columbia River. Lewiston, ID, is a port.

We export out of Oregon and Washington 90 percent of all the wheat that we grow. It is a very soft, white wheat, very desirable in the world, and we are very fortunate that we have been very successful in competing in world markets. A great deal of credit goes to the wheat growers. Forty years ago they levied a charge on themselves to open up offices overseas to attempt to sell their wheat and they were successful.

If we pass this inland waterway tax, and that is what it is, you will drive Oregon and Washington wheat out of international markets. You are not going to collect the money you hope to raise on this fee. You are simply going to draw people off the rivers and drive us out of world markets.

I have talked to the Pacific Northwest Water Association, Port of Portland, and the wheat growers. There is not a man or woman depending on that river who supports this.

I am not experienced with the Midwest waterway system. I doubt you can find anybody in Oklahoma who supports this. They can barge all the way from Tulsa, almost 800 miles, to the mouth of the Mississippi south. There is no one, from the mouth of the Mississippi to Minnesota, that supports this.

If you want to cripple an industry, if you want to cause layoffs and unemployment, if you want to drive us out of world markets, go ahead and vote to increase this tax from roughly 20 cents to $1.20, and you will succeed in hurting our balance of payments, in causing unemployment, in causing all of the misfortune that we claim we do not want to cause.

For all those reasons, and many more, I support the Senator from Iowa and I ask unanimous consent that a letter to Senator PACKWOOD from the director of the Port of Portland be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORT OF PORTLAND,
Portland, OR, March 5, 1993.

Hon. ROBERT PACKWOOD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: I want to call your attention to the important issue of how the Administration's proposed $1 per gallon waterway fuel tax increase would hurt the Pacific Northwest. The Port of Portland believes we have a public responsibility to address policy issues affecting the communities and customers we serve. While the proposal is yet to be spelled out completely, this much is known: the added $1 per gallon charge, to be phased in over four years on top of the current 17 cent charge, would mean a more than five-fold increase in this fuel tax. For each gallon of diesel fuel used on the inland water transportation system, the net effect would be a 108 percent jump.

Our Columbia/Snake River water transportation system is central to the success Oregon exporters have enjoyed in world markets. Yet, the five-fold increase in fuel costs proposed by the Administration would undoubtedly mean lost export markets. This is so because our customers compete against producers in other nations. These competitors will not be facing a similar tax. The result: foreign buyers will turn to producers outside the U.S. if domestic operators try to pass this price increase along. To remain competitive, domestic producers will be forced to absorb this cost internally or pass it along to their U.S. customers. Because our waterways move such large volumes of farm products, raw materials, and other commodities, this huge increase in taxes would reverberate through the economy of the region as well as the nation.

Estimates of revenue to be raised by this tax hike are $820 million over four years. That expectation is unrealistic. The real impact will be to force commerce off the river. As that happens, fewer gallons of diesel will be consumed. Thus, the anticipated tax benefits will not materialize.

The Port of Portland urges you to consider seriously the adverse impact such a tax proposal would have on our regional economy. First, the customers of the Port who use the waterways to compete effectively in competitive international markets would feel the cost escalation immediately. Their ability to compete, and help keep the U.S. trade deficit from deeping, would be diminished. The second impact would be higher prices passed along to Pacific Northwest consumers buying gasoline, electricity, building materials, food, and the like that move on the water transportation system. This proposed fuel tax would come on top of the existing tax and the proposed BTU tax, which would add another 8.5 cents to the cost of a gallon of fuel. All this amounts to a double shot at the water transportation industry. Already, according to industry analysts, fuel costs amount to 25 percent of the operating expenses of the barge industry. By comparison, fuel represents about 20 percent of operating expenses for trucks and only 6.7 percent of expenses for rail.

Finally, in justifying this higher tax, the Office of Management and Budget is claiming that waterways were built for "commercial navigation beneficiaries" so they should pay all operating and maintenance costs. Not so. Most rivers, particularly those in the Pacific Northwest, were improved for a variety of public interests, including flood protection, water supply and hydropower, as well as navigation. Even then, the federal government provides only in-channel improvements, while other entities such as ports and private interests provide docks, terminals, and elevators essential to the transportation system.

We all must do our share in helping to solve the nation's economic problems, but this plan would create substantial new economic difficulties. A better than five-fold increase in the fuel tax on the Columbia/Snake River system would erect a new trade barrier, leaving many of our customers unable to compete in their world markets. From the standpoint of world trade, this plan would endanger U.S. exports at a time when we most need them. From the standpoint of fostering economic growth, this plan would be counterproductive.

Again, we stand ready to discuss how to fund the operation and maintenance of our river system. I hope this information is useful to you and your staff. Let me know if I can supply additional information on this proposal.

Yours very truly,

MIKE THORNE,
Executive Director.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I hope that the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee will have a moment to hear what I have to say.

I rise simply as the chairman of the Committee on Finance and to note that the concurrent resolution before us, in a terse five lines, asks the Committee on Finance to raise taxes by $294 billion over the next 5 years.

We will be making history if that happens, Mr. President. It will be the largest tax increase in the history of public finance in the United States or anywhere else in the world.

This is the President's program, and I for one am committed to it. But I do observe that the first measure we have on the floor with the concurrent budget resolution is to say "but not this tax," and you cannot have been 17 years in the Finance Committee, as I have been, or many more, as my distinguished friend from Oregon who has just spoken has, sometimes as chairman. I refer to him as the once—and—future chairman, because if we do not get the President's program through he will be the chairman next.

Mr. PACKWOOD. I hope if we do get it through.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I see he says "I hope we get it through." I agree with him. Everybody is for the tax revenues in general but not my tax.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, if my friend will yield for a moment, I do not want as he paraphrased my quote to appear in the RECORD. I did not say that. I said if we do get it through I will be the chairman of the Finance Committee again.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I confess to have been somewhat surprised. We are all for increasing revenues but not this tax.

Mr. President, this tax is specifically provided for in an appendix page 139 of "A Vision of Change for America."

I do know that when in New Orleans the President was questioned about this—I would have to assume it was March 11; it was reported in the Washington Post on the 12th—and when asked about it President Clinton in the Post story says:

Clinton himself has suggested that the proposed tax was not supposed to have been that stiff.

"I'm not sure that the way that the structure, the plan, was originally designed, that it was supposed to go up that much," Clinton told an interviewer with WWL-TV in New Orleans. "I think that should be reexamined," he added.

Well, yes, that is possible.

It is clear, of course, that in the budget resolution, no taxes of any kind are specified. There is no "this tax" or "that tax."

I thank the Budget Committee for having avoided any obiter dicta, as lawyers say, saying, "Well, maybe, just in case nothing comes to mind, you can think about this tax or that tax."

We have the largest tax increase in history. The first time the President was presented with a specific, in a context where it was relevant locally, he said, "Well, I am not sure about that tax."

And the first resolution we raise on this floor is to say, "Not that tax."

Well, if that is the way it goes, that is the end of the program. That will be the end of the program.

I regret to say that, but this is a pattern of unraveling that just begins. It does not take much to start unraveling. And here we are, without even having gone to conference, already saying, "Not this tax." Not my tax; not your tax.

As that wonderful Finance chairman Russell Long used to say: "Don't tax you, don't tax me, tax that fellow behind the tree."

If this is the beginning, then also, Mr. President, it marks the end.

I do not want to object, because it is a very sharp rise. I do not know why it is suggested that the idea came from the Congressional Budget Office. It never comes from the sponsoring agency. Maybe it was a typographical error, although the numbers did add up.

I put the Senate on record: We are going to have to make history by the largest set of tax increases—we will call them revenue enhancers, or what you will, but taxes—and we better be ready for it.

I can well understand the Senators from Washington, who spoke so well on this subject; and the reference of the Senator from Oregon to wheat exports is no doubt correct.

I ask for 1 more minute.

Mr. HARKIN. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator.

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I would say to my friend from Missouri, who mentioned earlier the 25,000 mile inland waterway system of the Ohio, Missouri, and Mississippi systems, that

is the greatest river transportation system in the world. Longest and perhaps not as dramatic as the Columbia River, but of equal importance to both of us.

Every penny of those waterways was paid for and built by tax money. That is not the way the Lord made the Northern United States, the Columbia River Valley, the Ohio River Valley, the Missouri and the Mississippi. That is the price of Government. We are learning it in these days.

Mr. President, I do not wish to cause anxiety, but I want to say that if we cannot face up to revenues—and I understand that this may have been a mistake or, in any event, has been disavowed. Fine. I would like to make clear that nothing that happens on this floor binds the Finance Committee, in any way. I want to make clear I would be perfectly sympathetic to any specifics about why this should be adjusted or that should be adjusted, and we have a long list of those taxes.

But I want to say, if we are going to get to $294 billion, we will not do it at this rate.

I do not wish to speak any longer. I thank my able and learned friend from Iowa. Nothing is more important than the inland water traffic. In the Subcommittee on Water Resources, of which I happen to be chairman, I am specifically responsible for it.

We have had a water bill every 2 years now since 1986, after a 15-year interruption. The whole history of civilization is the history of the development of river valleys and their use for transportation.

But, keep this up and the President's program is in jeopardy. Once may be a necessary exercise; twice begins the unraveling of a great and necessary plan.

I thank the Chair. I thank my friend from Iowa.

Mr. SASSER. Will the distinguished Senator yield to me?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, I think, raises a very valid point today, as he always does.

At some point, the Finance Committee is going to have this burden thrust upon it. It is going to be the problem of the distinguished chairman and ranking member and the members of that Finance Committee to follow the admonitions in this budget resolution. And I certainly do not wish to make his formidable task any more daunting than it already is.

I certainly agree with him that what is said on the floor of this Senate by way of a sense-of-the-Senate resolution or what is said in this budget resolution about options with regard to raising revenues are not in any way binding on the Finance Committee.

The distinguished chairman and the members of his committee are free to work their will on the revenue measures as they emerge from the committee. Of that, there can be no doubt.

I am hopeful that once we have corrected what we perceive to be an error, an oversight, here and expressed our views on it, then from here on out we will move the President's package in its entirety.

The statement of the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee about waterways and how they are paid for is not lost on a Senator from Tennessee.

I well remember when I first came to the U.S. Senate, the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee—at that time the junior Senator from New York—said, good humoredly to me one day: "You know, there would not be a Tennessee Valley Authority if we in New York had not paid for it."

And there was a large element of truth in that. Because back in the 1930's, the mid-1930's, when those in my area of the country lived in dread—with the floods that came and washed over their land and swept away their homes and killed their livestock; when they lived there in darkness or by the flickering light of a candle or a kerosene lantern—the capital or the resources were not present in the Tennessee Valley in those days to build a Tennessee Valley Authority, with its great hydroelectric dams, or to construct the waterways and tame the wild rivers of that area.

But the capital of the affluent States, such as New York, so ably represented by my distinguished friend here today, was utilized by a man of great vision. And President Franklin Roosevelt and his administration, working in tandem with a Congress, decided to make some investments in the Tennessee Valley area and in countless other areas all across this country. And I daresay Iowa was lighted by the Rural Electrification Administration. It was largely paid for with dollars coming out of affluent States like New York.

So I just want to say to my great friend from New York, I hear what he is saying today. And, once again, we have a President, I think, who is willing to make investments in the future of our country just as President Franklin Delano Roosevelt made those investments in the 1930's. We looked to New York and her sister States to help pay for it in those days.

Mr. President, we will be looking to the distinguished senior Senator from New York to help raise the revenues for it this time. I look forward to assisting him in any way I can.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the distinguished chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. If I might also respond to the comments by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, I understand what he is talking about when he talks about unraveling the President's package. Certainly, we do not want to do that.

However, I believe it was perhaps the distinguished Senator from Washington who earlier had a quote from President Clinton when he was in New Orleans. I would repeat that quote as it was printed in the Commercial Appeal on Monday morning, March 8. During a television interview in New Orleans last week, President Clinton gave tugboat operators hope that the huge increase is being reconsidered.

"I think that should be reexamined," Clinton said. "I am not sure that the way the plan was originally designed that it was supposed to go up that much. I don't think there was a deliberate attempt to quintuple it."

So, obviously there perhaps was some—perhaps a mix up between OMB and the White House in terms of what kind of revenue enhancements they were going to use to put together their package. I daresay they did not sufficiently examine the impact it would have on the barge industry and I think now they are going to see that.

So I think the President himself has indicated a willingness to reexamine it.

So I do not think this in any way unravels the package because the President himself has said he would be willing to reexamine this.

I would just again ask my distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee. This is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. As pointed out by the Senator from Washington, my good friend, and others, this is not binding on the Finance Committee. I understand that. But I believe it does give a clear sense to the Finance Committee of what kind of revenues we want and what we do not want here in the Senate. I think that is certainly within our purview, as Senators, to be able to express that to the Finance Committee.

I ask the distinguished chairman this question, though. Comments were made by a couple of the speakers that maybe there should be another amendment offered that would lower the total revenue side of the package and indicate to the Finance Committee that this should be taken out of the proposed levies on the inland barge fuel.

It is my understanding that if this happens, that lowers the total revenue number but still does not bind the Finance Committee in any way to take it out of inland fuels.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. May I respond?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. That would be the case. And I think the administration may wish to address the fact that it is now $800 million short in its revenue plan—or some, whatever. If that increase was more than intended, there is something missing here. But I would

just feel—and I believe this is a question that should be addressed to our learned and able friend from Tennessee—but I certainly hope that does not happen. If you start that, the administration is over before it has begun.

Mr. HARKIN. Again, my point is since this is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that goes to the Finance Committee, we say we should not levy this because we believe it is a confiscatory tax and I have ample proof to show it would be absolutely devastating to the barge owners. But it does not in any way increase the total amounts and put a heavier burden on the chairman of the Finance Committee. It leaves the figures at the total of, I believe, $294 billion—$254 billion.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I can tell you—$294 billion.

Mr. HARKIN. So, again, to adopt an amendment that would lower that figure I think would perhaps cause a lot of problems to the Finance Committee in terms of putting the package together. At least this sense-of-the-Senate resolution—

Mr. MOYNIHAN. May I say, I think the problem would be with the Budget Committee's overall plan. It would be out of balance.

Mr. HARKIN. That is right. But again I would point out to change the numbers would be the same as what the sense-of-the-Senate resolution is. It simply would not bind the Finance Committee to do anything. Is that correct, I ask the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee?

Mr. SASSER. Yes, that is correct. The budget resolution simply sends to the Finance Committee, as the able chairman of the Finance Committee knows as well as I, a number. And then the chairman and his committee fills that revenue number any way that they see fit.

You can make a case that, if a sense-of-the-Senate resolution passes and the Senate goes on record as saying we do not want to raise $750 million over 5 years in inland waterway taxes, then I assume that the chairman and others on the Finance Committee would take that into consideration as they would other things in arriving at the revenue number. And logically you would think the Finance Committee would say: Well, let us look in another direction if we can. Because if we bring our revenue package out with that in it, we are probably going to face a debate on the floor of the Senate over that particular item, and the better part of valor might be to find another way to fill that particular revenue requirement.

But none of this is binding on the distinguished chairman or the Finance Committee. They can do what they wish. And if you did lower the revenue number by $750 million, or whatever this inland waterway tax is supposed to raise—according to my recollection, after CBO got through reestimating it was down to something like $380 million, if I am not mistaken—but if you lowered that number, still that is not binding on the Finance Committee. They can still levy the tax or not levy it. But I would think with a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, if it does pass here, I would expect the distinguished chairman and his committee would take that, along with other factors, into consideration as they arrive at their final package.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Will the Senator yield for one statement?

Mr. HARKIN. Gladly.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I think we may have been talking about two different numbers. I think the very able Senator from Iowa was talking about lowering the number, the amount of moneys to be raised by this particular tax. I was talking about the global amount of revenue the Finance Committee is required to raise.

Inadvertently, you and I did lower it already in our exchange. We must make this correction quickly.

You said the number we have is for $254 billion. In a moment of wishful thinking I agreed. It is $294 billion. It is only $50 billion. If that were agreeable to you, I think there would be many persons who would support the measure but I do not think they would include the distinguished members of the Committee on the Budget.

In any event, I see my colleague's point and he has had his answer from the able Senator.

Mr. HARKIN. The numbers of 294 and 254.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. 294—254. We will make history.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator and thank him for his contributions.

AMENDMENT NO. 181, AS MODIFIED

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator WOFFORD as a cosponsor to the amendment.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that in the fourth line of the amendment, the word "does" be changed to "do."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOXER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. There was an error in the English language. The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

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

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE BARGE TAX.

It is the sense of the Senate that the revenue figures set forth in this resolution do not assume an increase in inland barge fuel taxes beyond those increases already scheduled in current law and nothing in this resolution should be considered to assume such a tax or fee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Madam President, the Senator from New York, without exception when he comes to the floor, exercises our imaginations. I greatly appreciate his contribution to the debate on this issue. This Senator may say, if possible, with respect to one comment, perhaps made inadvertently by the Senator from Iowa, that only in the rarefied atmosphere of the U.S. Senate would lowering the amount of revenues required of the Finance Committee be considered adding to the difficulty of the task of that committee. If, in fact, that statement is true, we on this side of the aisle will attempt to make the task of the Senator from New York absolutely impossible by striking all references.

Nevertheless, there is one difference between the sense-of-the-Senate resolution which will now be adopted and the one which will be offered later. Ours will deal with it by lowering the amount of taxes necessary to be raised. This simply requires other taxes to be substituted for it, the ones which are here.

The Senator from New York was also quite eloquent when he talked about the various subterfuges and names we call taxes. I just wanted to share with him, because I do not believe he was here an hour or so ago when the Senator from New Mexico first used this quote from then Governor Clinton of some 4½ years ago in Newsweek:

There is a lot of evidence you can sell people on tax increases if they think it's an investment.

The Senator from Iowa has proven beyond any doubt that this particular tax increase cannot be sold as an investment.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I will check the record. If I did say that I did misspeak. What I meant to point out is it is not binding on it in any way regarding a specific item. If, in fact, the number is lower, it does not bind them in any way to lower the taxes on the fuel.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Will the Senator yield for one comment?

Mr. HARKIN. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I wanted to make a point to my good friend from Washington that it is elementally clear to me that if a tax increase is an investment, it follows it must be a saving.

Mr. GORTON. Madam President, I think on this amendment, at least, we have completed our debate. The Senator from Iowa has. We will be willing to yield back the remainder of our time on this amendment, not of course on the resolution as a whole.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I have an indication that there are a couple other Senators coming to the floor to speak. I have other comments I would like to make.

Mr. GORTON. I withdraw that observation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, again I want to repeat for the RECORD that this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, I believe, is the strongest signal that we can send to the Finance Committee. If there is a strong vote on this, and the yeas and nays have been requested and there is a sufficient second, then I believe it sends a clear signal to the Finance Committee in coming up with the revenue numbers that if, in fact, they do levy this type of confiscatory tax on the barge industry that there will be a vote on the Senate floor to remove that during voting on the reconciliation bill. So that is why I believe this sense-of-the-Senate resolution is the proper way to go, and I hope we do have a strong vote on it.

To then say, however, we need an amendment after that that would lower the total revenue numbers has no bearing whatsoever on the issue at hand; and that is whether or not we are going to levy this heavy tax burden on the barges. It has no effect on it whatsoever. What it does have an effect on is simply lowering the revenue numbers. That is all.

So I hope people do not misunderstand that. That is a separate issue, separate and aside from whether or not we are going to have a sense-of-the-Senate resolution on the tax itself.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, TN, Monday, March 8; an article from the St. Louis Post Dispatch of February 21; an article from the Houston Chronicle of Friday, February 26, an article from the Washington Post of Friday, March 12 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Memphis (TN) Commercial Appeal, Mar. 8, 1993]

BARGE OWNERS SAY FUEL TAX STINKS

(By Kevin McKenzie and Michael McMullan)

William Sory, owner of Memphis Barge Line Inc., used short, pointed sentences to describe his opinion of a Clinton administration proposal that eventually would raise the fuel tax he pays by 600 percent.

"It stinks," was Sory's initial reaction. "It could put me out, that kind of increase."

His final word: "That's a pretty tough pill to swallow."

Raising the diesel fuel tax paid by inland waterway users from 17 cents a gallon now to $1.19 in four years is part of the economic plan announced by President Clinton Feb. 17.

However, during a television interview in New Orleans last week President Clinton gave towboat operators hope that the huge increase is being reconsidered.

"I think that should be re-examined," Clinton said. "I'm not sure that the way the plan was originally designed, that it was supposed to go up that much. . . . I don't think there was a deliberate attempt to quintuple it."

The proposed fee increase shocked the industry. Those who run companies that tow barges on the Mississippi and other inland rivers say it was the worst news they've heard from the White House since the last time a Democrat was president.

President Jimmy Carter's 15-month embargo on grain sales to the Soviet Union after that nation's invasion of Afghanistan translated into lost business that the barge and towing industry hasn't forgotten. President Ronald Reagan lifted the embargo in April 1981.

"This is kind of like deja vu with the last Democratic president," said Bill Stegbauer, vice president of operations for Memphis-based Southern Towing Co.

The fee increases would be in addition to the Clinton plan to levy a broad-based energy tax, based on the energy content of fuel measured by British Thermal Units (Btus). That energy tax alone would add an additional 8–10 cents a gallon for diesel fuel used by towboats, said Jeffrey Smith, vice president of the The American Waterways Operators, an Arlington, Va.-based trade group representing the industry.

The current 17-cent-a-gallon tax collects only enough to cover half the $430 million spent in 1993 by the Army Corps of Engineers for construction and major rehabilitation of waterways, the Clinton plan said. The fee will rise to 19 cents when the new federal fiscal year begins in October under a previously scheduled increase.

Under the Clinton proposal, the tax hike would collect $820 million in four years. The fee increases would be phased in, beginning with an additional 10 cents this year. Next year, 15 cents would be added, followed by another 20 cents in fiscal 1996. An additional 55 cents, for a total of $1.19, would be added in fiscal 1997, the industry trade group said.

The administration views the increased fees as a replacement for other tax dollars supporting the Corps of Engineers. And, to justify the increase in user fees, the Clinton plan calls the towing and barge industry the nation's most heavily subsidized form of commercial freight transportation.

However, those in the industry contend that others who benefit from waterways don't pay the tax, including farmers who profit from flood control projects and those who use rivers for sport and recreation.

"I wouldn't mind paying my fair share, but the Corps of Engineers maintains the waterways and the locks and dams for three interests—people who use it for commercial interests, flood control and recreation," Stegbauer said.

"Now if we want to put a tax on everybody that goes water skiing in Pickwick Lake, and everybody that goes fishing in the Mississippi River and all the farmers that get flood control protection, then OK," he said.

"If they want us to pay for all of it, then let me have the waterway system. Let my industry take it private and run it and charge all those people," Stegbauer said.

A diesel fuel tax of $1.19 a gallon will put some companies in the industry out of business, owners and industry representatives said. That will accelerate a trend that has seen a loss of small firms and a growing dominance of larger corporations.

The increased cost of shipping by river also would shift traffic to other modes of transportation, particularly railroads. Currently, 15 percent of the nation's freight—including more than half of grain exports, a quarter of the coal and nearly a third of the petroleum products—is transported on inland waterways, the industry's trade group said.

"This is an astronomical tax. Right now the leaders of this industry are getting together to try to see how we can fight for our survival," Smith said. "This makes us an endangered species, no doubt about it."

Sory said his towboat, the Sebring, uses 30,000 to 40,000 gallons of fuel a month pushing barges loaded with petroleum products on the lower Mississippi, Ohio and Cumberland rivers.

He said that with a $1 increase in the user fee, he would be forced to raise his prices to keep his 10-employee company afloat. However, he said he couldn't be sure how much of the cost he could pass along.

"I may try it all, but I don't know how far I'd get," Sory said.

For Southern Towing's fleet of 22 boats, Stegbauer said the company paid $160,000 to $190,000 a quarter for the user fee when it was 15 cents a gallon. The company, which has 280 employees aboard boats and another 20 in Memphis, can't afford to pay several times that amount, he said.

"We don't have that kind of money," Stegbauer said.

"If we can bump half of it to our customers, that will be a major battle," he said.

"The other half will mean that we don't look forward to profits anymore. It's going to wipe us out because, without profits, no one is going to lend you any money. Without money to replace and upgrade equipment, you're not going to continue in business."

TOWBOATS, BARGES WAIT FOR CUTS

President Clinton's economic plan, A Vision of Change for America, views the nation's towboat and barge companies as recipients of government giveaways.

Increasing fees for companies that use inland waterways is one of 41 actions called for in Clinton's plan to eliminate subsidies and charge fees for government services.

"The nation can no longer afford subsidies and giveaways to those who don't need them, and we must assure that the taxpayer is fairly compensated for services or resources provided by the government," the report said.

Here is the text of the paragraph, on page 76, affecting use of the nation's rivers:

"Phase-in increased Inland Waterway user fees. The nation's inland waterways are the most heavily subsidized form of commercial freight transportation. Since the system was constructed for commercial navigation beneficiaries, they should pay for all operation and maintenance costs.

"Existing inland waterway fuel taxes collected on applicable segments of the system only offset half of the Corps of Engineers' cost of construction and major rehabilitation (estimated at $430 million in 1993).

"This proposal would increase the 1994 Federal inland waterway fuel tax from 19 cents to $1.19 per gallon in a series of increasing steps . . . Estimated savings are . . . $820 million over four years."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 21, 1993]

BARGE FIRMS SAY NEW TAX WILL SINK THEM

(By William Flannery)

George P. Foster has one word to describe the Clinton administration's plans for his industry: "Devastating."

"This tax could cost me $1 million a year and I can't pass that along," said Foster, president of Jefferson Barracks Marine Service Inc. and president of the St. Louis Harbor Association.

Among President Bill Clinton's deficit-cutting proposals is one to raise the diesel fuel tax for river barge operators to $1.19 a gallon from the current 18 cents a gallon.

"This is astronomical," said Jeffrey Smith, vice president of the American Waterways Operators trade group in Washington. The increase amounts to more than 500 percent, he noted.

Nor does it stop there.

"The Clinton BTU energy tax will add another 25 cents" a gallon, said Joseph A. Farrell, the group's president. "So, that makes $1.44 in taxes alone; that's more than [twice] the price of the fuel itself."

Foster worries that if the higher fuel costs are passed along many barge operators, grain companies and end customers will simply refuse to pay the higher prices and stop doing business.

"More that 110 million-tons of goods pass through the port of St. Louis each year—including most of the grain exported by the United States," Foster said. "President Clinton wants Americans to be more competitive. How can this help with our grain exports?"

"Barges are the most cost-effective and energy-efficient transport there is," Foster said. "One barge can move what it takes 15 rail cars to do."

Smith added that sinking the barge industry would have a wide-ranging economic impact.

"We transport 15 percent of the nation's goods, including more than half the export grain, a quarter of the coal and—people don't know this—but 30 percent of the petroleum and petroleum products in the nation," Smith said.

Smith said more than 700 towing companies nationwide operate 7,000 towboats and more than 30,000 barges. Most are on the Mississippi, Missouri and Ohio rivers, but some operate along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts.

Currently, Smith said, diesel fuel is about 45 to 50 percent of a barge company's costs.

"Any small- to medium-sized business that is asked to double its operating cost is going to be hurt," Smith said. "The math speaks for itself."

The morning after President Clinton's Wednesday night address to Congress, the White House released a 145-page report, "A Vision of Change."

The report outlined the administration's plans for spending cuts and tax increases designed to reduced the federal deficit.

"The Nation's inland waterways are the most heavily subsidized form of commercial freight transportation," the report states. Commercial users of the rivers "should pay for all operations and maintenance costs," it adds.

The White House report said that existing fuel taxes offset only half of the $430 million a year that the Army Corps of Engineers spends for construction and operations on the nation's navigable riverways.

The report said the new tax could bring $820 million into the federal treasury between 1994 and 1997.

Larry Daily knows where a good part of that money will come from.

"It will cost us about $12 million more a year, since we buy around 12 million gallons of diesel fuel," said Daily, who is with Canal Barge Co. in New Orleans, one of the nation's top 10 barge companies. Canal operates 25 towboats and 600 barges.

Daily said a towboat's fuel consumption "is based on the rough rule of thumb of one gallon per horsepower per day."

Smith said the average towboat on the upper Mississippi River has 4,800-horsepower diesel engines. Below St. Louis, where tows are larger, the average is 10,000 horsepower.

"If you take a 5,000 horsepower boat that burns 5,000 gallons then that's $5,000 added cost a day" due to the higher tax, Daily said.

"If you start with a new 15 barge tow in Minneapolis moving grain to New Orleans, that's a 14-day tow," Smith said. "The new tax could add $70,000 to the trip. That means they are not going to make the trip."

Nor is the proposed federal hike the only fuel tax barge operators must worry about.

"Across the river from you in Illinois, the state has a 6 cents a gallon state fuel tax," Daily said. "So that's in addition to the new tax."

Farrell and Smith said barge operators began complaining to members of Congress about the proposed tax increase. But the fight could be hard, Smith conceded.

"Except for St. Louis, we are a low-profile industry. But you'd think we would be a higher-profile industry in Arkansas," Smith said with a laugh.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 26, 1993]

BARGE FEE HIKE PROPOSED; CLINTON SEEKING HUGE INCREASE

(By Bill Mintz)

WASHINGTON.—Tucked away inside President Clinton's budget cutting program is a sixfold increase in the fees paid by barge operators carrying everything from gasoline to grain on inland waterways.

One large Houston-based barge operator said the increased levy on diesel fuel would have wiped out the company's profit from barge operations in 1992.

Complaining that the waterways "are the most heavily subsidized form of commercial freight transportation," the administration proposed increasing the user fee from 19 cents per gallon to $1.19 over the next four years.

The money—$460 million per year by 1997—would be used to pay for all of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' costs to maintain and operate the waterways.

Because the increased assessment is a "user fee' and not a tax, the Office of Management and Budget scores the money as a savings, so it wasn't listed among the administration's $240 million in tax increases.

The fact that the administration doesn't call the barge operators' fee a tax doesn't reduce the impact on the industry.

The fee, which would more than double the current cost of fuel used to move barges, would raise the cost of transporting many of the nation's important exports—coal, grain and refined petroleum products—and make U.S. goods more expensive than those of foreign competitors, said Mark R. Buese, vice president of Houston-based Kirby Corp., one of the five largest barge companies in the nation and the largest tank barge operator.

Some of the large barge-towing vessels used on the upper Mississippi River use 10,000 gallons of diesel fuel per day said Jeffrey A. Smith, vice president for public affairs for the American Waterways Operators, a trade group.

He said fuel costs represent about 30 percent of some barge operators' costs, and the proposed fee would double those costs.

Buese said fuel is about 15 percent of the costs for Kirby's fleet of inland barges.

He said the tax would cost Kirby about $18 million per year, compared with 1992 pretax operating profits from barge operations of about $17 million.

The increased fee was proposed by both the Reagan and Bush administration as an element to reduce the federal budget deficit. But, like many user fee proposals, it was not adopted by Congress.

Sen. Bennett Johnston, D-La., said at a Wednesday committee hearing that the proposed fee would drive most shippers to use trucks rather than barges, which would require the country to use more fuel.

Because the administration doesn't consider the barge operators fee to be a tax, it wasn't mentioned in the 71-page explanation of Clinton's tax plan released by the Treasury Department Thursday.

The long-awaited Treasury publication didn't clear up one question worrying natural gas producers and pipeline companies: Where will the government try to collect the proposed energy tax?

Treasury said the energy tax will be collected at the pipeline, but it didn't say whether that means the producers' end of the pipeline or the consumers' end. The gas industry wants the tax collected as close to the consumer as possible to make sure the industry doesn't have to absorb the cost.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 12, 1993]

PUTTING THE BITE ON THE BARGE BUSINESS

(By Don Phillips)

While many industries are counting the effect of President Clinton's planned energy tax in pennies per gallon, the nation's barge companies have been blindsided by the proposal for a fuel tax increase of $1 per gallon—a more than fivefold boost.

Even if the tax rises by less than $1, as now seems likely, the levy would dramatically raise costs for one of the most important parts of the nation's freight transportation network.

As proposed, it would add $420 million in taxes for operators on the inland waterway—more than their current pretax profits.

"It doesn't give you the warm fuzzies that anybody could survive that kind of impact," said Michael Hagen, president of American Commercial Barge Line Co. of Jeffersonville, Ind.

Whatever becomes of the tax, its origins have provided the industry with a glimpse of the curious way that Washington sometimes works.

The 1,800 companies that run barge lines or service them are mystified by the manner in which the tax was proposed, and they are not the only ones.

A consensus is growing that the idea was almost an accident—perhaps brought about by the newly easy flow of ideas between a Democratic White House and a Democratic Congress.

Among the ideas Clinton considered were those brought up by the Congressional Budget Office, among them the May 1992 CBO study, "Paying for Highways, Airways and Waterways: How Can Users Be Charged?"

The CBO study noted that current barge fuel taxes—17 cents per gallon and soon to go to 19 cents—pay less than 10 percent of the government's cost of maintaining navigation on the rivers and canals that form a web through the central and eastern United States.

"The substantial imbalance between costs and user taxes . . . suggests that it is desirable to explore ways of placing a larger share of the burden on the users," said the report.

"I have a feeling they just took it out of the CBO book," said Dawn Erlandson, a lobbyist for the environmental group Friends of the Earth.

Barry Toiv, a spokesman for the White House Office of Management and Budget, which put together the administration's proposed budget package, said he didn't know the genesis of the barge tax, but it is possible that the idea came from a CBO document.

"That would have been enough to gain consideration," he said.

Clinton himself has suggested that the proposed tax was not supposed to have been that stiff.

"I'm not sure that the way that the structure, the plan, was originally designed, that

it was supposed to go up that much," Clinton told an interviewer with WWL-TV in New Orleans. "I think that should be reexamined," he added.

The proposal shocked the barge industry.

It was as if a battle that raged more than a decade ago over fuel taxes and government waterway construction—which the industry thought it had won—had flared again when it turned its back.

The prime natural suspects as the instigators where the waterway industry's main competitors—the railroads—or perhaps environmentalists.

They were allies in a major battle over expansion of Locks & Dam 26 at Alton, Ill., on the Mississippi River in the 1970s and 1980s, and over earlier proposals for higher taxes or user fees on barge lines.

But it appears that economics, like politics, can make strange bedfellows.

While railroads once were certain to support any proposal that would raise the barge industry's costs, they have now fallen silent over the tax proposal, which, if enacted, would be a great and unexpected triumph.

Railroad companies seem almost embarrassed at the barge companies' bad fortune and seem confused as to what position to take.

"I really think that when our people saw the numbers, they knew something had gone wrong here," said Thomas Hoppin, a spokesman for CSX Corp. in Richmond, whose main business is railroading. "I don't believe there was any celebration in the railroad industry."

Part of the reason for Hoppin's lack of joy is that CSX owns American Commercial Barge Line Co.

But it goes deeper than that.

In the days since the great Locks & Dam 26 battle, railroads and barges have begun cooperating in a major way. This is the era of what government and industry are calling "intermodalism."

Fully 50 percent of the coal shipped in barges arrives at the dock by train, and sometimes even goes back to rail cars before completing its journey.

Coal from Wyoming's Powder River Basin might go by rail to Superior, Wis., across the Great Lakes by lake boat, back to a train to the Ohio River and then to a barge to the customer.

"The two industries, like the railroads and the trucking industry, have found a lot of common ground," Hoppin said.

If it wasn't the railroads, was it the environmentalists? Apparently not.

Erlandson, of Friends of the Earth, who has been active in trying to shape the Clinton program, said she has no idea who is lobbying for the tax proposal. "I don't know anyone in the environmental community who's pushing it," she said.

A spokesman for the White House Office of Environmental Policy said the office had no idea why the OMB included the tax.

"We assume it's just one of those good government user-fee things," the spokesman said.

Wherever it came from, the tax debate has loosed a genie that barge companies may find hard to control.

Joseph A. Farrell, president of the American Waterways Operators, said a $1 tax increase would be "catastrophic."

He said the industry is already operating at slim margins, and such a tax quickly would dry up some U.S. exports such as grain, because the extra cost of transportation would make them uncompetitive.

Hagen of American Commercial Barge Lines estimated his tax bill would rise by at least $70 million, about $20 million more than his yearly pretax earnings.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent that a letter transmitted to this Senator from the Agricultural Retailers Association, the American Corn Millers Association, the American Feed Industry Association, the American Soybean Association, the National Agricultural Chemicals Association, the National Association of Wheat Growers, the National Barley Growers Association, the National Corn Growers Association, the National Farmers Organization, the National Grain and Feed Association, the National Oil Seed Processors Association, the Terminal Elevator Grain Merchants Association and the Fertilizer Institute be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HARKIN: We, the undersigned agricultural and agribusiness organizations, respectfully urge you to reject the proposed 525% increase in the Inland Waterways Fuel Tax contained in the Administration's economic proposal. We believe this tax increase is neither fair nor well-reasoned. It will mean lost jobs, lost exports, and lost farm income at a time when we can ill afford any such losses.

Agriculture relies heavily on barge transportation. Agricultural products comprise nearly 35% of all products moved on inland waterways, and over half of all export grain moves by barge. A conservative estimate is that the cost of barging grain would increase about $.10/bushel, in addition to the $.10/gallon BTU tax that has been proposed. Fuel costs of a typical barge movement on the Mississippi River would increase by $70,000! Our comprehensive inland waterways system provides U.S. agriculture with a great competitive advantage over other countries, but this tax would put our export competitiveness at risk.

Some say that commercial users of the inland waterways system should pay all construction and maintenance costs. The fact is that the river system has been improved for many other reasons, including flood control, water supply, and hydropower. Many communities up and down America's rivers benefit from such public investment.

This proposal also works at cross-purposes with the Administration's environmental objectives. Barge transportation uses less fuel per ton-mile, creates less air and noise pollution, uses less steel and other materials per unit of cargo-carrying capacity, and claims a superior safety record in petroleum and hazardous material movements.

Perhaps worst of all, increased transportation costs brought on by this tax would be passed directly to U.S. farmers. A 1985 study by the Department of Agriculture projected that 70% of such costs are borne by producers. Our projections show potential farm income losses of up to $431 million annually, just in states bordering inland waterways. The economic ripple effects would surely be felt by all of agriculture in disruptions of transportation patterns and higher costs for other shipping modes. Consequently, farmers' prices would be driven down, and their costs for inputs like fertilizer would be driven up. Federal budget outlays would also increase through larger deficiency payments brought on by lower market prices, a cost not accounted for in the Administration's revenue projections.

We believe that a 525% increase in the inland waterways fuel tax, on top of other sacrifices U.S. agriculture has been asked to make, goes well beyond a fair contribution, and we urge your opposition to the increase.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Todd Kemp or David Barrett at the National Grain and Feed Association at (202) 289-0873.

Agricultural Retailers Association.
American Corn Millers Federation.
American Feed Industry Association.
American Soybean Association.
National Agricultural Chemicals Association.
National Association of Wheat Growers.
National Barley Growers Association.
National Corn Growers Association.
National Farmers Organization.
National Grain and Feed Association.
National Oilseed Processors Association.
Terminal Elevator Grain Merchants Association.
The Fertilizer Institute.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I just want to quote from the Commercial Appeal of March 8:

William Sory, owner of Memphis Barge Line, Inc., used short, pointed sentences to describe his opinion of a Clinton administration proposal that eventually would raise the fuel tax he pays by 600 percent.

Actually, it is slightly less than that, 525 percent, but still enormous.

He said:

"It stinks," was Sory's initial reaction. "It could put me out, that kind of increase."

It went on to say:

However, during a television interview in New Orleans last week, President Clinton gave towboat operators hope that the huge increase is being reconsidered.

"I think that should be re-examined," Clinton said. "I'm not sure that the way the plan was originally designed, that it was supposed to go up that much. * * * I don't think there was a deliberate attempt to quintuple it."

I already mentioned that on the floor, but I wanted to repeat that because I believe our actions with this sense-of-the-Senate resolution really not only is in the best interest of the country but I think is something that the administration will, after full consideration, I think be supportive of in terms of ensuring we do not levy this kind of confiscatory tax on the barge industry of America.

Mr. SASSER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Senator from Iowa for yielding.

Madam President, I want to make it crystal clear what I was saying a moment ago in the exchange between myself and the Senator from New York and the Senator from Iowa.

The adoption of the sense-of-the-Senate resolution of the Senator from Iowa, of course, is not binding on the Finance Committee. It would be made no more binding on the Finance Com-

mittee if we changed the number and simply deleted the amount that an inland waterway fee would raise.

A budget resolution simply sends to the committees of competent jurisdiction large numbers in which the committees of competent jurisdiction will conform policy or bills in their committees to conform with the budget resolution.

The thrust of the sense-of-the-Senate resolution of the Senator from Iowa, should it be adopted, I think, would be this: It would send a signal to the Finance Committee that the Senate as a whole does not look favorably on raising the inland waterway tax pursuant to the assumption in the Clinton budget plan as modified by the Senate.

It would send a signal to the Finance Committee that should they raise the inland waterway fees to the level to fulfill the number to conform to the assumption in the Clinton budget as modified, any bill bringing that to the floor would be subject to debate on the floor and probably an amendment to delete that tax would carry on the Senate floor.

Now, that in essence is the sense-of-the-Senate resolution. It simply sends a signal to the Finance Committee that you ought to look in another direction to raise the revenues, if at all possible, so as to avoid a possible amendment on the floor that would amend your bill and delete this particular portion. It is simply a yellow light, so to speak, to the Finance Committee, or a yellow light to any other committee of competent jurisdiction. So I wanted to make that very clear, that there is some substance.

The sense-of-the-Senate resolution here does carry a substantial amount of substance behind it—I wanted to make that clear—even though it is not totally binding.

Mr. HARKIN. If the distinguished chairman will yield, again, there is really nothing we can do here that absolutely binds anybody.

Mr. SASSER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. We cannot bind anybody. All we can do is speak, and we can take a vote, and we can indicate to the Finance Committee or anybody else what we would like to do.

Again, I think this sense-of-the-Senate resolution would send a strong signal to the Finance Committee that, if they proceeded with some such, there would probably be another vote on reconciliation on that very issue to take it out. So we cannot bind anybody regardless of what anyone wants to do, but I think, as the Senator says, it is substantive and sends a very strong signal to the Finance Committee of what this body wants done in the revenue measures that they send down. That would probably be in reconciliation, I assume.

Mr. DOMENICI. Does the Senator want to yield back time so we can vote?

Mr. HARKIN. If the Senator would not mind if I put in a quorum call for 5 minutes to see if these people are coming over or not, I would appreciate it.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, we have how much time on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority side has 32 minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. How much time do we have, Madam President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority side has 6 minutes and 54 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. What would the Senator like to do? We are prepared to yield our 32 minutes back and get on with a vote.

Mr. HARKIN. If the Senator will hold just 1 minute on this.

Mr. DOMENICI. OK. I will speak for a couple minutes, and we will wait for the Senator. We would very much like to move to a vote, but the Senator has his rights, and I understand and recognize that.

Madam President, I am not sure that very many people, even the best of Americans, are interested in this argument that has been taking place the last half-hour. But it does point up a couple of things. When the majority side does not like something in the plan, they just say it is the sense of the Senate that we ought not do that, but they leave the plan otherwise alone, including all the taxes that plan brings, and they leave the impression that you can really pick and choose anything you want in this budget and be for or against it and still have a plan.

To the extent they have said, "Where is your plan?"—and we are going to offer our plan in five or six pieces—it is rather interesting because there either is or is not a plan and it is or is not built around a series of policy changes. The President has advocated them and said if anybody can do better, why do they not try.

So I tell you what would be more effective than the resolution, which we are all going to vote for on this side, what would be much more binding would be to take out the taxes dollar for dollar that represent this barge tax and cut spending $780 million. That would not be much. We are actually increasing it $124 billion, so take out a little bit of that increase and say there is no revenue left in this bill for the barge tax. Then the other side could say, well, that is not binding. But I will tell you, it sends a very nice signal to the Finance Committee, and it is no yellow light. It is a red light. It says we did not even give you the revenues for that barge tax. They are not even in there. How in the world could they use it then even though we did not ask them and we did not give them the money?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Madam President, one of the main principles that underlies the President's economic proposals is equity. I believe that it is this same commitment to equitable economic policies that has led the President to reconsider the proposal for a new fuel tax for inland waterway users.

As it now stands, it is possible that waterway user fees could increase sixfold from $0.19 to $1.19. Yet, this increase could occur even though this fee is already scheduled to increase from 16 to 19 cents.

After meeting with President Clinton, I believe that he fully understands the adverse affects that this new tax can have on the inland waterway industry.

At this point, Madam President, I would like to highlight some of the reasons why I am cosponsoring this amendment with Senator HARKIN. Most importantly, I believe that this new tax would be unfair to the inland waterway industry since it could capture up to 20 percent of their revenues. Although this proposal would raise diesel fuel taxes incrementally over the next 4 years, this proposal would still create $820 million in new taxes for tow boat operators over that period.

Madam President, I would also like to highlight the fact that this increase in fuel taxes for barges will be on top of the 8- to 10-cent-per-gallon tax increase that will result from the imposition of the Btu tax. Futhermore, since more than 50 percent of grain exports are transported on inland waterways, much of the cost of an increase in this tax would be transferred to farmers and coal producers—perhaps by 9 cents a bushel or even more. In fact, this new tax could increase the cost of a typical 14-day trip carrying grain, corn, or soybeans from Minneapolis to New Orleans by as much as $70,000.

Finally, Madam President I would like to point out that this issue is very important to the people of my State. Illinois makes extensive use of both the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers and no State makes more use of our inland waterway system than my State does. That is why I believe that these cost increases are so severe that, if they were to be imposed, they could destroy the inland waterway system.

I would like to thank the distinguised Democratic manager of the resolution, Senator SASSER, for agreeing to support the amendment. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this amendment offered by my warm friend from Iowa, Senator HARKIN. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I strongly support the amendment offered by Senator HARKIN. We can not afford to shut down the inland water commerce of this Nation by leveling an additional tax on inland waterway commerce that would drastically increase the cost of transporting the vital commodities that move by ship and barge across this great Nation.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I am ready to vote if the Senator is ready. Is the Senator ready?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Yes, we are ready to yield back all of our time.

Mr. DOMENICI. We yield back all our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 39 Leg.]

YEAS—88

Akaka	Faircloth	McCain
Baucus	Feinstein	McConnell
Bennett	Ford	Metzenbaum
Biden	Glenn	Mikulski
Bingaman	Gorton	Mitchell
Bond	Gramm	Moseley-Braun
Boren	Grassley	Murkowski
Boxer	Gregg	Murray
Breaux	Harkin	Nickles
Brown	Hatch	Nunn
Bryan	Hatfield	Packwood
Bumpers	Heflin	Pell
Burns	Helms	Pressler
Byrd	Hollings	Pryor
Campbell	Inouye	Riegle
Coats	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Cochran	Johnston	Sasser
Cohen	Kassebaum	Shelby
Conrad	Kempthorne	Simon
Coverdell	Kennedy	Simpson
Craig	Kerrey	Smith
D'Amato	Kohl	Specter
Danforth	Krueger	Stevens
Daschle	Leahy	Thurmond
Dodd	Levin	Wallop
Dole	Lieberman	Warner
Domenici	Lott	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lugar	Wofford
Durenberger	Mack	
Exon	Mathews	

NAYS—12

Bradley	Graham	Reid
Chafee	Kerry	Robb
DeConcini	Lautenberg	Rockefeller
Feingold	Moynihan	Roth

So the amendment (No. 181), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 182

(Purpose: To eliminate the energy tax and offset lost revenues by reducing spending increases)

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], for himself, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. WALLOP, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BOND, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SMITH, Mr. GREGG, Mr. BURNS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. HELMS, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HATCH, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. COATS, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DOLE, Mr. HATFIELD, and Mr. GRASSLEY, proposes an amendment numbered 182.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 18, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.

On page 2, line 19, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.

On page 3, line 2, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.

On page 3, line 4, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.

On page 3, line 6, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.

On page 41, line 17, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.

On page 41, line 24, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.

On page 41, line 25, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.

On page 42, line 13, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.

On page 42, line 20, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.

On page 42, line 21, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.

On page 50, line 9, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.

On page 50, line 10, decrease the amount by $72,982,000,000.

On page 57, line 18, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.

On page 57, line 19, decrease the amount by $72,982,000,000.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, the amendment that I send to the desk today is on behalf of myself, Senator SHELBY, Senator DOMENICI, Senator WALLOP, Senator PACKWOOD, Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator LOTT, Senator BOND, Senator BROWN, Senator SMITH, Senator GREGG, Senator BURNS, Senator MCCONNELL, Senator FAIRCLOTH, Senator PRESSLER, Senator HELMS, Senator KEMPTHORNE, Senator BENNETT, Senator HATCH, Senator THURMOND, and Senator GRAMM of Texas, who has been a leader in this effort, along with Senator DOMENICI in the Budget Committee. I add Senator GRASSLEY, as well, on the Budget Committee, who helped us. I also thank the other cosponsors, Senator LUGAR, Senator CRAIG, Senator COATS, Senator COVERDELL, Senator D'AMATO, Senator MCCAIN, Senator STEVENS, Senator ROTH, Senator SIMPSON, Senator DOLE, and Senator HATFIELD.

I thank my colleagues for cosponsoring this amendment. This amendment is very simple.

This amendment will eliminate the so-called energy tax or Btu tax. That is $73 billion in new taxes in this resolution. This amendment also will eliminate $73 billion in new spending.

What we will be saying by adopting this amendment is we do not want to be increasing taxes on everybody in America, because everybody in America uses energy. We do not want to be increasing everybody's energy taxes in order to pay for $73 billion of new spending. That is the amendment. That is it. That is plain. That is simple.

This amendment is what is referred to as "deficit neutral." It cuts taxes and it cuts spending by an equal amount. I think it will save the economy, because this tax that we are now proposing, President Clinton's so-called Btu tax, would have a large negative impact on the economy. It would cost jobs. We might call the Btu tax the unemployment tax because the net result of this tax would be to put a lot of people out of work, hundreds of thousands of people out of work.

Madam President, first, I think it is important that we hold elected officials accountable and also hold them accountable for what they say as candidates. I would just read to you a quote from candidate Clinton. Candidate Clinton said, "I will not raise taxes on the middle class to pay for these programs." That is what he said as a candidate, he will not raise taxes to pay for these programs. The facts are he is raising taxes on all Americans to pay for these programs.

I also mentioned that as a candidate, Mr. Clinton said that he would oppose excise taxes, especially gasoline taxes. He mentioned that in his book. He mentioned it on the campaign trail many times "I am opposed to a gasoline tax increase." But the facts are his Btu tax increases gasoline taxes by 8 cents or more per gallon, it increases diesel tax by more than 8 cents, and it increases aviation fuel by probably well more than 8 cents.

So again I think we need to hold President Clinton accountable for what candidate Clinton said.

During the State of the Union speech, President Clinton said that this energy tax would cost a family of four $204 per year. That is not correct. His Energy Secretary now says that is over $320 per year. And other sources say, well, even that is an underestimate. The full costs will be well over $400 per year for a family of four. We are talking about middle-income families who are going to see their taxes go up collectively by hundreds of millions of dollars.

Madam President, we can solve that. We can eliminate that problem. We can hold President Clinton accountable to candidate Clinton and not increase this tax, and in the process we can save many, many jobs.

The National Association of Manufacturers estimates that the Btu tax would cost over 600,000 jobs. I think it is important we have talked about the economy—and I have seen my friends hold up charts talking about what we need to do to stimulate the economy.

What we do not need to do is pass a tax increase that will put hundreds of thousands of people out of work, and that is exactly what this tax will do. So we need to eliminate this tax.

You might say where does it cost the jobs? I can give you any number of examples. But just in today's Wall Street Journal, there was a report that American Airlines is grounding 25 DC-10's and cutting capacity by 3 percent this year.

Madam President, I will mention American Airlines is a big employer in my State, and I know it is a big employer in the State of Texas. Last year, American Airlines lost $975 million. This Btu tax will cost American Airlines anywhere from $160 million a year to $300 million per year, and they cannot pass it on. I will tell the Senator from Alabama they are already losing money.

So it is not a question of passing on this new tax. If they could pass it on, they would not have lost as much money that they lost last year. So the Btu tax will cost more jobs.

I can go through industry by industry. Agriculture is another example. I will touch on another example. I note the Presiding Officer is from the State of California. In California, a farmer who has a 1,200-acre farm, 600 in tomatoes, the estimated increase cost of this tax is $3,486. I say to the Senator from Kansas, close to my State, a farmer with 2,100 acres of corn, soybeans, millet, and wheat with no livestock would be $1,500 and with 3,000 acres, one-third irrigated corn, oats, alfalfa, the cost would end up to be $2,816. That is direct, out-of-pocket expense. That does not include the cost of fertilizer and everything else that would go up as a direct result of the higher cost of energy.

I could give countless examples. But I would just tell the Presiding Officer and my colleagues that this tax is very punitive. It will hit a lot of industries. It will hit the aviation industry particularly hard. The aviation industry estimates the Btu tax will cost between $1.2 billion to over $2 billion per year. The aviation industry in the last 3 years lost $10 billion. There are a lot of other industries that also cannot pass this tax on. There are a lot of industries that will lose jobs as a direct result of this tax.

Finally, Madam President, I want to mention how distorted this tax really is. The Treasury estimates that this tax would raise $95 billion. They have to raise $95 billion to net the so-called $71.4 billion. I might mention our amendment says $73 billion, because that is the way the Congressional Budget Office scored it at, $73 billion. But when you consider the dynamic impact on the economy, in other words, how many people will lose their jobs, how much lower taxable profits will be, how much inflation will increase Federal COLA's, how much more it is going to cost the military and so on, the net result is the Federal Government is only going to end up with about $38 billion even though they raise gross revenue of about $95 billion. You say, "Well, that is $38 billion, we are going to reduce deficit by $38 billion." That is not correct, because under this proposal, under the President's proposal, to help cushion the blow of this big energy tax, the President proposed increasing low-income energy assistance $2.9 billion. He proposed increasing food stamps $12 billion and he proposed increasing the earned income tax credit $26.8 billion. That is a total of $42 billion in new spending tied to this Btu tax proposal.

So the net result of the President's proposal is that it will raise $38 billion but it will cost $42 billion.

This tax is a loser. It is not going to raise net money to the Government because we are going to more than spend that, but the real facts are it is going to put hundreds of thousands of people out of work.

I do not think we can afford to do that. I do not think we should be increasing gasoline tax by 8 cents or more. I do not think we should be raising all the utility bills in this country by 4 or 5 percent. I do not think we should be telling major industries you are going to try to compete internationally, but we are sorry, this may stop your ability to be able to sell your exports. I do not think we should mislead ourselves about this tax's ability to decrease the deficit. I do not think we should suffocate the economy. That is exactly what this tax will do.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. This amendment will eliminate the Btu tax and eliminate the comparable amount of spending, that is, $73 billion. We reduced the taxes $73 billion and we reduce spending by $73 billion, and I certainly hope my colleague will agree. I note my colleague, Senator SHELBY, is on the floor and I appreciate his cosponsorship of this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield time to the Senator?

Mr. NICKLES. I yield the Senator from Alabama 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, I rise today in support of the Nickles-Shelby amendment that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has been talking about that will basically eliminate President Clinton's energy tax.

Madam President, I, along with many of my colleagues, have expressed general concerns about the weight given to tax increases over spending cuts in the President's budget proposal. Tax increases outnumber cuts by a ratio of at least 3 to 1. Along with other tax increases, I continue to have a deep reservation about the impact of the Btu tax on both my State's and the country's economy.

I believe that all of us are committed to deficit reduction and, yes, we have

some very tough choices to make, as we are reminded day by day. The American public has been asked to make some sacrifices, and I believe that a great many, the overwhelming number of our citizens, are willing to do that.

However, a broad-based, permanent energy tax I believe is not the path that we should take to deficit reduction, particularly in light of the fact that the projected revenues from a Btu tax would be totally consumed in what the administration calls new "investment and stimulus programs." In other words, new spending programs. Deletion of that spending makes $124 billion in taxes irrelevant to the President's plan.

The administration has asserted that the energy tax will ultimately improve our nation's competitiveness through increased energy efficiency. In addition, reduced national consumption of fossil fuels is a stated objective for the tax. The question that we must confront as we debate this tax is at what cost will we approach these goals. I believe that the establishment of an indexed Btu tax will have a major economic and competitive impact on this nation making the cost far too high.

A Btu tax will result in increased energy costs for manufactured goods. These increased costs will negatively impact our competitiveness with foreign manufactured goods, in both domestic and foreign markets. Many U.S. manufacturers will be forced to shift production to other countries with more affordable energy. And the chain reaction begins.

For example, consumers purchase fewer domestically produced goods, but purchase more goods produced abroad because they will be cheaper.

Foreign production and jobs increase, at the expense of domestic production and jobs.

Some of our most competitive energy intensive industries, such as lumber, agriculture, and petrochemicals, which account for a significant portion of U.S. exports to other countries, would be at a disadvantage.

A study done by the National Association of Manufacturers found that a Btu tax would cause a loss of nearly 600,000 jobs. It has also been estimated that a 10 cent increase in the taxes on gasoline could reduce GNP by three- to four-tenths of a percent over the period of the increase. Quite a lot of money.

The United States enjoys the privilege of being the world's leading exporter. However, a Btu tax could seriously jeopardize that status.

Our citizens are being asked to contribute their fair share toward deficit reduction. The Btu tax is anything but fair.

This energy tax is regressive and will hurt low- and middle-income Americans the most. These individuals, many of them elderly, already spend more of their budgets to pay for necessary service than does the average American family. Because so much of their income is spent on home energy, these households would be severely impacted by an increase brought on by an energy tax. This is particularly true in States with energy intensive industries.

Some regions and States will be paying far more than others. My home State of Alabama is among them.

Sixty-eight percent of Alabama's electricity generation is from coal. A Btu tax will have a serious impact on the coal industry in Alabama and elsewhere. We are looking at a 26-percent rise in the price of Alabama coal at full implementation of the Btu tax. This cost is ultimately passed on to the consumer and reduces coal's attractiveness as an energy source.

This does not bode well for the 6,200 employees in the Alabama coal industry who produce over a billion dollars worth of coal per year. This 26-percent rise in the price of coal will result in an 18-percent increase for electric bills in Alabama.

In Alabama alone, the proposed Btu tax will cost about $140 per person, or $584 million per year. This number does not even include fertilizer costs to our State's agricultural industry.

Also, Alabama exports about 25 percent of its coal. Consequently, I am concerned about the effects of the Btu tax with regard to GATT regulations. The mechanisms to offset the cost to exporters would potentially open them up to GATT sanctions.

Alabama is just one State in the Southeastern region that will be bearing a disproportionate tax burden.

The average cost of the Btu tax per year for a household of four in the Southeast is $507.

In the Southwest, that same family will pay as much as $652.

Families in the Mid-Atlantic will pay around $390; Rocky Mountain States $409; Plains States, $466; far Western States, $439; the Great Lakes, $446; and New England $405.

States like Alaska would average as much as $1,521 a year for a four-person household; Wyoming, $1,167; Louisiana, $1,090, and Texas, $738.

This is not the only area where inequities are created by the Btu tax. This Btu tax would tax oil at more than double the rate for coal or natural gas. The cost of gasoline, which is already on the rise, would increase by 10 cents or more. Home heating fuels and all other petroleum products will increase in price.

While I am supportive of efforts to curtail our Nation's dangerous dependence on foreign oil, it is important to recognize that the oil industry continues to play a vital role in the stability of the U.S. economy.

Oil meets 97 percent of the Nation's transportation fuel needs and supplies 41 percent of the Nation's energy needs. Oil remains a low-cost and flexible energy source. Singling out the oil industry to bear the heaviest tax burden will certainly have an adverse impact on the economy.

Madam President, many States are already suffering from depressed energy and agricultural prices. The proposed Btu tax increases the prices on a number of fertilizers that are the basic food-producing tools employed by farmers by as much as $9 per acre.

That may not sound like much on the surface, but look at the end result:

A typical corn farmer would see his expenses increased by $5,519 per year; wheat farmer's expenses will be increased by $4,515; cotton farmers expenses will increase by as much as $30,310; rice farmers expenses will increase by as much as $6,816; and potato farmers expenses will increase by as much as $15,416.

Farmers are already paying taxes on the energy used on the farm for activities such as grain drying, irrigation pumps, storage facilities, and vehicles. Congress has always recognized the critical relationship between the agricultural sector and its enormous and invaluable contribution to our Nation's economic well-being. We must continue to recognize this relationship and not place a direct and heavy burden on the American farmer, as would this proposed energy tax.

Madam President, in light of our Nation's massive Federal deficit, we know that we must come up with creative solutions for an economically secure future and I am willing to work with the administration and my other colleagues to that end.

However, we all know that much like a spending program, once we create a tax, we have a difficult time controlling its growth and its effects. I do not want us to walk blindly into a tax that could have severe repercussions for our energy industries, our consumers and our economy.

I believe that deficit reduction should be our number one priority. The bottom line is that we have to close this gap between incoming Federal revenue and outgoing Federal spending.

Federal spending continues to rise more than twice the rate of revenue. We must reduce spending. That is where our investment should be—in reduced spending. This amendment is 73 billion steps in the right direction.

The Btu tax is rendered absolutely unnecessary if we do not engage in new spending. I hope that my colleagues will join me in voting for this important amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AKAKA). Who yields time?

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I hope that we would have those in opposition also speak in opposition, so we could enter into a little debate on this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who wishes to speak in opposition to the amendment, on the floor. I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREAUX. Yes.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator ROTH and Senator HATFIELD as cosponsors.

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

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I would like to state up front I do not like any taxes. I do not like any taxes in the President's budget. I do not like any taxes in the Budget Committee's proposal. But that is not the real question, what we like. Because we are long past being able to do what we like in this body if we are going to be serious about solving this Nation's deficit and long-term debt problem.

When I was in the House, the other body, when President Reagan was reelected, it was really fun, it was easy, it was great. President Reagan essentially asked us to do two things. He said cut taxes and spend more money. That was fun and that was easy to do. There were very few Members who objected to cutting taxes.

We cut taxes dramatically. The top rate went from 70 percent to 28 percent. That was easy, and it certainly was a lot of fun to do a release, to tell our people we had cut their taxes by that huge amount.

The other thing he asked us to do was spend more money, and, boy, was that easy. Most Members thought that was the best thing we could possibly do. The President had asked us to spend more money. We greatly increased the amount of money we spent on the Defense Department, and a lot of Members sent a lot of letters and a lot of news releases out on what we were spending money for. So the 1980's were really a lot of fun, and they were very easy.

But as we stand on this floor in the 1990's we are looking at a $4 trillion long-term national debt. We are looking at a $350 billion-plus deficit this year.

I suggest to all of our colleagues that the fun is over and that the good times are over. And there is not a proposal that is a serious proposal that this body will be able to consider that really addresses the problem that is going to be easy to do. None of it is going to be fun. No taxes are easy to pass. No one is going to embrace any tax with any degree of enthusiasm and report back to our States that, by golly, I just passed a new tax. No one is going to want to do that, and no one is going to want to introduce or issue a news release about what programs we cut, because that is not going to be easy. So the easy and the fun days are over.

But I suggest the day of reckoning for this Congress' ability to be able to solve the problems this country is facing is at hand. I heard people say, "I do not like the Btu tax." I do not like the Btu tax either.

I have also heard some say it is unfair, it is regressive, it hits middle-income and working people more than it hurts wealthy people. I do not hear a lot of people making suggestions for raising revenues, and I do not hear anybody specifically spelling out what programs they want to have reduced, other than talking in generic terms.

Let me suggest that when you talk about it being regressive, you are only looking at part of the President's package. There is another part that not many people, I think, are focusing on. When the President spoke in the other body, in the joint session, he talked about the other part of the story, the rest of the story. Part of the rest of the story is his proposal to increase the earned income tax credit. The earned income tax credit rewards work in this country. It is not a welfare program because it only is helpful to those people who actually are employed.

The President's proposal is to increase the earning limitation for the earned income tax credit to people making up to $30,000 a year. When you look at what the earned income tax credit will give to people who work in this country, who are in the middle- and lower-middle-income brackets, it more than offsets the adverse effects of a Btu tax, it more than offsets the adverse impacts of a Btu tax because people under the earned income tax credit are eligible to get up to $2,400 a year in a tax credit to encourage them to continue to work.

If you look at the estimates on what a Btu tax would probably cost a family of four, one estimate is $17 a month, a little over $200 a year. That is substantially less of a tax increase than they would be able to get from the earned income tax credit that they will be given when the whole package is adopted and passed.

I looked at my income tax returns for the State of Louisiana. I will bet most of my colleagues on this floor are in pretty much the same situation. In Louisiana, for the last taxable year, the IRS tax returns show that 72 percent of the people in my State reported incomes of $30,000 a year or less. That tells me almost three-fourths of the people in my State would be eligible for an earned income tax credit that will do more than offset the adverse impact of a Btu tax.

So I think in these discussions—and we are going to have a lot more; those of us on the Finance Committee are going to have to spend a great deal of time trying to reconcile and report out the exact terms and conditions of this package and this program, including the earned income tax credit—but it is unfair to just single out one portion and say it is bad because I do not like taxes.

Nobody likes taxes. I suggest when you look at the Btu tax, you should also look at the earned income tax credit, which is designed to help middle-income and working families in this country, which I think offsets the adverse impacts of the Btu tax.

Our job is to make it fair, to make it work, to make it be imposed at the proper stage and not to be haphazardly thrown out there without a detailed and complete discussion. This budget resolution is going to allow that to happen, and I think we should go forward with it until someone comes up with a better idea, which I have not yet heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, this amendment before us today, I think, indicates why the American people and the press are not taking seriously the efforts on the part of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle with regard to this budget debate.

There is a lot of rhetoric here on the other side about opposing the Btu tax, opposing it because it will work irreparable harm on poor people, on working people, on middle-class people. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana, nobody likes a tax. I wish we could run this Government without any taxes whatsoever. We started down that road in 1981, I will remind my colleagues. We thought we would just keep on cutting taxes until perhaps we would produce such prosperity we would just keep on cutting them into perpetuity.

What occurred in the final analysis was a disaster. That is the reason we find ourselves in the hole that we are in today.

With regard to those among us who are poor, this Btu tax would offset any adverse effect on the working poor by the earned income tax credits. In other words, if you are working and you make below a certain amount and you are adversely impacted by the Btu tax, then, of course, you are made whole by the earned income tax credit.

There are other safety net programs to offset the minimal adverse side effects that this tax may have on the poorest among us. Food stamps, low-income home energy assistance program—all of these things help offset the admitted but slight regressivity of the Btu tax.

The truth is that in the President's tax program, 64 percent of the new revenues proposed by President Clinton will be paid for by families earning $200,000 or more a year. That is what our colleagues on the other side of the aisle object to. These crocodile tears over the middle class, or the poor, over this Btu tax—that is not convincing, I say, Mr. President, to this Senator.

Why should this amendment not be taken seriously? First off, what is pro-

posed is to offset the Btu tax with what are essentially unspecified cuts in function 950. What is function 950 of the budget? It really is simply just a plug. It is a holding place where you put a few things in the budget that you do not have any other place to put.

For example, function 950 includes anticipated additional budget authority and outlays that might be needed to finance pay raises for all agencies except DOD and the military.

It includes contingencies for specific requirements. It includes contingencies for relatively uncontrollable programs, if you have a mandatory program that happens to rollover. Contingencies for other requirements, that is what it says; it is that general. Undistributed offsetting receipts; employer share; employee retirement; interest received by trust funds; rents and royalties on the Outer Continental Shelf. That is what function 950 is.

Look at what has occurred just in the Senate Budget Committee, a whole host of amendments offered by our colleagues from the other side, paying for every one of them, they said, out of this tiny little function 950 which is undistributed offsetting receipts. They offered a total, Mr. President, of $764 billion over 5 years in cuts they were going to pay for out of function 950; $764 billion that they were going to pay for out of unspecified cuts in this tiny function of the budget.

Now they are coming in and saying we are going to pay for the Btu tax out of this tiny little function 950 of offsetting receipts and unspecified cuts. They are going to pay for $85 billion in revenue losses out of this function 950. An impossibility; an impossibility.

If they want to do away with the Btu tax, come in and tell us; how are you going to pay for it. Or then just confess what is the truth: We do not want to deal responsibly with the deficit. We know there is a deficit out there, but we do not want to have our fingerprints on any unpopular effort to deal with it.

That is what it is all about, Mr. President. That is what this function is all about. They are actually taking it out of function 920, allowances. But the principle is really the same. There is just nothing there.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SASSER. Yes; I will yield for a question.

Mr. DOMENICI. If I understand you correctly, when the President's budget was submitted to the Budget Committee under function 920, this little bitty function you are speaking of did not have anything in it. Then the chairman put $39 billion in it with a minus sign in front of it. I think you were saying—that was when you had to provide some more budget cuts—Senator PACKWOOD, remember CBO told them they were off?

Mr. PACKWOOD. $40 billion.

Mr. SASSER. Is the Senator addressing the question to Senator PACKWOOD or me?

Mr. DOMENICI. To you, but I saw him listening so I wanted to make sure he knew.

Let me ask, did you not put $40 billion in unspecified cuts in the same function to meet the CBO's objection to the President's budget? And why do they belong in there any more than anything else?

Mr. SASSER. As the Senator knows, and he knows the budget as well as anyone in this body, he knows that is a traditional use of function 920.

Mr. DOMENICI. Just as this is.

Mr. SASSER. The point I am making here is that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle had 764 billion dollars' worth of cuts in amendments over 5 years that they sought to offset with function 920. No wonder these proposals coming from the other side of the aisle are not taken seriously by editorial writers across this country, by the press, or by disinterested observers. There are no serious proposals that we have seen so far coming from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to deal with this deficit.

I really wish that there were. I think if some of our friends on the other side had their way, there would be serious proposals coming from some of them, because I happen to know some of them on the other side of the aisle are concerned about this deficit and they want to make responsible proposals. I well remember back in the early eighties, when at that time there was much concern on the other side of the aisle when Senator DOMENICI was chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, much concern about the escalating deficit then.

The then-chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator DOLE, had the courage to come forward and say, yes, we have to do something about this deficit. At that time, the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, now the very able minority leader, called for a broad-based energy tax. In the summer of 1982, as chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator DOLE told the Reagan administration if they did not want to end up with an even bigger deficit, then they needed to do something about it, and he suggested an energy tax. I want to commend him for it. The distinguished Senator from Kansas has stood on this floor, I think, on many occasions and taken some unpopular positions in an effort to fulfill his responsibility, first as chairman of the Finance Committee, and later as minority leader in dealing with this deficit.

But I say to my friends that we simply cannot drop this vital element of the President's budget and his economic program without having some way to pay for these revenues which are going to total some $85 billion over 5 years. If we just want to say, OK, we are not going to reduce this deficit $502 billion over 5 years, we are going to reduce it by some $417 billion over 5 years, then I say to my colleagues, let us just say it; let us be honest about it and say that we do not have any means of replacing lost revenues from this Btu tax and we are just going to borrow another $85 billion over the next 5 years. That is what we have done for the last 12.

But the difference is that the American people have said they want a change. They are tired of these borrow-and-spending policies. They say that they are ready to make a shared contribution to try to deal with the problems of the deficit, and they say that because they are concerned about their country, they are concerned about the future of their children.

I call to the attention of my friends on the other side of the aisle the Wall Street Journal-NBC poll that appeared just a few days ago, that showed the American people preferring the President's economic plan 2 to 1 over their proposal that did not raise taxes.

So the American people are way ahead of them on this. They are saying the thing that troubles us most is irresponsibility in dealing with this Government's fiscal affairs, and we are willing to make a contribution, a shared sacrifice, if this will alleviate the problems of the Federal budget.

If this proposal should pass, if the Btu tax were to be thrown overboard, and I do not like any taxes myself; I do not like a Btu tax, but I will say this: There are some favorable effects flowing from it. We are all concerned about the environment, at least we all say we are concerned about the environment. This Btu tax will encourage conservation. Some have calculated that this Btu tax will go a long way to moving this country back in carbon monoxide emissions to the 1990 levels from the year 2000 as we agreed to do at the Rio meeting just last year.

Mr. President, another salutary spin-off from this Btu tax will be to discourage energy consumption and particularly oil consumption. We in the United States on a per capita basis use much more oil than any other country in the world. It is calculated that this Btu tax will go a long way to reducing our oil consumption.

Mr. President, I am losing my voice here. Let me yield the floor momentarily.

Mr. PACKWOOD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Wyoming 5 minutes.

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, I thank both Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, I think it is amusing, to say the least, to be lectured by the chairman of the Budget

Committee about specifics, he having just voted for the amendment of the Senator from Iowa which contained no specifics but just a vague instruction not to charge money for barges.

I would like to just take this quick opportunity to criticize another statement that he made which talks about the admitted but slight effects. I do not think it is a slight effect if you work for Boeing and have lost your job because this tax is a subsidy for Airbus.

How is it a subsidy for Airbus? They do not have to pay the tax. And by putting $1 billion onto the airlines we have made their new purchases of airplanes another half a decade further away. Airbus is a cheaper airplane now because it does not have that tax to pay.

So we are subsidizing foreigners. We are subsidizing foreign oil with this tax. How? Because since the President and his able people want to hide this tax from the American people, they will not put it out for the consumer to know he is paying it, and therefore, it cannot be assessed on refined products. Having not been assessed on the refined product, the refined product comes in here and does another thing. Its slight effect, I would say to the Senator from Tennessee, is to put people in the American refining business out of business.

He also gives us a long song and dance about how this is environmentally sound. How, may I ask, will Vice President AL GORE's Rio demands be met by making high sulfur coal a cheaper fuel than the clean renewable water of the Pacific Northwest? How does it do it by eliminating the viability of nuclear power?

The purpose of the tax, Mr. President, is not to raise money but to satisfy a Rio demand of the Vice President. Because if the purpose of the tax is satisfied, two great new things happen. A whole new class of dependent Americans becomes ours to witness. Why? Because food stamps have to be issued to take care of people newly eligible for the stamps by virtue of having had to pay the Btu tax. Why? Because the earned income tax credit makes more people eligible for dependency on the Federal Government. These are hardworking Americans who are now not dependent on the Federal Government. The political science of this is great; this new Government dependency goes right around and these hardworking Americans must vote for the people who will now shell out money to keep them from having to pay the Btu tax.

It also fails on Rio because the tax makes the Pacific Northwest less blessed by clean, renewable hydropower. The tax fails on revenue because of the income transfers that are required. And it does one thing that the President promised when he said he was going to rework welfare as we knew it. How? By putting more Americans under income umbrellas.

Mr. President, this Btu tax is pernicious; it is dishonest because it is hidden from the people who will pay it. It puts people and Americans out of work. This amendment has the specificity required to remove new spending. If the purpose of the tax is solely to provide for new levels of Government, it succeeds brilliantly. If its purpose is to provide revenue, as the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Tennessee have said, it fails on every count because the new American is made dependent, the new American is eligible for food stamps, the new American who requires earned income transfers are now wards of the Government, under President Bill Clinton. It also fails environmentally.

And let me just say to my friend from Tennessee that its admittedly slight effects are not so slight when it is to the tune of $300 for a person in Wyoming. Maybe they do not live far from work in Tennessee but they live far from work in Wyoming. To my ranchers, my farmers, my miners, my county governments, my school districts who have to bus some kids 70 miles one way in a day, these are not slight effects, I would say. These are the effects of a Democratic Party seeking to embrace new dependent constituents.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator controls 35 minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. How much on the other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-nine minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank the Chair. I yield to the Senator from Texas 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I thank our dear colleague for his leadership, and I want to thank Senator SHELBY from Alabama for his leadership, for his courage, and for putting his constituents first. I think he has been a good lesson for us here today, and I simply wanted to make mention of it.

Mr. President, when the President gave the State of the Union Address, he said this energy tax is a throwaway, $10 a month, $120 a year. What he did not tell us was that was the direct cost, the increase in the cost of gasoline, the increase in the utility bills. But even his plan shows another $200 cost per family in the cost of everything going up because energy goes up in cost, everything from groceries to an airline ticket.

So in the President's budget, the cost of the energy tax is not $120 as he said in the State of the Union Address but $320. But now as outside groups are doing estimates, groups like the group headed by former Secretary James Schlesinger, who was Energy Secretary under President Carter, this tax is going to cost $500 a year per family on average in amount—more if you live west of the Mississippi, and more if you live in a rural area.

Our dear colleague from Louisiana said this is no problem because all of my people are going to get the earned income tax credit. Let me remind our colleagues, senior citizens do not get earned income tax credit. A lot of working Americans do not get earned income tax credit. A lot of people are not going to be protected.

What does the amendment do? The amendment before us cuts spending by $73 billion and eliminates this tax.

The budget now before us increases spending on new programs by $136 billion. What this amendment does is it takes $73 billion of the add ons away and eliminates this energy tax.

Our colleague from Tennessee says we do not have an alternative plan. Our alternative plan is as simple and direct as a plan can be: Do not increase spending by another $73 billion over the level we are spending now and do not impose this oppressive tax on the American people. That is what this amendment is about. It is a very simple plan. Every penny of the Btu tax is spent. None of it goes to deficit reduction.

Our colleagues talk about we have to stand up and raise taxes to lower the deficit. Not one penny of this Btu tax goes to deficit reduction. Every penny of it and more is spent on new programs under the Clinton budget.

So what we have done is simply said this: Out of the $136 billion of new add-on spending programs in the President's budget, take $73 billion of them away and do not impose the Btu tax. The Btu tax will raise energy costs on every American family. The Btu tax will make every American exporter less competitive. The Btu tax is going to affect the country, affect our growth capacity, affect job creation. It is a very poorly designed tax, and it is a tax that is going to cost us in terms of economic growth.

Does anybody here believe that the benefits of the 73 billion dollars' worth of new spending programs will really be worth the Btu tax to pay for it? Will it be worth the jobs? Will it be worth the cost imposed on the people who do the work, pay the taxes, and pull the wagon? The Senator from Oklahoma says "No." The Senator from Alabama says "No." I am proud to have my name on the list of those who say do not impose an energy tax. Do not impose a burden on working families. Do not destroy American jobs to increase spending.

It would be one thing if this money was going to deficit reduction, but every penny of it and more is going to pay for 136 billion dollars' worth of add ons. Take the new spending away. Take the Btu tax away.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Oregon 4 minutes.

Mr. PACKWOOD. I thank my good friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, there has been much debate here about specific taxes. Earlier we were talking about the Btu tax and the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator MOYNIHAN, made a good point. You are not ordering a Btu tax. You are saying to the Finance Committee here is the amount of money to raise. We recommend this but come up with it as you want. Likewise, on the spending cuts, this may be a generic outline but you are not ordering the committees to come up with these cuts. You are saying here are the goals we want to reach.

We are involved in a philosophical debate here, and it is a genuine philosophical difference between the political parties. The Republicans want to tax less and spend less. The Democrats want to tax more and spend more. Those are honest differences of opinion. Harry Hopkins, Roosevelt's chief aide, 60 years ago said it very clearly. "Our philosophy is tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect." And the Democratic Party has not changed in 60 years.

I will make this prediction. I want to be on the record now. If President Clinton's budget is adopted exactly as we have it, dot every "i," cross every "t," 5 years from now, we will be spending more of our gross national product by the Government, we will be taxing more, percentagewise, of our gross national product, our unemployment rate will be higher, and the deficit will be bigger than it is today.

Critics will say, oh, no, because this goes to deficit reduction.

I will tell you what will happen if we pass this budget exactly as it is with permanent taxes in it. They will never come off. What will happen is the next Congress and the Congress after that will have a demand to spend, and we will. Let me make that prediction. A higher percent of our gross national product will go for taxes, higher percent will go for spending, the deficit will be bigger, and unemployment will be bigger.

But all this amendment does is to take this generic outline—this is not a blueprint, this is an outline—and the Republicans are saying, let us cut $74 billion in taxes, and we will say to the Finance Committee, you have to raise $74 billion less, and let us cut spending $74 billion. And we are saying to the relevant committee, you cut the spending $74 billion. That is all. It is a philosophical decision, and this body can make whatever choice it wants. I personally am for smaller government and less taxes and less spending. I think the Democrats are for bigger Government and more taxes and more spending.

I thank my good friend from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. I yield to the Sentor from Alaska 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, we are told not to take seriously the amendment that we have proposed. Let me tell you, Alaskans take the amendment seriously. We are looking at a potential cost, as a consequence of the Btu tax, of approximately $1,500 per household.

I ask that this statement put out by the American Petroleum Institute today entitled "Proposed Energy Tax Will Hit Alaska Hard" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Petroleum Institute]

PROPOSED ENERGY TAX WILL HIT ALASKA HARD

OVERVIEW

The Clinton Administration's proposed BTU energy tax would hit Alaska's citizens especially hard—much harder, in fact, than it would most Americans. According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Alaska consumed about 550 trillion BTUs in 1990.[1] This means Alaska residents would have paid $216 million—equivalent to $1,521 per family of four—in additional energy taxes, had the Clinton Administration tax proposal been fully implemented.[2] A tax burden this large would slow the state's economy, cost jobs and make goods and services produced in Alaska less competitive in world markets.

ENERGY TAX IMPACT ON ALASKA

[In millions of dollars]

	Cost	Percent share
Residential	$16.8	7.7
Transportation	102.4	47.2
Commercial	18.5	8.5
Industrial	79.1	36.5
Total	216.7	100.0

Everyone depends on energy every day, so a tax on energy, as a tool to reduce the deficit, would hit Americans hard—and Alaska's citizens in particular. Gasoline and diesel fuel are used to carry people to and from work, haul goods to market, and deliver services to your front door. Jet fuel is used to transport people to business meetings and vacations; LPG (liquified petroleum gas) helps produce petrochemicals; and distillate fuels fire industrial and commercial boilers. Electricity—generated by coal, oil, natural gas, hydropower and nuclear fuels—lights our front porches and cools our offices, factories and living rooms. Coal, too, powers many utilities and manufacturing processes. And natural gas cooks food, heats homes, powers forklifts and performs countless other commercial and industrial tasks. Many of our major industries—petrochemicals, glass, and aluminum are just a few—use tremendous amounts of energy in the production process.

A fairer way to raise money to reduce the budget deficit, after all practical spending cuts have been made, would be to levy a relatively small tax on all consumer goods. Under a value added tax (VAT), energy would be taxed along with other goods and services. However, a VAT would not unduly penalize particular businesses or regions of the country, as would a BTU tax. And a VAT can be designed to exempt essentials such as food and medicine so the poor would not be unfairly burdened. Even with such exemptions, a one percent VAT would raise $27 billion or more.

WHY THE BTU TAX HITS ALASKA HARD

The Clinton Administration has proposed taxing the heat content of fuels, measured in British Thermal Units (BTU's). The proposed tax, in addition to being one of the worst ways to raise government revenue, is also discriminatory. A tax rate of 25.7 cents per million BTUs applies to virtually all energy sources except oil, which is taxed at 59.9 cents per million BTUs (about two-and-a-third times as high as other forms of energy). Alaska gets its energy from a variety of sources, including a large percentage from heavily-taxed oil.

The BTU tax would apply to all sources of energy except solar, wind and geothermal power (which together comprise less than 1 percent of the U.S. energy supply). There would be an exemption for non-fuel uses of energy, such as the raw materials used in the production of fertilizer. Even with these exemptions, the residents of Alaska would be hit hard by a BTU tax. A BTU tax this large would affect every household, worker and business in the state.

ENERGY USE AT HOME

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, households in Alaska consumed more than 48 trillion BTUs in 1990. Electricity—for lighting and for heating in particular—accounted for nearly 43 percent of this total. Natural gas and petroleum accounted for much of the remainder. Had the Clinton Administration's BTU tax been in effect in 1990, Alaska households would have had to pay $16.8 million in additional taxes.

ENERGY USE ON THE ROAD

A BTU tax on transportation would hit Alaska residents hard. In 1990, some 570,000 people living in Alaska consumed 172 trillion BTUs to transport goods, services and people. In 1991, the 318,000 drivers in Alaska operated nearly 470,000 registered vehicles and drove 4 billion miles on more than 243 million gallons of motor fuel. Had this fuel—along with jet fuel and other fuels used in transporting people, goods and services—been taxed according to the Clinton Administration's proposed BTU formula, Alaska would have paid $102.4 million in additional energy transportation taxes in 1990. As motor fuel consumption rises—as it is likely

[1] This end-use energy consumption figure excludes non-fuel uses of fossil fuels. For example, the natural gas used as a raw material in the manufacturing of fertilizer would not be taxed.

[2] The details of the proposed Clinton Administration BTU tax are not yet available. However, its broad outlines are known and, in this paper, the impact of the tax is assumed to occur in the same state where the end-user energy consumption occurs. The figures therefore reflect on-site consumption and not the fact that industrial firms and some commercial firms eventually pass through to their customers some—or all—of the tax. To the extent that firms can do so to out of state customers, impacts among states will vary from those shown here.

to do by 1997 when the proposed tax would be fully phased-in—Alaska residents would likely pay even more in transportation taxes. And few Alaska citizens have access to mass transit as a way to reduce their exposure to a BTU tax on motor fuels.

ENERGY USE ON THE JOB

Energy powers in the state's economic growth—and its job growth. In 1990, the commercial and industrial users of energy in Alaska consumed more than 330 trillion BTUs. Had this energy use been subject to the proposed BTU tax, Alaska businesses—and ultimately, consumers—would have paid more than $98 million in additional energy taxes for their goods and services in 1990. Energy-intensive industries that are important to the Alaska economy include lumber, paper and pulp, and mining.

Lumber and logging are heavy energy users. Energy is needed to cut, stack and haul trees to sawmills and planing mills. Moreover, trucks and trains that deliver hardwood flooring, plywood and other forest products to their end-users consume energy that would be subject to the proposed BTU tax.

The construction industry is a big energy user. Cement companies in particular consume large quantities of energy in order to produce and transport concrete to sites to build bridges, office buildings, the foundations of new homes, and new shopping centers. Energy also is consumed producing fabricated structural metal, concrete block and brick, glass and ceramic wall and floor tile.

Every manufacturing process consumes energy. Coal, oil, natural gas and the electricity produced from a variety of energy sources power factories. Trains, trucks and planes consume energy when they deliver raw materials, such as steel, aluminum or plastics to the factory door. And energy is consumed when the finished product is transported to regional distribution centers and retail outlets. In fact, according to the National Association of Manufacturers, "one-third (and possibly more) of the total BTU tax would fall directly on industrial production processes."

In short, a BTU tax would raise household, transportation and business costs. Higher costs would have a ripple effect. Some of Alaska's citizens would lose their jobs because consumer buying power would be reduced as a result of sending more tax dollars to Washington and the higher cost of goods and services. And the things Alaska's residents produce for export would also become less competitive in world markets. This, too, could result in lost jobs.

VALUE ADDED TAX IS A MORE EQUITABLE ALTERNATIVE

A BTU tax is not the only option for dealing with the federal budget deficit. If after making all reasonable and realistic spending cuts policymakers decide additional government revenues are needed, a tax on consumption, such as a credit-invoice value added tax, or VAT, would be fairer than a tax levied solely on energy. Unlike an energy tax, a VAT's regressivity can be reduced by excluding critical goods and services such as food and medical care.

The VAT, already in use in virtually every industrial country in the world except the United States, would apply to energy, but also to other consumption. Its burden would be spread uniformly across the U.S. economy and would not unduly penalize particular businesses or regions of the country. The BTU tax, however, would have a far greater impact on the residents of Alaska than on others.

Regional inequities of the BTU tax on a four-person household

Region:	Annual Tax
Southwest	$652
Southeast	507
Rocky Mountain	489
Plains	466
Great Lakes	446
Far West	439
New England	405
Mid-Atlantic	390

NOTE.—People living in rural regions (where driving distances are long) and regions with more energy-intensive industries will be particularly hard-hit by the energy tax.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. It says the tax burden of this magnitude will slow our State's economy, cost jobs, and makes goods and services produced in Alaska less competitive in the world marketplaces.

Mr. President, as we address the issue of equity, this Btu tax is grossly unfair. It proposes to treat gas, coal, and hydro at a rate of 25.7, but it takes oil and adds 34 cents per million Btu and calls it a special surtax.

Mr. President, it is not a surtax. It is a sin tax. It puts us into the category of tobacco and liquor. The logic of this absolutely escapes me. In the bush communities in Alaska, up to 25 percent of the income goes for energy. We are big, we are cold. We are not going to save anything from the standpoint of saving oil because it takes so much kerosene to get there in the jet, just as it does my friend in the chair from Hawaii. We are large, we are big, we are cold. The national average of household income spent on energy is about 7 percent, compared with 25 percent in the State of Alaska.

Mr. President, we are looking at the energy industry of this country, which constitutes about 9.8 percent of the gross national product, to come up with 22 percent of the new taxes proposed by the President. It is hurting the fishermen, the farmers, the miners, our international competitiveness, and costing jobs. And what we are also looking at is a proposed tax on energy to produce energy, like LNG, like the fertilizer urea. This is going to affect our international competitiveness. There is no consideration in here for the inflation factor. One airline in my State of Alaska, Alaska Airlines, is looking at a $19 million increase as a consequence of this Btu tax, no offsetting entries. It is simply not fair.

I think we ought to address the question of why some of the oil companies are for it. Most of the oil industry is against it. It is not good for Americans. But some majors are for it. The question is why. They have different sources of crude oil and refined products. Some of them depend on imports. Those imports will undoubtedly increase. The beneficiaries will be the Saudis and Mideast countries, not necessarily the United States, the U.S. consumer, or the taxpayer.

The oil companies are going to go down, Mr. President, and talk to the Treasury and hope that they can work something out. Right now nobody knows how it is going to work out. It is an individual negotiation. Members of this body and myself are going to watch those negotiations. We are going to watch those special interest groups to ensure that there are no loopholes granted in any proposal of a nature such as this.

Mr. President, this tax is simply not well thought out. It hurts the U.S. consumer, and it hurts those that are dependent on oil and have absolutely no other alternative. In my home in Alaska, I only have oil. My neighbors only have oil. Yet we are being asked to make a fair contribution which is not fair because of the special 34-cent surtax. And the equity of that escapes me.

I urge my colleagues to support the pending amendment, which is, in good conscience, what is best for America.

I will support the amendment of my colleague from Oklahoma.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thank my friend and I thank all the Republican Senators who, I think, have presented an air-tight case for getting rid of the energy tax.

When I was a young lawyer, there was an adage around. It said, when you have bad facts, you bring a lot of law books along. When you have good facts, you do not need any law books.

What has happened here is there is no defense for this energy tax. It is not needed. It is not good for anyone. It is going to destroy American business. It is going to harm senior citizens. No earned income tax helps senior citizens in retirement. The poor in America do not get any earned income tax credit unless they are working and unless they have families. There are millions without families. They are not going to get anything out of this attempt to counteract progressivity by expanding the earned income tax credit.

Frankly, it is about as regressive as you can get. It is going to cost jobs, and it is not going to improve the environment. It is not going to do anything to cause us to consume less. Lo and behold, it is going to cause us to produce less oil.

Then, when you have all of those facts against you, you bring out the law. And the law is budgetese. The law is putting up a chart, talking about all of the Republican amendments. Keep in mind, if one of them had passed, we would not have offered the other ones. We are giving examples of how one major amendment will be funded. That is what we are doing. And we are as-

suming, if it passes, we do not take the other one up. So everybody should dispel any notion that we do not have a plan. This is the first installment of a Republican plan, and it is very simple—$72 billion less in taxes, and $72 billion less in new Government expenditures.

There is nothing more difficult than that, nothing erroneous about that, nothing wrong with that under the budget system. Clearly, that is how you do it. Function 920 is more budgetese. The chairman, a marvelous Senator, who knows the budget, and when it works to his purpose, he does not talk about it. He put $40 billion in unspecified cuts in it to make his budget work, and then he would have the American people say that the Republicans do not have a budget. That is why they are up here doing this. This budget is clear. The appropriators in the U.S. Congress will have $72 billion less to spend if the Nickles amendment is adopted.

The President asked for $124 billion in new programs and add-ons. We are saying spend $72 billion less of that. Very simple and forthright and very true. And on the tax side, why do we want to tax energy? This is no environmental tax. It may have started out as a great environmental bonanza to America, but the administration negotiated it out in such a way that it does not help the environment. You pay twice as much for crude oil as you do for natural gas, the cleanest of all fuels. Hydroelectric and natural gas, they get a big whopping Btu tax, and they do not have anything to do with the environmental problems of the country. So on all scores it does not work. There are no facts to support a Btu tax. You have to come with some legalese, and the legalese is to make excuses and talk about Republicans and talk about no plans.

I close by saying for those who wonder about our plan, this is the first installment tonight, $72 billion less in taxes, $72 billion less in expenditures. I think the American people expected that. Thank you.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Senator NICKLES, Senator WALLOP, and others, to eliminate the Btu tax from the pending budget resolution.

Mr. President, we have heard so much about sacrifice in the debate over the budget deficit. And sacrifice will surely be needed if deficit-reduction is to be achieved.

The amendment before us has nothing to do with backing off of any necessary tough medicine. It does not undercut the deficit reduction in the pending resolution—it leaves all of the deficit reduction intact, and indeed, I will argue that the pending amendment would improve the resolution's prospects for lasting deficit reduction.

What this amendment does is simply to lower the amount of new taxes and new spending in the bill. Thus, it shifts the sacrifice from the working Americans who would have to pay the costs of the Btu tax and asks for more sacrifice from Members of Congress who are anxious to spend public money. That is all that it does. It eliminates an amount of new spending—not existing spending, but new spending, above and beyond projected increases—and uses that savings to save working Americans from the presently unseen—or apparently understood—effects of the proposed Btu tax.

If sacrifices are indeed necessary to reduce the deficit, they ought to start here in Congress with some spending restraint. Recently we reduced legislative branch appropriations and committee staff funding, an appropriate bit of belt-tightening. However, I don't believe that this entitles us to a new spending spree of $124 billion over 5 years—which I repeat again, is over and above projected increases.

So let us be very clear about what is in this budget resolution. New taxes—nearly $300 billion in net new taxes. Spending cuts? On the domestic side—only $7 billion in net domestic spending cuts. While we are only cutting domestic spending by $7 billion, we are hitting the American public with a whopping tax bill—including $78 billion in energy taxes.

We hear a lot of rhetoric in this Chamber about how some are unwilling to bite the bullet to reduce the deficit because they are protecting some special interest. I would suggest that those who oppose this amendment are protecting the special interest of congressional spending at the expense of the working Americans who will pay this tax. This budget resolution asks those Americans to pay $78 billion in new taxes so that we can have the luxury of embarking on popular new spending initiatives that will get everybody reelected. Surely the American people can figure that out.

The Btu tax is undeniably regressive. The administration has admitted as much by proposing a low-income energy assistance program to ameliorate the effects of the tax. But if we simply scale back some of the proposed new spending spree, we can eliminate the need for this tax altogether.

I would make one final point before I close. This amendment is scored as being revenue-neutral. I believe it is better than that—it will improve the long-term deficit-reduction potential of this resolution.

This is because all of the new spending in the resolution will permanently work its way into budget baselines in years to come. A dollar spent this year will mean an inflation-adjusted dollar spent next year, and again every year after that. All new spending plans will be figured in relation to the accelerated levels of spending created by these new spending initiatives.

On the other hand, there is no reason to believe that the revenue from this tax would increase to keep pace with the proposed new spending. In fact, the opposite is true. The extent to which new taxes burden our economy and diminish projections of Federal revenue is never properly accounted for. We will be fortunate indeed if the Btu tax produces its projected revenue.

Passage of this amendment would mean eliminating a dubious revenue projection, while at the same time eliminating assuredly increasing new spending. That is a trade which would be beneficial for us to make. We would also be placing back upon this Congress some of the burden which this resolution currently seeks to shift onto working Americans. I hope my colleagues will support this amendment and I yield the floor.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I intend to yield almost immediately to the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, but let me just say: This is a plan to reduce the deficit, to get this economy moving again? This is a plan that comes up with $764 billion in unspecified cuts over 5 years? This is a plan, which to pay for it you would have to reduce domestic discretionary spending by 60 percent over 5 years.

What kind of plan is this, Mr. President? Look here. Eliminate Social Security tax. How do you pay for that? Unspecified spending cuts. What are they? Eliminate the energy tax. How do you pay for it? That is $73 billion, with unspecified spending cuts. Restore defense spending. That was one of the amendments. That is $56 billion. How do you pay for that $56 billion in increased spending? Unspecified spending cuts. Protect small business and family farms. Sounds great—$56 billion. How do you pay for it? Unspecified spending cuts. Reduced discretionary programs, 50 percent. How do you pay for it? It is $46 billion in unspecified cuts. It goes on and on.

So the point is, Mr. President, that is just the kind of plan that got us in the hole we are in now, and if we adopted all of these proposals that make up some kind of plan, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee would have to reduce his appropriations for domestic discretionary spending by 60 percent over 5 years. Why, that is ridiculous. You would have to shut down almost all of the operations of the U.S. Government.

Well, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and President pro tempore is on the floor. I am sure that he will address this matter in his usual eloquent and exhaustive fashion. I look forward to hearing from him.

I yield to my friend from West Virginia such time as he may consume.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank my friend.

Twelve years ago, this Nation embarked on a grand new fiscal experi-

ment. It was an experiment based upon the theory and all too attractive promises of supply-side economics. We were told at the time that if we would cut domestic spending, we could also reduce taxes—3 years in one fell swoop in cutting taxes; 5 percent, 10 percent, and 10 percent—increase military spending, and still balance the overall Federal budget.

I will say it again. We were told—I heard it, I was here, and I listened—that if we would cut domestic spending, we could also reduce taxes, increase military spending, and still balance the overall budget—I mean, just in a matter of 2 or 3 years—"In FY 1983, if not in FY 1982," I believe were the exact words, all at the same time. Talk about pulling a rabbit out of the hat. We were told that it could be done. And the people said, give the new President a chance.

What did we do? I voted to give the new President a chance. We slashed real, domestic discretionary spending, and far more substantially than most might realize. We also cut taxes, again far more substantially than most might realize, and we massively increased military spending. Yet, we did not balance the budget—not by a long shot. Instead, we incurred an unbroken string of triple-digit billion dollar deficits.

Let us go back just a little way over the path of time. Here is a chart. Look at the first year of the Ford administration budget. It ran a $70 billion deficit. The second year, a $50 billion deficit. The first year of the Carter administration, a $55 billion deficit. The second year of the Carter administration, we ran a $38 billion deficit. The third year, a $73 billion deficit, and the fourth year, a $74 billion deficit. In other words, double digit deficits in the billions.

Then, for the first year for which the Reagan administration was responsible, the man who said that if we would follow his will-o'-the-wisp supply-side economics theory, cut taxes, cut spending, and raise military spending we would balance the budget, what happened? In the first year for which his administration was responsible, the chart show a $120 billion deficit for the first time, a triple digit deficit in the billions, $120 billion. The next year it was $208 billion, then $186 billion the next year, and the next year $222 billion.

So the first 4 years of the first Reagan administration we see what we got. We did not get balanced budgets. Then the first year of his second administration, $238 billion, the second year $169 billion, then $194 billion, and then $205 billion.

No balanced budgets in sight. Look anywhere you please.

Then we came to the first year of the Bush administration. A $205 billion deficit. The second year a $278 billion deficit, the third year a $322 billion deficit, and last year $340 billion in the red.

No balanced budget anywhere in sight. Look where you may—east, west, north, and south, it is not there.

Well, the theory was that slashing the tax rates would generate such a tremendous surge in new economic activity that the tax cuts would just pay for themselves. What a marvelous potion of brew for one to imbibe. And that we could then finance the largest peacetime military buildup in history and still balance our budget.

The theory failed miserably. The promise of fiscal conservatism was overrun by the fiscal radicalism of borrow and spend.

I heard a little while ago one of the great orators on the other side of the aisle talk about how the Democrats believed in taxing and spending; the philosophy of the Democratic Party is to tax and spend, the Senator said.

Mr. President, we saw what the philosophy of our Republican friends was under the Reagan administration and under the Bush administration. The philosophy was borrow and spend. Don't pay for it today. Good morning in America. Use your credit card. So we went on a national credit card binge. We used the credit card. We borrowed money. Have a good time today. There is, indeed, a free lunch. You do not have to pay for it today. Eat, drink, and be merry today. Let our children pay the bills tomorrow.

At that time in the early Reagan years, Senator Howard Baker described the radical new approach that we were undertaking as "a riverboat gamble." Regrettably, it was a gamble that we lost.

As a result of the fiscal folly of the past 12 years, we are left today with budget deficits and a national debt that is skyrocketing out of control.

Let us take a look at our national debt on the chart beside us. Our national debt stands today at over $4 trillion, $4.114 trillion. That is a lot of money. How long does it take to count $1 trillion at the rate of $1 a second? it would take 32,000 years.

On January 20, 1981, when the Great Communicator was sworn in on the west front—and by the way I had more to do with that swearing in on the west front than anyone else had—it was I who insisted that we change from the east front to the west front of the Capitol for the inauguration, and that was a good move. So we had our first swearing in there on the west front. It was a marvelous view. On January 20, 1981, when the Great Communicator was sworn into office, this country had a national debt of $932 billion, $932 billion. Not quite a trillion dollars. After 192 years and 39 administrations, this country had a debt of $932 billion, $932 billion. It had gone through all the administrations: George Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Jackson, Van Buren, Harrison, Tyler, Polk, Taylor, Fillmore, Pierce, Buchanan, Lincoln, and the first Johnson, Andrew Johnson, and then Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Arthur, Cleveland, Benjamin Harrison, and Cleveland again.

Then McKinley, Teddy Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, Nixon, Ford, and Carter.

Our country endured through all of the panics; the panic of 1837, the panic of 1857, the panic of 1873, the panic of 1893, the Great Depression of the 1930's. Our forefathers paid off the Revolutionary war debts, they paid the costs of the War of 1812, the war with Mexico in 1846–1848, the Civil War, the Spanish-American war in 1898, World War I, World War II, the war in Korea, in Vietnam, all of these, mind you, yet the country had run up a national debt of $932 billion—less than $1 trillion.

But as President Reagan once said, "You ain't seen nothing yet." Well, we had not seen anything yet.

In the 12 years of the Reagan and Bush administrations, and the Bush and Quayle administration, that debt more than tripled—more than tripled—in the end, we had a quadrupling of the national debt, $4.114 trillion. That is how we got there.

Well, I voted for the tax cut Mr. Reagan had promised with all these magic incantations. I listened to him and I voted for them, and I voted for the massive buildup in defense spending. I voted for everything that came along in defense. You name it, I supported it here on the floor.

What is the result of a national debt of this proportion? This debt continues to rise with supersonic speed. When I was in high school we read a book, "Around the World in 80 Days," by Jules Verne, 80 days around the world. Today, men travel around the Earth in 80 minutes. And we are going upward at supersonic speed, with this national debt.

Well, the interest on the debt was $69 billion in 1980. And for this year it is going to be $199.6 billion.

Now we hear all this ripping and roaring and gnashing of teeth and shedding of tears about taxes. And I have had my handkerchief out, also, shedding a few tears myself.

But what about this hidden tax, this interest payment on the national debt? That is a hidden tax. And you pay it and you pay it and you pay it and I pay it and they pay it and she pays it. We all pay the hidden tax on the national debt.

(Mr. KERRY assumed the chair.)

Mr. DOMENICI. I do, too.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from New Mexico does not want to be left out in this. He pays it, too.

He pays it, too, that noble Roman. This is a hidden tax and it buys not one

textbook for the schoolchildren of the Nation.

Well, within the next few weeks, we, in the Congress, will be asked once again to raise the statutory limit on the Federal debt, and we will be forced to do so. No doubt, there will be much wrangling; we will hear a great deal of lofty rhetoric that will make the rafters ring; many fine speeches will be made. But, in the end, after the dust has settled and the smoke from the vocal guns has floated away, we will have to raise the debt limit. We will do so in order to avert shutting down the Federal Government and to avoid wreaking havoc in the lives of millions of Americans. For the 27th time in 12 years, we will raise the debt limit so that Social Security checks can be mailed out, so that veterans can continue receiving medical care, so that the FBI and the DEA can continue to fight crime and drugs in America, so that disaster assistance can continue to flow to those battered by blizzards, tornadoes, hurricanes, and other acts of Nature, and the list goes on.

Again, we will raise the debt limit, and many may view our doing so as a sign that, despite all the talk of change, business as usual continues in Washington. Yet, before we take up the issue of raising the debt ceiling, we have an opportunity to show the American people that business as usual is not the order of the day. We have an opportunity to show the American people that we intend not only to talk about change, but also to enact change, and that opportunity is before us today in the form of the fiscal year 1994 budget resolution reported by the Senate Budget Committee.

The resolution before us represents a complete turnaround from the failed fiscal policies of the past. It provides for deficit reduction of $500 billion over the next 5 years, and it does so through a balanced mix of both spending cuts and revenue increases. Moreover, it signals an equally important change in our fiscal priorities by providing for enactment of a package of investment initiatives that will allow us to address infrastructure needs too long neglected, and thus help lay the foundation for strong and steady economic growth in the years to come. Even with these investment initiatives, the resolution reported by the Budget Committee will produce $500 billion in deficit reduction over the next 5 years.

Now, there are those who suggest that the resolution before us is inadequate, that it does not go far enough or fast enough in terms of reducing our budget deficit. Others criticize it for its mix of spending cuts and revenue increases. To both, I would respond by urging them to take a second look. These are the most difficult of times. We face the conflicting pressures of wanting to gain control of a budget that is unquestionably out of control; yet, of having to do so in the midst of an economic recovery of uncertain strength and fortitude. We find ourselves walking a fiscal tightrope—trying to bring down the deficit in an orderly fashion without either going too slow, so as to raise concerns about the legitimacy of our endeavor, or too fast so as to slow our economy and risk throwing it into recession.

To those who suggest that $500 billion of net deficit reduction is not enough, I urge them to consider the consequences of pushing too hard and throwing our economy back into recession. As we struggle to bring down the deficit, nothing would be more counterproductive than to set too high a target and cut short the current economic recovery. To those who argue for greater spending cuts and fewer revenue increases, I likewise urge them to recognize that reducing spending can create a drag on the economy, and therefore, poses risks of its own. Although one might question or debate the relative productivity of certain types of Government spending, one cannot deny that Government spending generates real economic activity. When the Government spends money, that money does not simply vanish into thin air. To the contrary, it goes toward buying goods and services, toward paying salaries, toward increasing disposable incomes—to repeat it, it generates economic activity. Cutting spending can have real, adverse economic consequences. To blindly call for further massive reductions in domestic spending, seemingly without any regard for the negative impact such cuts could have on our economy, is foolhardy.

Finally, to the critics of the budget resolution reported by the committee, I would draw their attention to the extraordinarily positive reaction of the financial markets to the President's economic proposals. While not identical to the plan unveiled by President Clinton last month, the budget resolution before us conforms to the basic outlines of that plan in that it seeks to both reduce the deficit and increase public investment. Again, I believe the undeniably positive reaction of the financial markets to the President's plan confirms the appropriateness, both as to its timing and its balance between spending and taxes, of the deficit reduction plan contained in the resolution of the Senate Budget Committee.

In addition, I believe it appropriate that we all ask ourselves, what is our reason for wanting to gain control of our budget and stop the runaway increase in our national debt? What motivates us in this endeavor? Clearly, it is that we wish not to burden our children and our children's children with an unmanageable debt that will stifle economic growth in the years ahead and keep them from enjoying an ever-rising standard of living as we have enjoyed—a rising standard of living. The folly of the past 12 years is not simply the enormous debt that was accumulated. It is more the fact that an unprecedented amount of debt was taken on without any corresponding buildup in investment. Simply put, the tragic legacy of the 1980's is that, from a mountain of debt, we made but a molehill of investment. We took on more than $3 trillion of debt in only 12 years; yet, we invested little, little—we invested little in our Nation's infrastructure, in our workers and our children, or in civilian research and development—public investments that help maximize the return on private investment and enhance productivity growth. Now, we face runaway budget deficits, we spend $200 billion a year on interest on the national debt—that $200 billion is a hidden tax—and our economy is mired in the most anemic economic recovery on record.

Sadly, the policies of the past are demanding their due. The chickens have come home to roost.

Fiscal policy should be directed at laying a foundation that will encourage and promote economic growth. Government itself may not be the engine of economic growth, but it certainly can help lay the tracks and maintain the rail bed. The focus of our efforts should be to establish policies that promote investment and thus lay a foundation for sustained long-term economic growth. Investment is the key to long-term economic growth. The proper role of Government, therefore, should be to promote investment, not impede it.

It is in this regard, however, that our national debt and the projections that are made of future budget deficits are so troubling. When the Federal Government, year after year, incurs one record-breaking deficit after another, we impede private investment by the very fact that private investors are then forced to compete with the Government for the limited pool of available investment capital. At the same time, the cost of carrying our debt—the interest the Federal Government must pay to finance its debt—also impedes our ability to finance important public investment projects.

The cost of carrying our debt: $200 billion, a hidden tax with no return to the taxpayer. It does not buy one lead pencil.

Our massive debt not only forces us to forego the important direct benefits that public investment can provide, but also causes us to lose the stimulative effect that public investment can have on private investment. In my view, the evidence is clear: public investment not only benefits our economy directly; it also encourages greater private investment.

In the eighties, we had a Johnny-one-note policy based on the magic and popularity of low taxes. In the 1990's,

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 4) 34

we woke up to the sour notes of a long recession, massive unemployment, rising deficits, and a slipping standard of living. In reality, the cut-spending crowd really only cut the heart out of domestic spending. Somehow they did not count Pentagon spending as spending. They were fond of saying, you can't just throw money at a problem. But, look at the money they threw at the Pentagon. Everybody remembers the $600 toilet seats and the $14 light bulbs. That was the folly of the 1980's.

We pumped up the Pentagon with every spare dollar we could get our hands on. But we could spare only pennies for our infrastructure needs.

We slashed domestic spending but the administration forced cuts in domestic discretionary spending. They called it all pork barrel and waste—pork barrel. Pork barrel: Bridges, highways, water, sewer facilities, airport construction—not large airports, except one, but still airport construction. That is pork, they say. We spent $9 billion in Federal funds on the metro system here and I have been fully supportive of it. Is that pork? No. That is in the District of Columbia and environs. All of this infrastructure is investment in our country.

Meanwhile, billions were wasted in a defense spending orgy. We did not fuel our domestic engine of growth, the private sector sagged, and the only thing that flourished was the deficit. We became so enamored of cutting taxes that we undercut our ability to provide basic services to our own people. It was easy. It was popular.

Yes, I was able to go back to West Virginia and say, well, I listened to what you said. You said give this man a chance. And he wanted to cut taxes and I cut them. I voted to cut taxes for the wealthy. That is easy; easy. Easy, as they say, as falling off a log—back in the sticks from where I came. Easy as falling off a log: Cut taxes, raise the standard high—I am for cutting taxes. And so we cut taxes.

Who wants to vote to increase taxes? I do not. Who gets any pleasure out of that? I do not.

Who gets any pleasure out of paying taxes? I do not. But you cannot get something for nothing.

So it was popular, but it was disastrous for the very taxpayers that we were trying so hard to placate.

So what do we hear now from the other side of the aisle?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator and the time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee such time as he might consume off the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Cicero was asked which of Demosthenes' orations he liked best? His answer: The longest.

This is not my longest oration. I am not going to keep the Senate waiting unduly.

In addition to vociferously opposing efforts to scale back our military budget, we hear nothing but disparaging remarks about the President's efforts to boost public investment in America.

If he were living back in the late 1800's, he might also expect to see the flash of a gun from the pocket of a Senator from Mississippi threatening the Senator from Missouri. But we try to keep our tempers in check. Yet, passions are inflamed.

We are told over and over that Government is too big, and that we cannot afford to increase spending by even a dime. Yet, Mr. President, I must protest. For too long, those who would seem to prefer that Government do nothing but "raise and support armies" have been allowed, unchallenged, to portray the Federal Government as an unruly behemoth that overtaxes and overspends, and I fear that much of our citizenry has been taken in by such arguments.

However, the facts, surprising as they may be to many Americans, and perhaps shocking as they may be to many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, are that Federal taxation is no higher today than it has been, on average, over the entire postwar period.

Let me explain that. That sounds like a rather outlandish statement.

On the chart to my left, we begin with the Eisenhower administration—that is when I came to Washington. I was sworn in while President Truman was still President. I will always be proud of that. I served under President Truman for 17 days, from January 3 to January 20, 1953; a long time ago. Only one man over on the other side—in the House—has seniority over me on this Hill. So there I was, when Dwight Eisenhower came into office.

This chart shows total Federal outlays and revenues as a percent of the gross domestic product, GDP. And taking, for example, during the administrations of President Eisenhower, total outlays were 18.3 percent of the gross domestic product during his administration.

The next bar represents the Kennedy-Johnson years. The next bar represents the Ford-Nixon years. The next bar represents the Carter years. The next bar represents the Reagan years, and the last bar represents the Bush years. And the same can be said for the bars on the far end of the chart, which are the revenue bars.

So if the viewers will pay close attention, they will see that during this period, going back to the Eisenhower years, total Federal outlays have increased, as a percentage of the GDP, from 18.3 percent during the Eisenhower years to 23.3 percent during the Bush years; in other words, 5 percent increase in outlays as a percent of the GDP.

Revenues, meanwhile, have remained fairly level, going back to the Eisenhower years and proceeding on down through the years under Mr. Bush. We will note that revenues as a percentage of the gross domestic product remained fairly level. That may sound like an astounding statement, but it really is not. It is a fact. Keeping in mind that the gross domestic product, when I first came to Washington at the beginning of the Eisenhower administration, was $223 billion, going back to 1947, the first year, may I say to the Senator from Tennessee, that I served in the West Virginia House of Delegates.

Mr. SASSER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. Could I just make one other statement? The gross domestic product back in 1947, which is a little farther back here—we just did not have room to extend this chart—but the trend was the same. In 1947, the gross domestic product of this country was $223 billion; $223 billion, not much more than the interest on the national debt that we pay today, which is about $200 billion. But in 1992, the gross domestic product was $5.9 trillion; in other words, it was 24 times as much as it was back in 1947 when Harry Truman was President and I was a greenhorn down in the West Virginia Legislature.

But as a percentage of the gross domestic product, the revenues have not grown very much. Let us go to the next chart.

Mr. SASSER. If the Senator will withhold for just one moment.

Mr. BYRD. I will yield, yes, I am sorry.

Mr. SASSER. Looking at this chart and looking at the years 1982 through 1989 in outlays, we see a growth there of from 21.8 percent of GDP to 23.2 percent of GDP in outlays.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. SASSER. While at the same time, on the revenue side, we see a decline in revenues of 19.3 percent of GDP to 18.7 percent of GDP.

Mr. BYRD. Yes, precisely.

Mr. SASSER. And if I recall the Senator's previous charts, those are precisely the years in which we had the explosion of the deficits in the Reagan years.

Mr. BYRD. That is right.

Mr. SASSER. So what the Senator is demonstrating here by his charts is that outlays going up in 1990's—when they said they were cutting spending, Government spending, the outlays were really going up as a percent of GDP faster than any other period shown on the chart and revenues were coming down.

Mr. BYRD. Yes. Exactly.

Mr. SASSER. So that would explain the explosion in the deficits that occurred during the decade of the 1980's. Is that right?

Mr. BYRD. That would certainly help to explain the explosion.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Let me show the Senator something that will be even more of an eye opener.

Let us think about Social Security outlays and revenues, off budget now, Social Security outlays and revenues.

Going back to the Eisenhower administration, as a percentage of the gross domestic product, Social Security outlays were 1.5 percent of the GDP during the Eisenhower administration. And the viewers will note that as the years went by, the percentage of GDP represented by Social Security outlays increased to 4.2 percent of the GDP during the Bush years—remembering, the GDP had increased 24 times over what it was in 1947. So as the GDP was going up, these were going up also. But they were rising more as a percentage of the total GDP over those years.

Now look at the revenues in Social Security. Keep your eyes on the chart. The revenues from Social Security went up from 1.7 percent of the GDP during the Eisenhower administration to 5.2 percent of GDP during the Bush administration. In other words, three times as much—three times as much—percentagewise of the GDP over those years.

Now, as we go to the next chart, remember this chart and the earlier chart. Remember, in the earlier chart we said that revenues over this long period remained pretty much on a level keel as a percentage of GDP. Now, here is Social Security; it did not remain level. It went up, a steep climb, as a percentage of GDP.

All right. That is Social Security revenue. Now, what this chart would show is that, when we take out Social Security revenues over that period—take them off budget—they call it on budget. You take Social Security off budget and you say it is on budget. It is a little confusing, is it not?

George Romney said:

> I didn't say that I didn't say it. I said that I didn't say that I said it. Now, I want to make that very clear.

So it is a little confusing, is it not? On budget or off budget? Anyhow, when we do not count Social Security revenue—remember that revenues with Social Security included were level—when we take Social Security taxes out, what happens to the remaining non-Social Security revenues? They went down, went down from 16.2 percent of GDP during the Eisenhower years to 13.6 percent of GDP in the Bush years. Mind you now, that 13.6 percent of the gross domestic product for revenues, non-Social Security revenues, is the lowest in 50 years—lowest in 50 years.

So if we do not include Social Security taxes, the American people are being taxed less as a percentage of the gross domestic product today than they were 50 years ago. Meanwhile, the non-Social Security outlays have not increased very much as a percentage of GDP—16.7 percent during the Eisenhower period; 19.1 percent during the Bush period. In other words, non-Social Security outlays, increased only 2.4 percent from the Eisenhower years through the Bush years. Right? And the reason these outlays are up, the big reason, is the great increase in Medicare, Medicaid, and interest payments.

Now, let us talk just briefly about the amendment. What does this amendment do? It cuts $73 billion out of investment. It purports to reduce taxes by $73 billion. So it says no Btu tax, $73 billion. And how do we pay for it? Cut discretionary spending $73 billion. Where would the domestic discretionary spending be cut? Nobody says. But remember this, may I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle:

The Finance Committee is not being told to bring in a Btu tax. The Finance Committee can bring in whatever it wants or any combination of revenues to make up the $73 billion. So that is a reconciliation instruction to the Finance Committee. "You go out into the hedges and the byroads and come back with some revenues. We are not telling you to bring back a Btu tax. You do not have to come back with that particular tax; just go out and get $73 billion in revenues."

So the Finance Committee will abide by the reconciliation instructions, and, after careful hearings and discussions, that Committee will come in, if this budget resolution is adopted, with that amount of revenues or even less. But, may I say to my distinguished friend from Oklahoma—and he is my friend; he works closely with me on the Appropriations Committee—the Appropriations Committee is not given reconciliation instructions by the Budget Committee. The Appropriations Committee is not given reconciliation instructions by the Budget Committee. But if this amendment is adopted, the Senate will have voted to cut discretionary spending $73 billion. The budget resolution sets the allocation for the Appropriations Committee, and we live within our allocation. Every year that I have been chairman of the Appropriations Committee we have lived within our allocations, we have not gone over the caps. As a matter of fact, we have come a little under.

You pass this amendment, that is it. That is it for domestic discretionary spending. Discretionary spending is cut, and we do not know where. The Nickles amendment does not say where. That is it.

This budget resolution, let me point out, already cuts discretionary appropriations by $16.3 billion in 1994. We have a BEA cap of $513 billion for fiscal year 1994. The Budget Committee reported a discretionary figure of $496 billion. In other words, this resolution says that domestic discretionary appropriations are going to be cut by $16.3 billion in budget authority for fiscal year 1994 and $17.3 billion for fiscal year 1995, below the discretionary caps in the Budget Enforcement Act; in other words, below the summit agreement that I and many others in this Senate worked for. We are already getting the cut in this budget resolution. Now we are going to take another cut of $73 billion if the Nickles amendment is agreed to.

Mr. President, the budget resolution represents a turn in the road. It is honest. It is not based on phony projections of growth. It asks that all of us contribute to the economic welfare of our Nation and our people, as we all should. In the 1980's we were told a rising tide will lift all the boats, but the tide did not come in as far as we thought. Many of the boats stayed beached.

Mr. President, let me just refer to a remark that was made by a Senator on the other side of the aisle. Undoubtedly, Senators will be within their rights if they refer to my remarks. But we were told that we should hold President Clinton accountable for what candidate Clinton said. But I fear that what is going on here is an effort to hold President Clinton accountable for what President Reagan did. Ronald Reagan and George Bush put us in the hole, put us in this hole, this hole we are in right now. They led us down this destructive path.

President Clinton is doing what he can do to get us out of this hole. I do not particularly like a Btu tax. I come from a coal-producing State. I do not like it. My coal operators do not like it. My coal miners will not like it. Is there another man in the Senate who is the son of a coal miner? You are looking at one.

There is a song about the coal miner's daughter. I married one, a coal miner's daughter. We do not like this tax in West Virginia. We do not like any tax in West Virginia. I do not like this Btu tax. But the Finance Committee can adopt any sort of tax or any combination of taxes that they deem advisable. There is no Btu tax in this budget resolution. This is only a revenue number which must be raised in some way by the Finance Committee. Eliminate $73 billion in infrastructure spending. The Senator from Oklahoma would have us do that. The Senator is worried about the impact of taxes on the economy. But the offerers of the amendment are apparently totally unconcerned about the elimination of the infrastructure spending which helps to shore up the economy.

Mr. President, I have lived a long time. I was a boy about ready to graduate from high school during the Great Depression. We were promised two chickens in every pot and two cars in every garage. And I heard it ring,

"Prosperity is just around the corner," just around the corner. And I saw the faces of coal miners thrown out of work. I saw the little children of coal miners in raggedy clothes. I saw coal miners in the snow. I saw coal miners in the snow wearing hemp sacks around their feet. I saw coal miners who did not know where the next day's rations would come from. I saw the lines drawn in their faces, their weather beaten hands and gnarled fingers, wondering where the next meal was coming from. Soup lines were all over this country. Apples were sold on the street corners by the veterans. Millions of people were out of work, walking the roads in the country, saying, "Mister, can you let me have a dime?" And then Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected—he was a crippled man—and he and a Democratic Congress lifted this country from its prostrate position, flat on its back, lifted it to its feet and gave the American people hope. The farmer was able to go out and put a new coat of paint on the barn, a new roof on the house, send his children to school. And we saw the marshes dredged and the rivers bridged and highways built that gleamed in the autumn Sun, as they moved across the mountains, the Alleghenies, the Ozarks, and the mighty Rockies, to the western ocean.

How did that President do this? He had faith in the future, and a Democratic Congress invested in the country's future by appropriating moneys for infrastructure. Later, President Eisenhower came in. He was President when we authorized the interstate highway system across this great Nation. He was the President who oversaw its beginning. Today we have thousands of miles of navigable rivers, hundreds of thousands of bridges, over 500,000 bridges, in this country. Thousands of miles of highways—all of these were investments in the country.

I say we can do it again. I say that the country is on its knees, and the people are looking for a leader; and at last we have one who is not running away from the problem. He is not trying to bash the Congress and blame everything on the Congress. He is not afraid to lead. He is trying to lead. And the American people want to give him a chance to lead.

This amendment would destroy and gut his program. Our friends across the aisle want to immobilize this President right at the beginning of his administration. They want to gut his program of investing in America.

Mr. President, this amendment tries to eliminate a Btu tax that is not there and make cuts that are not specified. Mr. President, it takes the heart and the hands of all of us, working for the good of the Nation together. The policies of the past have failed. There was no free lunch. And morning in America quickly became the day after a tough night at the bar. Maybe those who want to continue that misguided course have not sobered up yet.

But the American people have. They know the economy is in trouble. They know that we cannot continue on the same tired track, pronouncing the same old platitudes of cutting domestic spending. Cut domestic spending, cut education, cut research and development, cut moneys for immunization against diseases among children, cut law enforcement, pull back on the war on drugs, rip the money out of our national parks, gouge the money out of our national forests, forget the rivers and harbors of the country; let them go to Sheol.

Let us worship at the altar of cutting spending. Do not say where you are going to cut, though. Where are you going to cut? Where are you going to cut? What do you propose to cut? Take it out of parks? Take it out of fish and wildlife, take it out of schools? Take it out of Indian Health Services?

Mr. D'AMATO. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. Take it out of food stamps? Take it out of unemployment compensation? Take it out of veterans pensions, out of veterans compensation, out of the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of community development block grants? Take it out of training for unemployed workers, take it out of environmental cleanup? Where are you going to cut? Tell us. Be specific. We have been cutting domestic discretionary spending for years, and cutting to the bone.

The same old platitudes: cutting and spending. What spending? Military spending? That is Government spending. Medicaid, Medicare? Oh, they say, "We will not cut Social Security." That is off the table. So we know they will not cut that. What then, will they cut?

Mr. President, the old platitudes of spending cuts are portrayed as the bogeyman, and low taxes are a panacea for all this Nation's ills. That is pap and is bunk, and the American people know it. It is time to move on, and those who simply mean to obstruct and tear down should move their demolition derby elsewhere.

It is time to build. We have gone through 12 years of the slashing and burning and cutting, and what has it gotten us? We are at the point now where we are going to have to invest in our country, and it is going to cost us more to catch up. We are going to have to do something about the deficit, and it is going to cost us.

And for years we have stood on this floor and said to the White House, give us leadership. Give us leadership. If we have a leader, we will follow him. We do not need someone whose daily exercise is to slap the Congress around. That was the daily scenario, the daily ration, beat the Congress over the head, batter the Congress, and there are people in this Chamber who piled on the Congress.

But now we have a leader in the White House. He is trying to do something to clean up the mess. It hurts. There is pain in it. I have long said there would be.

The American people know that the time for a free lunch has ended, and they are interested in doing something about the fiscal deficit and doing something about this country's investment deficit as well.

When I was at the summit, I said we do not just have a Federal fiscal deficit; we do not just have a trade deficit; we also have an investment deficit. We have disinvested in this country so long that it is falling apart.

The time has come now to face up to the problem and do something about it, even if it hurts. Let us think of our children and our grandchildren.

Webster in his speech upon the occasion of laying of the cornerstone of the Bunker Hill Monument in 1825 said:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. President, let us, in our time, do something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to vote down this amendment, and to take a stand for what is best for our country, for our children, and for our children's future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MURRAY). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I have a couple very brief comments.

How much time remains on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighteen minutes.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, will the distinguished Senator yield a moment?

Mr. NICKLES. I am happy to.

Mr. SASSER. Many colleagues on this side ask when are we going to vote. I expect they are doing the same on the Republican side.

Does the Senator expect to go beyond the 18 minutes allocated to him?

Mr. NICKLES. I do. To respond to my friend and colleague from Tennessee, I do for probably only 20 minutes. We have an additional 10 Senators asking to speak and I think they have all agreed to limit their remarks to 4 minutes.

Mr. SASSER. So the Senator thinks he will consume 33 minutes?

Mr. NICKLES. In addition—40 minutes.

Mr. SASSER. About 40 minutes on his side.

And then I know Senator EXON wishes to speak for 5 minutes on our side. Anyone else? And Senator KERREY of Nebraska wishes 2 minutes.

Are there any other Senators on our side wishing to speak this evening?

So that gives us some idea. In other words, if the Senator consumes 40 minutes on his side, and we have another roughly additional 10 minutes on our side, then we are looking at a vote some time in the neighborhood of 8:50 p.m.

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, first I wish to make a couple general comments, and I appreciate the history lesson given by our friend and colleague, the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

Even if this amendment passes, I would like for my colleagues to know that revenues will still have $339 billion additional spending over the next 5 years.

I would also like my colleagues to know that even in outlays, outlay growth will still have additional $322 billion more than we are spending in 1993. Spending continues to go up and revenues continue to go up. But this amendment cuts both spending and taxes by $73 billion.

In other words, we do not want to raise taxes on farmers, on coal producers, on oil and gas producers, on the airline industry, on the steel industry, on the aluminum industry. That is going to cost hundreds of thousands of jobs. We are trying to save the economy, not cripple it. That is the reason.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. NICKLES. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am asked the question, when will we get a time certain for this vote. Senators were pretty close to a time certain. The chairman tells me the Senator has an understanding which might lend itself to a unanimous-consent agreement at 8:45 p.m.

Mr. NICKLES. I think it would be 9 o'clock. We have 11 Senators requesting 4 minutes each.

Mr. SASSER. So that is 44 minutes, and we will take 10 minutes on our side. I think we could move to go ahead and vote at 9 o'clock.

Mr. DOMENICI. Does the Senator have me in for some kind of wrap-up of 2 or 3 minutes?

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator makes 12.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator wants 9:10 p.m.; is that the time he wants?

Mr. SASSER. I am just advised another Senator on our side wishes to speak. Will someone ascertain who wishes to speak?

Why do not we yield back to Senator NICKLES and the Senator and I try to work it out and at the conclusion of his speech here then perhaps we can enter into a unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask that the time I use not be charged to his but be charged off the bill, not be charged to Senator NICKLES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire 4 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for yielding.

I, like many Members, especially new Members, was most impressed and found most valuable the perspective on history of the Senator from West Virginia. I found it fascinating. The fact he proposed an application, I found that most fascinating. Give us some on this side so we will be able to pass this amendment.

This amendment has a major impact on New England. We have heard a lot of western Senators. We heard a lot oil-producing States and coal-producing States and other energy-producing States. Let us talk a little bit about consuming States in New England. In New Hampshire 80 percent of the households heat with home heating oil. This amendment targets every one of those homes for a confiscatory tax. It essentially is a tax across the board—low income, middle income, high income. You pay this tax. You pay this tax. In New England you pay extra tax, twice as much as you do if you happen to heat with natural gas or electricity or hydro.

Why us, I ask, Madam President? I ask the other side of the aisle. Why did you pick on the States which depend so heavily on home heating oil for extra bonus of a tax? It does not make any sense to begin with, because it is regressive and attacks the middle class and attacks low-income individuals, but it specifically attacks with a tax at the very core of what makes New England function, which is our capacity to have energies which we can then convert to products and to jobs and to have available energy for our homes.

Someone said this was done in order to try to reduce the amount of oil that is being consumed in this country. Some thinker down at the White House decided that this was a way to protect the environment. We have to tell you in New England what is going to happen when you put a regressive tax like this on our people? They are going to change to other forms of energy. The other forms of energy probably will be wood and that is an extremely environmentally sensitive type producer of waste, smoke waste.

So it is a mistake environmentally. It is a mistake from the standpoint of cost. And it is certainly not fair to the middle-class taxpayer and middle-class income and low-wage earner in New England. It is Btu. Btu—that must stand for bad times for us, because that is exactly what is going to happen in New England if this tax passes.

I reserve the remainder of my time and yield it back to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from Montana 4 minutes.

Mr. BURNS. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Madam President, I will not take my 4 minutes. I just want to remind our colleagues here tonight. We talk about deficit and erasing the deficit. We are not. If the President's plan went in right now, without any change we are still spending deficits. We deficit spend. We accumulate debt.

Now, take this. If you think your children are going to have anything to pay for after 4 years of the President's budget, you are wrong, because we still accumulate, by his figures, $1 trillion more debt on top of the $4 trillion that we have now. That is $5 trillion.

Now my dad always told me. "If you want good, sound advice about fiscal matters, go ask a man that signs checks on both sides, and usually you will get pretty good advice."

I listened to the Senator from Utah last night. Those of you who did not hear that and probably did not read it in the RECORD today, you missed a great speech.

I want to remind you that we accumulate debt. We deficit spend. There is a difference. We still, at the end of the 4 years or 5 years—I do not care; you pick a year—we still accumulate $1 trillion of new debt.

And if you think that is good for America, then you light up and vote yes on this Btu tax. I am not going to say anything about the fairness, but I want America to realize why we think it is pretty serious and why maybe somebody has a hard time understanding.

Just remember what I said: We deficit spend, but we accumulate debt.

To borrow words from Benjamin Franklin, nothing is certain except death and taxes.

Most folks do not mind paying their fair share of taxes. Yes, we grumble and complain as we send our tax dollars off to Washington, but we recognize that it is the price for the Government we are getting. The situation changes, however, when the tax system isn't fair, and this is the problem farmers and ranchers face with the President's proposed energy tax.

I strongly believe that President Clinton deserves a great deal of credit for bringing the issue of deficit reduction to the forefront and for putting an economic program on the table. His objectives are right on target. I am concerned, however, that his program, which relies more heavily on tax increases than on spending reductions, won't hit the established target of deficit reduction but will hit America's farmers and ranchers, who already operate on a slim profit margin, particularly hard.

Agriculture is an energy-intensive business, ranking fifth among all user categories in the consumption of energy. Farmers rely on some form of energy for putting in the crop, taking out

the crop, and moving the crop to market. Ranchers, too, depend on energy to maintain and move their stock.

The President's energy tax will increase fuels prices an estimated 8.3 cents per gallon. This means fuel costs for American farmers will increase an estimated $500 million per year. Farmers used 1.4 billion gallons of gasoline in off-road uses in 1991 and they used 2.8 billion gallons of diesel fuel. In addition to these direct fuel costs, prices for petro-based fertilizers and chemicals will also rise significantly. This will add an additional $500 million per year to the farmer's operating bill, making the total energy tax burden for America's farmer $1 billion.

Furthermore, under the Clinton package, America's farmers will also see $8 billion in Federal spending cuts and additional user fees over the next 4 years.

Farmers and ranchers, just like other Americans, are willing to tighten their belts and do their part in the deficit reduction battle, but it's clear that agricultural folks are being asked to do more than their fair share. Since 1981, Congress has reduced agricultural spending by more than $57 billion. In 1990, farm price supports were cut by 20 percent, more than any other program.

The simple fact is that spending on farm programs has decreased while Government spending on other entitlement programs, and the Federal deficit, has increased. Of today's entitlement programs, agriculture ranks No. 12, and of the top 12 programs, only farm program spending has declined since 1985 and only farm program spending is projected to continue to decline.

Now, I recognize just how difficult it is to come up with a balanced proposal where all are asked to make equitable sacrifices. If Moses himself brought down the Ten Commandments for long-term economic stability, I doubt that many in Congress would embrace him warmly.

However, the fact of the matter is that the President's economic package asks too much from agriculture. More than that, it asks too much from large, Western, rural States like Montana.

Not only are we going to take a hit because agriculture is our No. 1 industry, but we also have longer distances to drive and colder, longer winters than most. On top of that, we are also an energy producer. Coal, gas, hydroelectric—they will all feel the economic impact of increased energy taxes.

Instead of implementing energy taxes, I would like to see more legitimate reductions in Federal spending. The problem is not that the Government taxes too little. It is that the Government spends too much.

It is imperative that we work with the President in arriving at a more balanced approach for dealing with the deficit. My comments about the President's economic package are intended to be constructive. If the President is successful, then the country will be successful. If he country is successful, then Montana will be successful. If Montana is successful, then the job for our farmers and ranchers will be that much easier.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise today to support the Nickles amendment which would strike the Btu tax. I would like to take this opportunity to vividly illustrate why I strongly oppose the Btu tax.

Toward that end, I ask the Senate to listen as I walk through the town of Yazoo City, MS.

A small town which has produced many of our State's most famous citizens, it is the home of Jerry Clower, the great country comedian. Willie Morris, the well-known southern writer. The new Secretary of Agriculture Mike Epsy—and the new chairman of the Republican National Committee, Haley Barbour.

The town is nestled in the hills which mark the beginning of the Mississippi Delta.

The county is roughly the same size as Rhode Island. The city population is 12,500, the total county population is approximately 25,000.

The per capita income for Yazoo City is $7,399, or only 45 percent of the national average.

It's economy is dependent upon agriculture, the production of agrichemicals and fertilizers, small manufacturers, and forest products. Every single aspect of the Yazoo City and county economy is energy intensive.

The question this Senator must ask is, What is the impact of the Btu tax in Yazoo City, MS, and all the other communities just like it across this land?

To start, let's look at Mississippi Chemical. Its the largest employer in Yazoo City—employing approximately 570.

It produces, on an annual basis, 720,000 tons of ammonium nitrate, 522,000 tons of nitrogen solutions and 500,000 tons of anhydrous ammonia. Mississippi Chemical estimates that the Btu tax will increase the cost of each ton by $6 to $9.

Mississippi Chemical's total cost of production will increase by between $10.4 million and $15.7 million. Will that mean lost jobs, lost markets? Yes.

Mississippi Chemical will be forced to pass what cost it can on to the farmer in Yazoo County. The farmer's cost of production will increase. That farmer, who is already paying higher fuel costs as a result of the Btu gets a double hit.

What happens next? The farmer may or may not be able to pass the tax any further. If he can, it goes in the food chain. Result—higher food costs for the consumer.

What happens to the rates the citizens of Yazoo City and County must pay? Yazoo Valley Electric and the Public Service Commission which serves the town and region will be forced to increase the rates an average of 5 percent or for a total of approximately $1 million to accommodate the Btu tax.

What will this tax do to the American taxpayer? A new Federal correctional facility will be constructed in Yazoo County and will be operational in 1996 just in time for the Btu tax to be fully implemented.

Using power requirements for the Yazoo Federal prison as provided by the Bureau of Prisons, the Btu will increase the cost of providing energy to the prison by an annual amount of $113,200. The bill will be paid by the American taxpayer.

The facility will House 3,800 prisoners. The Btu will increase the cost to the taxpayer of each prisoner by $30 a year.

Is this tax regressive in Yazoo City? Again the per capita income in Yazoo City is $7,399. For Mississippi, the average per capita income is $9,648. Yazoo City is substantially below the Mississippi average, both are significantly below the national average.

It is this type of tax that hits the poor, rural and agricultural communities the hardest.

The President says he will expand the LIHIP Program to address the regressivity. But let's examine that.

In Yazoo City, if LIHIP is fully funded as the President requests, it will only cover 10 percent of the households eligible. Or in other words, 90 percent of those eligible will not receive any assistance to make up for the harm of the Btu tax.

I have a list of companies in and around Yazoo City, each one will be adversely affected, jobs will be lost, costs will increase and inflation will rise. As you walk through this town, I want everyone to know what will happen in Yazoo City and the towns just like it around this country if a Btu tax is passed.

It will harm the economy of Yazoo City just as it will harm the Nation's economy. It will not reach any of the objectives put forth. The deficit will not be reduced—it will only pay for new spending. It will not reduce U.S. dependence on imported oil—dependence will increase, domestic production will continue to decline. The economy will contract not expand. Jobs will be lost not created. Competitiveness will suffer and inflation will rise.

For Yazoo City and for the Nation, I urge my colleagues to support the Nickles-Shelby amendment and to oppose the Btu tax.

I ask unanimous consent that the list of companies be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Existing Manufacturers List, Yazoo County, MS

Standard Industrial Classification

AMCO Manufacturing, Inc.
Industrial Park
Post Office Box 1107
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-4464
Lecil Lee, Plant Superintendent
Employees: M:20 F:2 T:22
Disk harrows 3523
Bedding equipment & power ditchers 3523
Terrace construction equipment 3523
Metal fabrication, custom 3599

Anderson-River Oak
Industrial Park
Post Office Box 1105
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-2066/746-4054
FAX: (601) 746-3313/746-8730
Donald R. Bohannon, President
C. Pat Ramsay, Vice President & General Manager
Larry Kitchens, Vice President & General Manager
Employees: M:95 F:5 T:100
Drum debarker, Chips 3553
Kiln-dried foreign & domestic woods 2421

Apac, MS
Post Office Box 24508
Jackson, MS 39205-4508
(601) 922-8000
B.A. Atkins, President
David Barton, President Southern Division
Employees: M: F: T:
Asphalt..... ....
Paving Contractors..... ....

Architectural Millworks Ind., Inc.
Route 6, Box 268
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-3876
Melanie Kitchens
Dewey Hood
Employees: M: F: T: 2431
Custom cabinets, molding, trim 2434

Barry Barnes Lumber Co., Inc.
Old Highway 3 South
Post Office Box 930
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-9298
Barry Barnes, President
Employees: M:52 F:3 T:55
Hardwood lumber (red & white oak, ash, hackberry, etc.) 2426
Hardwood lumber (cypress, poplar, maple, cherry, etc.) 2426
Lumber, hardwood & softwood (rough, sawed & planed) 2411
Rough & semifinished timber & ties 2421
Kiln drying of lumber 2421
Hardwood flooring 2426
Hardwood paneling 2435

C-G Industries dba Marting Manufacturing
Industrial Park
Post Office Box 629
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-1332
Cecil Cartwright, President
Employees: M:9 F:2 T:11
Aluminum fishing, commercial & chemical boats 3732
Hog & cattle feeders 3523
Hog & cattle scales 3576
Farrowing crates & handling equipment 3523
Hog & cattle waterers 3523

Carroll Gin Co.
Post Office Box 205
Holly Bluff, MS 39088
(601) 828-3462
Joe S. Stoner, Sr., President
Employees: M: F: T:
Cotton gins..... ....

Carson Printing & Office Supplies, Inc.
217 South Main Street
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-1597
R.B. Carson, Sr., Owner
Employees: M:1 F:2 T:3
Commercial printing-offset (stationery, cards & forms) 2752
Commercial printing-letterpress (newsletters, posters, etc.) 2751

C'est Bon Millworks
816 W. Second Street
P.O. Box 1431
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-1323
Billy Brewer, Shop Foreman
Employees: M:3 F:0 T:3 2431
Custom cabinets, molding, trim 2434

Crabtree Manufacturing
Highway 3 Bypass
Rte. 4, Box 99
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-6591
Jimmy Crabtree, Owner
Employees: M:18 F:1 T:19
Machine shop & welding repair ....

Environmental Solutions, Inc.
625 East 12th Street
Post Office Box 1064
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-7470
Alan Ramsay, President
Employees: M:9 F:4 T:13
Equipment—Extract silver from X-Rays & Photographic Solutions .. ..

Helena Chemical, Inc.
Industrial Park
Route 4, Box 102
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-1515
Charles Johnson, Branch Manager
John E. Book, Fertilizer Manager
Employees: M:8 F:1 T:9
Fluid suspension fertilizer 2875

W.S. "Red" Hancock, Inc.
Old Highway 49
Post Office Box 207
Bentonia, MS 39040
(601) 755-2253
Raiford Hancock, President
Employees: M: F: T:
Construction—Oil Field Equipment .....

Greg Harkins Chairs
O'Possum Bend Road
Route 1, Box 27
Vaughan, MS 39179
(601) 362-4233
Greg Harkins, Owner
Employees: M:1 F:0 T:1
Rocking chairs, hand-made (oak & walnut) 2511
Rocking chairs, large-size (double, nannie & children's) 2511
Straight chairs, stools & benches ... 2511

Holly Bluff Gin Co.
Post Office Box 187
Holly Bluff, MS 39088
(601) 828-3757
John Phillips
F.H. Coghlan
Cotton Gins ....

Jim King Welding
58 Anderson Road
Route 1, Box 22
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-3885
Jim King, President
Employees: M:1 F:0 T:1
Welding ....

Linwood Gin Co., Inc.
Ivy Dixon Road
Rte 1, Box 270
Vaughan, MS 39179
(601) 673-2229
Harrison Moore, President
Bill Parker, Manager
Employees: M:7 F:1 T:8
Employees: M:26 F:6 T:32
Cotton Gins ....

Memphis Hardwood Flooring Co.
Post Office Box 307
Bentonia, MS 39040
(601) 755-2962
Gene Gouch, Plant Manager
Employees: M:58 F:0 T:58
Hardwood lumber 2426

Midway Gin of Yazoo County
Rte 2 Box 49
Benton, MS 39039
(601) 673-9801
Harris Swayze, President
Employees: M:6 F:1 T:7
Employees: M:25 F:25 T:50
Cotton Gins ....

Mijo Lithographing Co., Inc.
304 South Main Street
Post Office Box 307
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-4693
Burke Jones, President
Employees: M:2 F:4 T:6
Business Forms 2752
Commercial Printing ....

Mississippi Chemical Corp.
Highway 49E
Post Office Box 388
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-4131
FAX: (601) 746-9158
Tom Parry, President
Employees: M: F: T:570
Ammonium nitrate 2873
Urea, nitrogen solutions & anhydrous ammonia 2873
Liquid carbon dioxide 2813

Nitrous Oxide Corp.
Rialto Road
Post Office Box 1085
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-7607
Wardell Walton, Superintendent
Employees: M:5 F: T:5
Nitrous oxide 2813

The Printing Shop
Railroad Avenue
Post Office Box 338
Bentonia, MS 39040
(601) 755-2974
Stanley Simpson, President
Richard Sanders, Manager
Employees: M:1 F:1 T:2
Commercial Printing..... ....

Satartia Gin Co., Inc.
Post Office Box 125
Satartia, MS 39162
(601) 746-7033
James Cresswell, General Manager
Employees: M: F: T:
Cotton Gin..... ....

Simmons Farm-Raised Catfish
Route 4, Box 224
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-5687
FAX: (601) 746-8625
Harry Simmons, Jr., President
Hardy White, Jr., Plant Manager
Employees: M: F: T:90
Fresh & frozen catfish (fillets, whole, nuggets & steaks) 2092

Southern Bag Corp.
Industrial Park
Post Office Box 389
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-3631
FAX: (601) 746-3673
Rick Markell, President
Employees: M:125 F:75 T:200
Multiwall paper bags 2643
Stepped-end paper bags 2643

Spencer Ready Mix
HWY 3
Post Office Box 173
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-6080
Jack Spencer, President
Employees: M:10 F:1 T:11
Concrete..... ....

Strickland Pallet Co.
Highway 3, Industrial Park
Post Office Box 1156
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-4499
Sam Strickland & Mable Strickland, Owners
Employees: M:4 F:1 T:5
Pallets, wood 2448
Warren Pallet Co.
Old Highway 3
Post Office Box 797
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-6245
C.L. (Pee) Warren, Owner
Esther H. Warren, Owner
Employees: M:6 F:1 T:7
Pallets, wood 2448
The Yazoo Herald
1035 Grand Avenue
Post Office Box 720
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-4911
Roy Thomas, General Manager
Employees: M:5 F:5 T:10
Newspaper 2711
Yazoo Industries, Inc.
2003 Gordon Avenue
Yazoo City, MS 39194
(601) 746-3245
FAX: (601) 969-7058
Larry Loughman, President
Joey Ledlow, Plant Manager
Employees: M: F: T:350
Wire harnesses for automobiles 3714

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator DURENBERGER, Senator D'AMATO, and Senator GORTON be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. NICKLES. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. SASSER. Before yielding to the distinguished Senator from New York, the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee and I have been comparing notes here.

We are going to need an additional 20 minutes on our side and how much on your side?

Mr. DOMENICI. Forty-eight minutes.

Mr. SASSER. I thought some of that might have already been consumed.

Mr. DOMENICI. We can do it with 4 minutes less.

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I will propound a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that a vote on the Nickles amendment occur no later than 9:15 this evening, and that the opponents of the amendment be allocated 20 minutes and the proponents be allocated 40 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOMENICI. With the 40 minutes being under the control of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

We have no objection.

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

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Chair and I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO].

Mr. D'AMATO. Madam President, I rise to support the Nickles amendment.

Let me just get to some plain, ordinary common sense. I just read this little book called the Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate. It only came out last week on the 12th of March, 6 days ago. It is interesting. I wonder how many of my colleagues, who were not on the Budget Committee, have had the opportunity to really read this. It is frightening.

I have to tell you that this tax proposal is a lesson in idiocy. Who the heck ever heard of raising taxes, not $73 billion like you are talking about—and, you know, the group we have in the gallery there, those sleeping mimmies. I am wondering where they are for the media.

They are going to raise taxes $95 billion—that is what they are going to collect—$95 billion in order to get, well, they say $73 billion, but Treasury says when you raise the $95 billion—and, by the way, these figures come from Treasury—we are going to raise $95 billion and you are going to wind up with $71.4 billion.

But you do not wind up with $71.4 billion. Guess what? Surprise. You wind up with $38 billion.

Now you have to be a pretty doggone stupid business person to say, "I am going to raise taxes $95 billion to come out with $38 billion." How would you run a business that way? And why should we run a country that way? And we are the board of directors. I cannot believe it.

You want to raise $38 billion net, so you raise $95 billion? You have to find a better way. This is ridiculous.

Because when you read page 31 of this little budget book, do you know what it says? In order that this $95 billion will not be so bad, we are going to help them. We are going to give additional low-income energy assistance, $2.9 billion. So we have to subtract that $2.9 billion from the net revenue.

Do not forget, we started with $95 billion.

We have to subtract the food stamps, because, after all, poor people are not going to have expendable income, not $12 billion, so we are going to subtract that. And we have an earned income tax credit to the poorest of the poor, because we do not want to hurt them, $26.8 billion. And so we subtract that.

We are down here. When you take the figures that come from this book, this budget book, $35 billion, because we said we are going to raise $95 billion, we get down to $71.4 billion when we raise $95 billion.

And let me tell you why. Because Treasury says businesses, the cost of the businesses, they deduct that from their income tax. So you see, even though you raise $95 billion, when the businesses of the country write off, and the individuals, what it cost them for this tax, you only collect $71.4 billion. And then when you take the $35 billion from that, you come out with $38 billion net.

Now, that is stupid. Do you want to vote for this energy tax and Btu tax? What member of the board of directors of the great Nation of the United States we are.

There was a little pin that it was taxing and spending, stupid. Well, that is right. That is it.

That is why this Senator, Senator NICKLES, says, "Junk this and you do not have to spend all of this and you do not hurt the economy."

Let me tell you what it does to my State. They are going to pay $1.2 billion for gasoline taxes; 10 cents a gallon more.

Let me tell you what it does to farmers in upstate New York. A minimum of $1,000 each; probably about $2,000 for every dairy farmer in New York. And they barely make it now.

Long Island, a basket case in the recession now, another almost $300 million for homeowners in Long Island. Those who have a gross income of $35,000 to $40,000 will pay between $400 to $600 a year more for their energy cost. Great. Great. Great.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has used his 4 minutes.

Mr. D'AMATO. I ask unanimous consent that I might be given another minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NICKLES. I yield the Senator an additional minute.

Mr. D'AMATO. This is great.

And we have been criticized for saying that you have a canard. Ninety-five billion dollars more, and you are only going to wind up with $38 billion.

And we say to people that if you really want to take advantage, you can apply for food stamps, then we are going to put you on a heating assistance program, and we are going to give you earned income tax credits.

Is that not great? We make a bigger class of more people on poverty.

Let me tell you something. If the rest of this budget is built on this kind of flimflam, we are kidding ourselves and those bunch of turkeys in the media besides. What a let-down. What a job they are giving to the American people. We should know better. They should know better, but we certainly should.

That is why we should support this amendment.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I thank my friend and my colleague from New York for his statement. I yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] for 4 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today in support of the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES].

The decisions we are called upon to make in regard to the budget resolu-

tion before the Senate today are some of the most important and far reaching decisions that we are likely to make this year. At stake is the economic future of our Nation—both in the short-term and in the long-term.

During the debate on this resolution, the Senate is going to have to choose between two basic approaches to deficit reduction. The President's plan, as embodied in the resolution before us, represents an approach that will not achieve its intended result. On the contrary, the tax and spending increases in the budget resolution are directly opposite of where this Nation needs to go in cutting the deficit.

The alternative approach to deficit reduction is, of course, to strike all of the tax increases in the resolution and replace them with spending cuts. We will be debating just such an amendment later in this resolution's consideration on the floor.

There is much that I could say on the overall effectiveness of these two approaches, but I want to focus my remarks right now on the pending amendment, which would strike the most onerous of the taxes included in the budget resolution—the Btu tax.

The proposed Btu tax will have a very negative effect on the Nation's economy. What is worse, though, is that the tax will hit industries and regions unevenly. My home State of Utah will suffer a triple hit, which could lead to disastrous economic consequences for many Utahns.

First, Utahns, like other Americans, will pay much higher taxes directly as a result of this Btu tax. The administration indicates that the impact of this tax will only be about $17 per month for the average household. I suppose this $204 per year represents a minimal sacrifice that the administration feels that the average American family should gladly contribute for the sake of deficit reduction. I wish that were the extent of it. Unfortunately, this number does not even begin to tell the story of the Btu tax's effect on Utah.

The average Utah family is going to pay a lot more than $204 per year in higher costs as a result of this tax. Some estimates put the number at over $400 per year. Unlike the taxes most Americans are used to paying, though, the Btu tax will be disguised as higher prices. These higher prices will be on a variety of products and services that all of us purchase everyday. Utility bills, of course, will go up. But so will the cost of food, of a new car, of a can of paint, or of a pair of shoes for the kids.

Think about it. The burden of the Btu tax cannot be reduced to an innocent sounding $17 per month. Indeed, consider that every business's operating expenses will go up because of this tax—some more than others. Manufacturers will have to pass the additional costs on to their customers, or if they cannot, lay off workers. Farmers will have to charge more for food, or get out of farming. A service business will have to charge more for their services, or again, go out of business or lay off workers.

The second way that Utah families would be hit by this tax is through these job losses or business closings. This is a factor that seems to have been ignored by the Clinton administration. The fact is, though, that this Btu tax will lead to lost jobs. Estimates place the number of lost jobs at between 500,000 and 700,000.

It is easy to see the possibility of lost jobs in Utah. The economies of two Utah counties are based almost exclusively on the coal industry. This industry will be particularly hard hit by this tax. In fact, the National Coal Association estimates that the price of Utah coal will go up by a whopping 45 percent by the Btu tax, one of the highest percentage increases in the Nation. Much of Utah coal is sold on long-term contracts. When coal companies cannot pass these increased costs through to buyers, layoffs may be the only solution.

As a matter of fact, I spoke to a representative of a Utah coal company this afternoon. He told me frankly that the increased production costs to them, as a result of the Btu tax, would prevent them from opening a new mine they are considering. This proposed mine would provide 300 direct new jobs, and another 100 indirect new jobs to the local economy. For small rural areas, jobs like these would be highly sought and form the mainstay of a small Utah community's vitality.

It is one thing for a family to contribute $17 per month toward the deficit. But what do I tell a laid off Utah coal miner's family who has lost a job because of this Btu tax? That this is their contribution for the good of the Nation? What do I tell a community whose economic base has been dramatically reduced because its main industry is no longer cost effective? That this is tax fairness?

Agriculture is another vital sector of Utah's economy that will also be hard hit by the Btu tax.

According to the American Farm Bureau, the Btu tax will generally stifle economic output, increase production costs on farmers, cause farm prices to decline and jeopardize our ability to compete in world markets.

Rural Americans, by definition, live in relatively remote and less intensely populated areas. The cost of driving more miles to work, shop, send children to school, and to conduct a variety of other normal activities will be immediately felt. Rural Utahns tend to have lower than average incomes.

Agricultural production is highly energy-dependent. Farmers rely on gasoline, diesel, propane and other fuels for operating equipment such as tractors, combines, and trucks. They also heat barns for livestock, greenhouses for horticultural crops, have cooling tanks and storage facilities that require energy to operate. Farmers rely on electricity, gas and petroleum fuels for energy operated irrigation systems. These direct uses of energy will increase farmers' costs by an estimated $500 million per year when the proposed energy tax is fully implemented.

The costs of fertilizers and pesticides will increase because the main ingredients of these two items are natural gas and petroleum. As the Btu tax is assessed on these main ingredients in an analysis by the AFB will force farmers to pay $500 million per year to purchase these inputs.

This means, according to the AFB, the direct and indirect production costs increases will be an estimated $1 billion per year, nationally. In Utah, the picture is even more dramatic. I have three examples of Utah farmers who will see an increase in direct energy costs to their operations.

Rulon Gammon operates an 80-cow dairy with 180 acres of irrigated cropland in Vineyard, UT. He uses 5,650 gallons of diesel fuel and 2,000 gallons of gasoline annually. Using the projected tax rate increase of 7.5 cents per gallon on gasoline and 8.3 cents per gallon on diesel fuel, Mr. Gammon will spend an additional amount of $468.95 for diesel fuel and $150 for gasoline, for a total increase amounting to $618.95

Alan White operates a 700-cow-and-calf beef operation in Upalco, UT, which is located in eastern Utah's Duchesne County. Mr. White owns 700 acres of cropland, uses 5,500 acres of private range, and grazes his cattle on 30,000 acres of public lands. He uses 14,400 gallons of diesel fuel and 6,200 gallons of gasoline. With the projected increase per gallon from the Clinton energy tax plan, Mr. White's direct energy costs will increase $1,195.20 for diesel fuel and $465 for gasoline, or a total increase of $1,660.20.

Finally, Alan Kenison operates a 1,500-acre alfalfa hay farm, 80 percent irrigated, with a 1,300 head background feedlot. His operation is in Levan, UT. Mr. Kenison uses 22,750 gallons of diesel fuel and 7,950 gallons of gasoline. The new energy tax will increase his costs by $1,888.25 for diesel fuel and $596.48 for gasoline. The total direct cost for this operation will total $2,484.73.

These direct-cost increases may not mean much to many people who live in Washington, DC or within the Capital Beltway, but in rural America and the small farming communities of Utah, this is a big deal—an important matter in the livelihood of Utah's farmers.

The important bottom line to all of these figures is the reduction in net farm income. Nationally, the American Farm Bureau estimates the impact will be a reduction of 2 percent in net farm

income when the estimated $1 billion increased costs for agricultural production and agricultural inputs are combined. In the examples I just stated, Mr. Kenison will see a 3.1-percent reduction in his net farm income, and Mr. White will experience a 6.9-percent drop in his net farm income. And that is if all other costs associated with each operation remain the same, which we know they will not.

The Intermountain Farmers Association of Utah confirms that the Btu tax will cause the price of nitrogen fertilizers to increase by 5 percent for Utah farmers.

I hope it is obvious to everyone that farmers cannot absorb additional costs unless they can obtain more for their produce in the market place. I mentioned Mr. Alan White of Upalco, UT. He indicated this very fact to me today. He stated that since 1988, his property taxes have increased 70 percent, while the price per pound for one of his steers has remained below the 1979 price of 95 cents per pound. He was able to gain 90 cents per pound for the same product last year, so prices are coming back.

But this body needs to understand the impact this energy tax proposal will have on the farmer's pocketbook in Utah. Utah, as most of the West, has been suffering through a severe drought for the past 8 years. This, combined with the cost of using private pasture, the proposed increase in grazing fees, and other related expenses, will literally shove our rural people off the land which they love and which they covet. They know that the land is their livelihood, and bad management of this land will severely negate their livelihood as much, if not more, than the Clinton energy tax proposal.

I have received some preliminary information of what the proposed Btu tax will mean to an energy-producing, energy-consuming State like Utah. Imposition of the Btu tax would translate into a $184 million transfer of resources from Utah consumers and businesses to the Federal Government. In the near term, households will be faced with higher energy prices. This will require a larger share of the household budget and reduce disposable income. Accordingly, households could be expected to reduce their expenditures on other goods and services.

Overall, the impact of the tax on the Nation, and particularly on States like Utah, will be exactly opposite from what was intended. Jobs will be lost, Federal revenue will be lower, lives will be changed, and we will not achieve deficit reduction.

We must do better, Madam President.

Madam President, I have received some preliminary information that details the specific impact the Btu tax will have on Utah fossil fuel prices and Utah's five energy-end sectors. I ask unanimous consent this information be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISSUE DEFINITION

A principal feature of President Clinton's February 17th Economic Stimulus and Investment Package is the broad-based Btu tax on energy. In his State of the Union address, President Clinton cited reasons for choosing the broad-based Btu tax over other energy tax options the administration considered:

"Unlike a carbon tax, it's not too hard on the coal states, unlike a gasoline tax it's not too tough on people who drive a long way to work, and unlike an ad valorem tax it doesn't increase when the price of an energy source goes up."

Implementation of the tax would also help to meet other administration policy objectives to increase the energy efficiency of the economy, reduce oil imports, improve the environment through reduced growth in fossil fuel consumption, and help the economy by lowering the federal deficit. Furthermore, the broad base of the tax would keep the tax rate low and spread it evenly across regions, industries, and consumer segments throughout the United States.

The Clinton Btu tax plan should not only be viewed in terms of what it will do to achieve these important national policy objectives, but also in terms of its effects on economic activity in Utah. The following is an analysis of the features of the Clinton administration's proposed energy tax and an assessment of the direct impact on energy expenditures in the residential, commercial, industrial, agriculture, and transportation sectors of Utah's economy.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The administration's proposed Btu energy tax is indexed to a fuel's Btu content. When implemented the levy will apply to coal, crude oil, natural gas, and nuclear fuel. Electricity generated by hydropower would be taxed on the average fossil fuel Btu input required to generate the equivalent amount of electricity. No tax would be levied on solar, geothermal, wind, biomass and other alternative energy forms. Fossil fuels produced for export and those used for nonfuels purposes such as chemical feedstocks would also be exempt. The basic tax for coal, crude oil, natural gas and nuclear fuel is 25.7 cents/million Btu. However, a supplemental "national security" tax of 34.2 cents/million Btu is proposed for crude oil, resulting in a total tax on that energy source of 59.9 cents/million Btu.

The tax would be phased in over three years with ⅓ of the tax effective July 1, 1994, two thirds by July 1, 1995 and the full tax imposed by July 1, 1996. When fully implemented in fiscal year 1997, the tax is estimated to garner $22.3 billion in revenues. Over the first five years it is designed to raise between $71 and $76 billion in revenues and is considered a crucial component of the administration's deficit-reduction plan.

The Clinton administration currently proposes the collection points for the Btu tax be at the point of first purchase: the minemouth for coal, at the refinery for crude oil, the port of entry for imported oil and petroleum products, the pipeline for natural gas, and the utility for hydro generated electricity.

Based on 1991 prices, the effects of the Btu tax on Utah fossil fuel prices will be significant:

Coal—Utah's underground mined coal will be taxed at a rate of 25.7 cents per million Btu which adds an additional $5.91 to the costs per ton. As a result the minemouth price will increase by 27 percent from $21.81 to $27.72.

Crude Oil—The 59.9 cents per million Btu tax on crude oil will be levied at the refinery and will translate into an additional $3.47 per barrel of oil purchased. Utah refineries acquisition costs will increase by 17 percent to $23.46 per barrel of crude oil purchased.

Natural Gas—The Btu tax levied on natural gas is the same as coal, 25.7 cents per million Btu. Under the Clinton proposal the price of Utah-produced natural gas sold for delivery to pipelines will increase from $1.56 per mcf to $1.80 per mcf, an increase of 15 percent.

How price increases at the point of first purchase ultimately translate into changes in energy prices paid by end-users will depend on the competitiveness of Utah's energy markets and the availability of alternative energy sources to end-use sectors. Moreover, the impact of the Btu tax on end-use prices will vary among consumers, regions of the state and sectors of the economy.

The analysis of impacts in this briefing is for the very near term. We assume complete pass-through of the Btu tax onto end-use prices and that no fuel substitution or consumption changes takes place.

ENERGY END-USE PRICES AND EXPENDITURES

Energy use has changed considerably in the last 20 years in response to energy supply shocks and economic adjustments to changes in the costs and availability of energy. Over this period Utahns have adjusted their consumption patterns to use energy more efficiently. At the same time the economy as a whole has shifted from more energy intensive industries such as mining and manufacturing towards less energy intensive activities producing goods and services. In 1991 Utah's five energy end-use sectors: (1) residential; (2) commercial; (3) industrial; (4) transportation; and (5) agriculture, spent approximately $3 billion consuming an estimated 571 trillion Btu.

Residential Sector—The residential sector accounts for approximately 20 percent of the primary energy consumed annually in Utah, including energy used to generate and deliver electricity to this sector. In 1991 as estimated 117.3 trillion Btu was consumed by households, with space heating and water heating accounting for over 50 percent of the total. If motor fuel consumed in vehicles owned by households is taken into account, total energy use by this sector is 185 trillion Btu, 32 percent of total energy consumed in Utah during 1991.

Based on 1991 energy prices it is estimated the implementation of the Btu energy tax will increase the average price paid per million Btu by the residential sector 5.6 percent. The tax would raise the average price for unleaded gasoline by 7.8 cents per gallon, natural gas prices by 25.7 cents per decatherm, and electricity prices by $.002/Kwh. Home heating oil prices would experience the largest increase, rising about 9 cents per gallon.

Historically, this sector has paid higher prices for energy than the other four sectors. In 1991 household expenditures on energy totaled $1.3 billion and averaged $2.535 per household. Motor gasoline represented the single largest energy expenditure for households at $1,322, followed by electricity, $619, and natural gas, $526. Fuel oil, coal and LP gas accounted for less than 5 percent of the total expenditures for space heating, lighting and operating appliances. Under the Clinton proposal annual average expenditures for all energy consumed by each household would

increase by $136, a little more than $11 per month.

Commercial Sector—Energy consumption by the commercial sector includes space heating and lighting for nonresidential, government-owned, and nonprofit institutional buildings, street lighting and certain other supporting services—including vehicles and trucks used in the delivery of goods and services by this sector. Over the past two decades economic growth and transition to a service-oriented economy have greatly expanded the commercial sector in Utah. As a result, consumption of primary energy for this end-use sector has increased faster than any other sector. In 1991 energy consumed by the commercial sector totaled 104 trillion Btu, or about 18 percent of Utah's total. Ninety-three percent of energy use for this sector involved space heating and cooling, water heating, and lighting.

In 1991, energy expenditures for the commercial sector are estimated to be $557 million. Electricity was the largest energy expenditure for this sector totalling $350 million, followed by natural gas, $134 million, and petroleum products used for space heating and transportation, $87 million.

On average, prices paid for energy by the commercial sector tend to be lower than those for the residential sector—especially for natural gas and electricity. Based on 1991 prices, the Btu energy tax is expected to increase total annual commercial energy expenditures by 5 percent to an estimated $27.4 million dollars. The average commercial firm's electricity bill will increase 4 percent, or $225 per year while the average commercial natural gas customer can expect their annual expenditures on natural gas to increase $224. In terms of increased costs of doing business, the tax is estimated to add about $1.45 to the commercial sectors' energy costs of $33.90 per $1,000 of gross state product.

Industrial—What is commonly referred to as the industrial sector includes not only manufacturing and processing, but also the activities of mining, agriculture and construction. However, for purposes of this analysis agriculture is treated as a separate sector of the economy.

The industrial sector is the single largest consuming sector accounting for 37 percent of all primary energy consumption in Utah during 1991. More so than in other sectors, the industrial sector consumes a wide variety of fuels in such diverse end-uses as heat, power, and feedstocks. Industrial energy users are also more flexible than the other end-use sectors in adjusting their energy consumption—switching fuels and processes as market conditions dictate. The most energy-intensive manufacturing industries in Utah are primary metals, petroleum refining, stone and clay products, and chemicals.

In 1991 natural gas accounted for nearly a quarter of all primary energy consumed by the industrial sector. Consumption of coal and petroleum products totaled 92 trillion Btu and were consumed in near equal portions. Electricity consumed by this sector was 22 trillion Btu.

Prices paid for energy by the industrial sector are typically lower than those paid by customers in other sectors. For example, in the case of natural gas, the rate industrial customer pay per Mcf averaged $3.69 in 1991 compared to $5.44 per Mcf paid by residential customers. In 1991 estimated industrial energy expenditures totaled $619 million.

The Btu energy tax will increase industrial energy expenditures an estimated 7 percent, or $45.4 million per year. An industrial firm's average annual electricity bill will increase $1,515. The average annual bill of a Utah natural gas utility industrial customer is estimated to increase $6,486. The estimated costs of petroleum products to industrial users will increase an average of 8 percent, raising total petroleum expenditures in this sector to $136 million form $127 million. In terms of increased energy costs per $1,000 of the industrial sectors gross state product, the Btu tax is estimated to add about $6.65 to the energy costs of $90.67.

Transportation—The transportation sector in Utah is almost entirely dependent on petroleum products for energy. In 1991, over 99 percent of the energy used in the transportation sector was petroleum-derived. In this analysis, the principal sources of transportation energy are diesel fuel and motor gasoline for freight trucks, kerosene-type jet fuel for airlines, and diesel and fuel oil used by the railroads. Motor gasoline for light duty vehicles (automobiles and light trucks) has been apportioned to other sectors. In addition, natural gas used to operate pipeline pumps should technically be included, but for purposes of this study has been assigned to the industrial sector.

As defined, this sector accounted for 59.1 trillion Btu or 10 percent of the energy consumed in Utah in 1991. Freight trucks consumed largest portion (46 percent) all in the from of motor gasoline and diesel. Airline and air freight companies consumed an estimated 25 trillion Btu of kerosene-type jet fuel and aviation gasoline. Railroads were responsible for the remainder of energy consumed, using 36.7 million gallons of diesel and fuel oil.

Since oil will be taxed at more than double the rate of other fuels under the Clinton proposal, this sector will be hit particularly hard by the Btu energy tax. Fuel costs represent between 6–8 percent of operating expenses of the trucking industry. The Btu tax would increase 1991 expenditures on motor fuel for Utah's freight companies $18 million from $234 million to $252. The airline industry would see jet fuel prices increase by 7 cents per gallon, adding $13 million in additional fuel costs when the tax is fully implemented. Railroads would experience the largest percentage increase in cost of fuels. Diesel fuel that sold for 72.5 cents per gallon before the tax would increase 9 cents per gallon, adding $3.4 million to the cost of fuel. Accordingly, the Btu tax is estimated to increase the transportation sectors energy costs per $1,000 of gross state product by $26.40 to $363.

Agriculture—At 5.3 trillion Btu consumed, farms represent the smallest energy consuming sector analyzed in this briefing. On a percentage basis agriculture accounts for less than one percent of total estimated consumption in 1991. For purposes of this analysis only energy consumption and costs associated with rising crops and livestock are included in analyzing the impacts of the Clinton Btu tax plan. Energy costs and impacts to farm residences is calculated separately and assumed to be the same as that of the average Utah household.

According to the Bureau of the Census, direct expenditures for petroleum products and electricity on Utah's farms represent 8.9 percent of total production expenses. In 1991, estimated energy expenditures on Utah's farms totaled $46 million. Of the total, $31.2 million was spent on motor gasoline and diesel fuel to operate light duty vehicles and machinery, $1.3 million for natural gas used in water heating and process drying. The remaining $13.3 million in energy expenditures was accounted for by purchases of electricity for lighting, cooling, heating and pumped irrigation.

The Btu tax is expected to increase total direct energy expenditures for Utah farmers by 7.3 percent, or about $3.4 million. The increase in energy expenditures when averaged over farm acreage implies that the energy expenditures per farm-acre will increase from $4.06 to $4.35. For a 1,000 acre farm of livestock operation this translates into an additional $290 in direct energy costs on the basis of 1991 energy expenditures. Adding $136 of increased energy costs of the average Utah residence to account for increases in costs to farm residences, results in an estimated total energy cost increase to a Utah farmer of $698.

In terms of increased energy costs per $1,000 output of gross state product, the Btu tax is estimated to add about $6.97 to a farmers' energy costs of $95.67 per $1,000 of gross state product.

CONCLUSIONS

Imposition of the Btu tax promises to have two types of effects on Utah's energy markets and economy: a direct effect on consumers' consumption and expenditures for energy because of an increase in energy prices, and an indirect effect on the macroeconomy of the state because of the fact that energy is a key intermediate input in the production of goods and services in the economy. The magnitude of the direct effects on Utah's economy will depend on patterns of energy use in each economic sector as determined by prices, supply, climate, demographics, intensity of energy use, and types and age of building stocks.

Based on this preliminary analysis and 1991 energy expenditure estimates, imposition of the Btu energy tax would translate into a $184 million transfer of resources from Utah consumers and businesses to the federal government. This figure represents less than one percent of Utah's gross state product.

Imposing the Btu tax for purposes of reducing the federal deficit would increase the costs of energy for nearly all end-users, reduce households disposable income, and possibly consumer spending, and increase business costs of providing goods and services. From the point of view of the residential consumer two impacts will prevail. In the near term households will be faced with higher energy prices. This will require a larger share of the household budget and reduce disposable income. Accordingly, households could be expected to reduce their expenditures on other goods and services.

The tax is also likely to increase the costs of doing business. Energy represents a key intermediate input in the production of goods and services. An increase in the costs of energy due to the Btu tax will raise production costs per unit of output for firms. This would place upward pressure on the price of intermediate goods and final goods and services in the Utah economy.

A complete analysis of the economic impacts of the Btu tax should include both the direct effects and the complex indirect interactions between changes in energy prices and consumption and how this translates into changes in economic activity in the overall economy. Due to limitations of time and the analytical tools currently at our disposal, only the direct effects are considered for this issue briefing.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Utah for his excellent statement and I yield the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Madam President, I rise in support of the amendment before us.

When I evaluate a proposed tax, I ask several questions:

First, is the tax needed?

Second, is the tax a fair and efficient way to raise needed revenues, and does it have any effect on the Nation's economy that need to be taken into account?

I want to be clear, at the outset, that despite the lesson of fiscal history from our colleague from West Virginia, I do not think this is the time to raise taxes on the American people, unless those taxes go for deficit reduction, as opposed to additional spending. One of the real pluses of this amendment is that it reduces spending to go along with the reduction in taxes that we would establish here. While the Btu tax is harmful, responding to political pressure by transforming it into some other kind of tax, to be determined later, is clearly not the way to go.

Second, the Btu tax is not a fair or efficient way to raise revenues which might, in theory, be needed.

Imposing taxes on energy at an early stage in production allows the tax to be collected at only a few points, but it introduces all kinds of distortions into the economy. Managing the various exemptions that are proposed by the administration would result in a nightmare of paperwork reminiscent of the bad old days of energy price controls. Our foreign trade position would be undermined, because the tax would probably not be able to be rebated on exports under international trade rules.

But, perhaps what troubles me the most and has troubled many of my colleagues, particularly on this side of the aisle, is that the tax has an adverse—almost a disastrous effect on the American farmer.

The American farmer is the cornerstone of the American economy. American farmers are price takers in a world economy. Imposing the cost of a Btu tax on them will further push them behind in their efforts to pay their bills.

The cost of many of the inputs in the farm economy, such as fertilizer and pesticides, will be raised sharply by this tax. The cost of drying crops will go through the roof.

All in all, the Btu tax will raise the direct cost of farming in Minnesota by thousands of dollars for a typical farm—perhaps $2,000 to $4,000 for the typical wheat farmer, $5,000 for the typical corn farmer, and as much as $15,000 for a typical potato farmer.

There will be indirect costs, as well. Farmers drive long distances in the ordinary course of their business and personal lives. They must depend on oil to fuel the transportation system that brings their crops to market.

I should note that farmers are hard hit by a variety of taxes in the President's proposal. The inland waterway tax, for example, will raise the cost of shipping a bushel of corn from the Midwest to New Orleans by 7 cents. The estate tax rate increase will hurt, and so will the personal income tax rate hikes. All in all, another shift of revenues from rural to urban—from heartland to coasts.

Farmers are not the only ones affected by the Btu tax. Gasoline would go up by 7.5 cents per gallon. Home heating oil would go up by 8 percent, electricity bills by at least 3 percent, and natural gas heating by 4 percent. Some energy producers might well reap windfalls by raising the price of their products, since oil is taxed at a special, higher rate.

All in all, Mr. President, the Btu tax—which of course will drive up everyone's cost of living, city or country, rich or poor—is simply a bad idea. I urge my colleagues to support the pending amendment and strike this tax's revenue from the budget resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the recent remarks of Gerald Lacey, vice president of National Barley Growers, before a House subcommittee meeting on this issue be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF GERALD LACEY

One of the most disturbing proposals for grain producers (including barley) is the combination of energy taxes and user fees which would severely impact grain marketing costs. BTU taxes are not fair in that they just do not hit us all equally. Farmers with our high energy inputs, such as fertilizers, chemicals and fuel for getting our tillage and harvesting done, get hit just too hard to survive. The proposed user fees or bare fuel taxes are going to add 15 to 20 cents a bushel to our grain that is already having trouble competing with world market grains that have lesser or no fees. Many farmers consider this ever increasing regulatory cost escalation as a greater threat to their success than the weather.

A decrease in payment acres would seem to be an untimely strategy which could further complicate the already discouraging GATT negotiations. The U.S. has had the past experience of unilaterally making production adjustments which have cost export market share and have disadvantaged us in our long competition with the European Community.

There have even been suggestions to reduce or even eliminate the Export Enhancement Program. That would seem to be the ultimate folly if we have any hope of maintaining a competitive stance in the world market. We would be rapidly shouldered aside by the predatory pricing practices of the E.C.'s restitution program and the single-desk marketing arms of our other grain exporting competitors. The same is true for proposed cuts in the important GSM credit programs which have been equally vital to the U.S. commodity exports.

Those are the specific budget proposals that we would single out as particularly threatening. We would also mention a cost scored against the USDA budget which we have never been comfortable with. I refer to the considerable freight differential costs that accrue to Agriculture when required to use U.S. flag while shipping under the terms of the Cargo Preference rules. Since those charges are, in essence, a subsidy to the merchant marine, we do not feel that it is fair that in this period of intense fiscal austerity, the USDA budget should be burdened with those outlays. At the very least, the line item should be subjected to the same vigorous attention that is being given to the commodity features.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank my colleague, Senator DURENBERGER, for his statement and I yield to Senator GRASSLEY for 4 minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I think this Btu tax is the most antifarmer, antirural portion of this budget.

Madam President, I am alarmed at what I read recently in a publication here, just out this week, called "Agricultural Commodities News and Views."

This quotes:

Vice President Al Gore is said to be "strenuously working against efforts to exempt ethanol from President Clinton's proposed Btu tax," says one source.

A source very familiar with meetings on this issue says Gore is "dead-set against any exemption for ethanol."

Madam President, as a Senator, Mr. GORE used to help us promote ethanol. You have to wonder what happened.

Certainly, such a tax would assure that MTBE monopolizes our reformulated fuels program, pushing ethanol and farmers out.

That, of course, would make big oil very happy, particularly Arco, which is the largest manufacturer and importer of MTBE—the largest importer in the world.

My colleagues may have noted the recent articles detailing the sudden fondness and support of Arco that they directed at the Clinton energy tax proposal. I think it is all starting to become very clear. But, Madam President, the Btu tax on ethanol is just one of many devastating provisions included in this budget resolution presented by the Clinton administration and Senate Democrats.

The waterway barge diesel tax will cost an average 400-acre grain farmer $5,000 in lost income. The direct and indirect cost of the Btu tax will cut income by another $1,600 for the average American farmer.

The increased costs of meat inspection will be passed back to the farmer. And, as the Washington Post recently noted, agriculture is getting hit with 6.4 percent of the budget cuts while it comprises only 1.8 percent of domestic spending.

Madam President, Iowa's farm crisis hot line, where people who are in trouble can call in to get help on emergency basis, is receiving the most calls that they have received since the height of the farm crisis in 1986.

In 1989, the average Iowa farmer netted an income of only $14,000. In 1991, that did rise quite a bit to about $21,000. But this budget, with all these tax increases and all these cuts, particularly the energy tax increase, is going to put our farmers and rural Americans out of business.

You have to ask, is that a plan? Again I want to quote from the Ag Commodities News and Views in answering this question. An EPA staff member was asked what would be the benefit to U.S. agriculture by leaving Clinton's energy tax package as is?

The EPA staff member's response was, "there would be fewer farmers."

Has President Clinton declared war against America's farmers, against America's rural citizens?

Has the President gotten carried away with the advice of Ken Cook of the Center for Resource Economics? Cook warned Clinton not to pursue "support from the farm community too aggressively" because Clinton drew "solid opposition in farm country" during the election.

I ask my Democrat colleagues who have talked to the President, is his idea of deficit reduction really an effort at family farm reduction via devastating tax increases?

We need a candid, honest answer. Your answers could help save rural Americans from the devastation of budget resolution, especially the Btu tax. It is the most antifarmer part of the budget.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank my friend and colleague, Senator GRASSLEY. I must say, Senator GRASSLEY worked hard for this amendment in the Budget Committee.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I thank my friend from Oklahoma and commend him for this amendment. We have heard from a lot of Senators tonight, Madam President, about the impact of the Btu tax on America. I want to get very specific in terms of the impact on Kentucky.

In my judgment, the Btu tax is probably not going to produce the revenue that the President anticipates, in any event. Some would argue that it may even end up in the hole. But one thing we know is sure, one thing we know is certain, Madam President: The Btu tax is designed to discourage the use of fossil fuel.

How anyone from a coal-producing State could oppose the Nickles amendment astounds this Senator. Just looking at my State, for example, a University of Kentucky study indicates this tax will cost the Kentucky coal industry about $1 billion a year. That is $1 billion a year on the coal industry in one State, Kentucky. Many financially strapped coal operators will not be able to pass that cost through to their customers. The result: Mine closings.

Overall, the University of Kentucky study predicts the loss of 2,000 to 3,000 Kentucky jobs within 2 years of the implementation of this tax. This study was done by a respected University of Kentucky economist. It took a long, hard look at this and its impact on our State: 2,000 to 3,000 Kentucky coal jobs lost within 2 years, Madam President, of the implementation of this tax. You could not pick a worse tax, from a Kentucky point of view, than this tax.

Also, without some type of rebate for exports which may not even be possible under our trade laws, overseas sales of U.S. coal would simply be killed.

So, Madam President, what I want to talk about is the impact of this tax on one State: My State, Kentucky; $1 billion a year, 2,000 to 3,000 Kentucky coal jobs lost as a result of this tax. If Senator NICKLES' amendment is not successful, you can kiss those 2,000 to 3,000 jobs in Kentucky goodbye. This tax is a disaster for the Commonwealth of Kentucky, not to mention the impact on the country at large which has been described by speaker after speaker tonight. But this is terrible for Kentucky, the worst conceivable tax. All of this in the name of deficit reduction? In the name of deficit reduction, we are going to wipe out 2,000 to 3,000 Kentucky jobs.

Madam President, I rest my case based very narrowly on the impact on Kentucky.

Madam President, I rise today in support of this amendment to strike the energy tax from the budget resolution.

During the campaign, when George Bush predicted that Clinton would raise taxes on the middle class, Clinton howled in protest—and I quote:

> It is a disgrace to the American people that the President of the United States would make a claim that is so baseless, that is so without foundation, so shameless in its attempt to get votes under false pretense * * * it amounts to desperate tactics.

George Bush was right. Bill Clinton is raising taxes on the middle class—through his new Btu tax.

The amendment before us presents my colleagues on the other side of the aisle with a unique opportunity. By voting for it, they can help the President to actually keep one of his campaign promises and they can prevent a very bad idea from becoming law. The fact is, the Btu tax is regressive, inflationary, and will eliminate, not create jobs.

Families earning less than $10,000 a year spend 10 percent of their income on energy—excluding gasoline—while families earning over $50,000 spend less than 3 percent. Low- and middle-income families will bear the brunt of this tax.

The Btu tax actually taxes production, not consumption. This tax will raise the cost of making goods in this country, driving manufacturers and jobs offshore and reducing U.S. exports. That is hardly consistent with President Clinton's other campaign themes: stimulate economic growth and create jobs.

The Btu tax will not raise the revenue Clinton hopes to get. Because it is inflationary and dampens economic activity, the Btu tax actually could reduce income tax revenues. It will also drive up the cost of Federal entitlement programs which are tied to the cost-of-living index.

According to Clinton, the reason we have a Federal budget deficit is because we do not pay enough taxes. Never mind that the average American now works 126 days a year just to pay his or her tax bill. Taxes now take up almost 40 percent of American families' expenses—more than what families spend on food, housing, and clothing.

No, Madam President, the real reason we have a deficit problem is because Government taxes and spends too much. Congress has raised taxes 56 times in the last 30 years and for every dollar in taxes raised, spending has increased $1.59. Since the 1990 budget agreement, spending has actually increased $1.91 for each dollar in taxes raised.

President Clinton says higher taxes are needed to pay for his economic stimulus package. On this point, the President is about 22 months too late. Economic growth was up almost 5 percent last quarter, the seventh consecutive quarterly gain. In fact, the United States enjoyed the highest economic growth of any major industrial nation in 1992. Even if a stimulus was needed, it would take more than the $30 billion Clinton is proposing to put a dent in our $6 trillion economy.

The fact is, the President desperately wants to take credit for an economic recovery that was well underway when he came into office. After the American people feel the full impact of these new taxes, the President's approval ratings may need a stimulus, but for now, the American economy is doing just fine on its own.

Clinton's energy tax will not stimulate economic growth, produce jobs, or reduce the budget deficit. It will only impose a direct burden on middle-class America to pay for bigger Government. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to scrap the Btu tax.

I certainly hope the Nickles amendment will be successful, and I commend the Senator from Oklahoma for his leadership on this important question. The Btu tax is a disaster for America. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Madam President, I thank the very distinguished floor manager for yielding to me. First, I want to say such equities as exist in the Btu tax can and, in my opinion, will be redressed. The Senator from New Hampshire made a valid point about the impact it will have on New England.

I can tell you as a Senator from a rural agricultural State that farmers get the biggest whammy of all out of the Btu tax, and I intend to do my very best, as my distinguished colleague from Nebraska and the rest of us will later do, to redress that. But make no mistake about it, the battle tonight is to try to find a defeat for the President of the United States. It is not because this is the last chance to address the Btu tax.

I heard the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico this afternoon say we are only going to cut $7 billion in spending cuts—how silly can you get—over $4 billion in agriculture alone in cuts.

I intend to support this resolution to cut $500 billion off the deficit, and I want to send a clear signal to the American people that the zany years of the past 12 years are over. I cannot believe, as I reflect back on it, that on this very floor, the herd instinct swept across this floor. The President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, came to town on a solemn promise that I will balance the budget. That is the reason he was elected, on that solemn promise. Within 3 years—strike that—within 2 months, after his election, he said if you will only cut $2.5 trillion in taxes over the next 12 years, mostly for the wealthiest people of this country and double defense spending from $150 billion to $300 billion, that is the key to success; that is the key to prosperity and jobs. And the herd instinct swept across this floor.

You are looking at 1 of 11 Senators who did not believe it. A country lawyer from Charleston, AR, population 1,500, my native intelligence told me that is the craziest thing I ever herd, and I voted "no". And 12 years later, we do not have a balanced budget, we have a budget deficit that went from $920 billion when the President made that solemn promise in 1980 that is now over $4 trillion.

The lunacy, absolute lunacy that swept across this body now has this country on the abyss of an economic catastrophe. We have a young man who came from my home State. Yes, he is a dear friend, but I can tell you one thing. I have a credo that I believe in strongly and it is that you can tell more about the truthfulness of what a politician is saying to you by how unpleasant it is to hear it than any other thing. So when that young President went before the U.S. Congress and made his State of the Union Address, what did he do? He did not say, "Oh, if I could just get a line-item veto; oh, if I just had a constitutional amendment to balance the budget; oh, if it were not for that crazy runaway spending, tax-and-spend liberal Democrats." I cannot spend a nickel that Congress does not appropriate.

He did not give you any of that stuff you have been hearing for 12 years. He said, American people—he did not say it. I am saying it—I am paying you the highest compliment a man in public office can pay you. Do you know what that high compliment is? I am putting my trust in you with the truth.

Oh, how difficult it is for politicians to tell people things they would rather not hear. Politicians never think people can handle it. The truth of the matter is they can handle it. There is not a dirt farmer in Franklin County, AR, my home, that does not know that this country is in deep trouble.

About the only thing I have said to my President—and this was unsolicited. I told him, I said, I do not want to burden you, but I want to tell you, you are not just the country's last best hope; you are the country's last hope.

So he says to the American people and the Members of Congress, we are going to raise taxes. We are going to take some of the $2.5 trillion that went mostly to the wealthiest people in the country, we are going to take some of that back and we are going to start that deficit South. And the Btu tax, which is not perfect, I am going to put an investment earned income tax credit in there to help offset the burden of the Btu tax.

Have you heard anybody on the other side mention that tonight? Not one soul. Do you know where they show that? They say, "Well, look how much money the President wants to spend." Look at all this money here. Do you know why all that money is there on the earned investment tax credit? To offset the burden of the Btu tax for working poor people.

You have not heard anybody mention that.

Mr. President, if we had solved all of our problems in the last 12 years—education, crime, housing, health care—if, while we were spending $3 trillion in the last 12 years that we did not have, we had solved those problems, you might make some kind of argument in defense of the wild spending while we cut taxes the past 12 years. But that is not what has happened.

In the same period of time that we were quadrupling the Federal deficit and quadrupling the number of millionaires—and I have nothing against millionaires; I have been trying to join them all my life—we put 3 million people on the streets. I see them every night when I drive home, and you do, too. We have gone to about dead last among the developed nations in education. And there is absolutely no question that we have more people without health care than any nation on Earth—all while we built a deficit that is going to destroy the Nation if we do not heed this President saying this is your last best chance.

The same people who made the arguments about the key to prosperity is to spend $3 trillion you do not have stand before you tonight and say well, it is crazy to say that we are going to create jobs by taxing people. The Btu tax, if it were a gasoline tax, you would hear the same arguments. If it were any kind of tax, you would hear the same arguments.

This afternoon the senior Senator from Texas had a chart saying, why, they want to raise—they want to cut defense spending from 6 percent of GNP, which it was under Ronald Reagan, to 3.2 percent. And they want to increase social spending from 10 percent to 19 percent.

You bet. That is exactly what I want. That is exactly what any sane person would want. You heard the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee this night say domestic discretionary spending as a percentage of the budget and GNP has actually declined. What we spend on ourselves for education, for health care, for highways has declined. Entitlements up about 140 percent, defense up 100 percent, and what we spend to make ourselves a great people declined. Is it not about time we start spending some money on ourselves to take people off the streets, to try to take the guns off the streets? It reminds me of people who stand up and defend being able to walk into a gun shop and buy an imported Chinese AK-47 with no questions asked, which is what the guy who shot up the CIA did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has spoken for 10 minutes.

Mr. BUMPERS. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is yielded 1 additional minute.

Mr. DOMENICI. They have no additional time, do they?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BUMPERS. So, Mr. President, I want to plead with my colleagues, if you want to join with Senator KERREY of Nebraska, Senator DASCHLE of South Dakota, and other Senators here from rural areas to try to redress some of the injustices of the Btu tax on agriculture, please join us. We will do it. But do not use a resolution, the budget resolution, to try to embarrass the first President the United States has had who paid them that high compliment of putting his trust in them by telling them the truth. He said folks, we are in a heap of trouble. I would love to tell you something pleasant tonight, but it is not pleasant. We are

going to raise your taxes. We are going to cut a lot of spending. But I will tell you what, we have nothing more or less to lose than our whole future, our Nation.

My 3½-year-old grandson who spent the night with me last night deserves a future, so let us start tonight by helping preserve it for him.

I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I yield the Senator from Delaware 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. ROTH. Madam President, I rise today to support this amendment to strike from the President's plan what amounts to a major tax increase on the middle class.

The President's new tax is based on the energy content of oil, coal and natural gas—the lifeblood of our economic strength. Virtually everything Americans do relies on energy usage. Consequently, not only will such a tax hit our manufacturing, farming and transportation sectors, but the service and retail sectors as well. It will inflate the prices of goods across the board and hit our families where they live—literally in their homes, every time they go to the thermostat * * * every time they draw a warm bath for their children * * * every time they turn on the oven or the stove to cook a meal. And on top of these drawbacks, this tax is not fair. Some regions will feel its effect more than others.

I would like to talk about its adverse effect on Delaware. First, under the Clinton plan Delaware has a disproportionate tax increase, placing its tax liability eighth of all States and the District of Columbia. This is from the respected independent research group, the Tax Foundation.

The Wall Street Journal placed Delaware in a similar position. Only Connecticut, New Jersey, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Massachusetts, New York, and Maryland rank ahead of Delaware in the amount of increased taxes their citizens will have to pay. According to the Tax Foundation, the net tax increase in Delaware per person, each year, will be $263. Over the 4-year term of President Clinton, that will be over $1,000 for each man, woman, and child, or $4,000 for a family of four. Obviously, this tax hike will have a dramatic effect on the economy in Delaware. Decreasing consumers' discretionary income to buy goods and services will hurt economic growth, and create inflationary pressures that will further rob the middle class.

My State's largest industry is agriculture, like it is in many other States. And I can tell you the farmers in Delaware know they cannot affort this energy tax, which has been estimated to increase production costs by as much as $1 per acre, or more.

In the northern part of Delaware, the chemical industry is our major employer.

According to the New York Times, the chemical industry is the fourth most energy intensive industry in the Nation, with energy taking up more than 5 percent of manufacturing costs. Chemical manufacturers consume 7 percent of the Nation's total energy supply. About half of that amount will be subject to the Clinton energy tax because of power consumed by production equipment.

It has been estimated that the chemical industry annual fuel bill will be increased by $10 billion, or 12 percent.

Does anyone think that these increased costs will not inflate prices to the consumer?

Does anyone think that increasing production costs in this global economy will improve America's competitiveness? This tax is not—I repeat is not—going to be rebated at the border. Some of us have concerns about our country's ability to compete with new excise taxes that are not export neutral—in other words, taxes that increase the cost of U.S. products, taxes that are not forgiven, when our products are exported.

The chemical industry is the Nation's biggest export sector, larger than agriculture, producing a surplus of $16.3 billion last year, down from $18.8 billion in 1991. Even without this energy tax, forecasts indicate further declines. With the tax, the declines will surely be greater. Only ceramics, metal refining, and paper production have energy costs higher than chemicals, and I might add that since one of our chemical employers owns a major oil company, the northern part of Delaware will have additional difficulties to overcome. After the recent layoffs in the chemical industry in Wilmington, it is hard for anyone in Delaware to support this tax as a growth proposal. In fact, the only growth that we will see from the Clinton tax plan is in the size of the Federal Government.

Finally, I would like to talk about the unfairness of this tax. In the Northeast, and Mid-Atlantic regions, where roughly 40 percent of the homes are heated with oil, we will be asked to pay more than anyone else. While natural gas, coal, and other fuels will be taxed at 25.7 cents per million British thermal units [Btu's], petroleum-based fuels like home heating oil in Delaware will be taxed at more than twice that rate, or 59.9 cents per billion Btu's.

This is not a luxury for Delaware families that President Clinton is trying to tax. this is a necessity. It is not just regions that are unfairly treated under the President's plan. It is the middle class.

This is the same middle class that candidate Bill Clinton told would enjoy a tax cut if he were elected. This new energy tax will hit virtually every family earning more than $30,000, and in fact will hit families earning much less. We all know how the administration arrived at its numbers, using inflated family income by adding health benefits, Social Security payments, imputed rent on their homes and other nontaxable items. Under this proposal, many taxpayers will have to pay the higher taxes, but not get the tax rebates that they had hoped for—the rebates the President indicated they would receive. For example, one of my constituents, Mr. James Barry, wrote to me because he makes less than $30,000 and will have to pay from $300 to $500 a year in higher costs because of the Clinton energy tax. You see, he does not qualify for the earned income tax credit offered by the President, because he's retired. And every retiree without earned income is going to suffer the same fate. So, if you are retired, hold onto your wallets. If the IRS does not get you with the Social Security tax hike, it will get you with the energy tax because you do not qualify for a tax rebate. Those who work and have no children at home, but earn between $9,000 and $30,000 will have a big tax increase, too, because they do not qualify for the President's earned income tax credit, either. Believe me, there are plenty of these families, too.

Simply stated Mr. President, America cannot afford this tax at this time. We must be focused on creating economic growth, competing from a position of strength internationally, and providing security for our families here at home. This tax is not only unfair to certain States and regions in America, but it will be adversely felt by virtually every American.

In sum, we cannot tax America into prosperity.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Idaho. Would you inform me how much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes fifty-five seconds.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank my colleague from Oklahoma for yielding and I stand in strong support of his amendment this evening.

I have listened with amazement this afternoon and evening, Madam President, as Senator after Senator has come to the floor and said, "We have got a bad tax, but we have got to vote for it."

You just heard the Senator from Arkansas say it is going to hurt farmers, it is going to hurt families, and it is going to hurt working men and women, and we will fix it sometime down the road, but you have to vote for it tonight.

Citizens in my State were asking me that question. Several weeks ago when

I said I could not support this because it would lay Idaho agriculture to waste, and when I gave them the figures they knew why I could not support this President on this issue. He is wrong. That is why. But the other side of the aisle tonight does not dare give this new President a defeat on his first outing. That is what is at issue here.

The Senator from New York said it is a dumb tax, and it is a dumb tax—and 600,000 jobs in this country. I do not care how you try to subsidize your way out of that one. You cannot do it. And $504 per Idaho family on Btu alone. You know, Idaho is a blessed State. It has a unique resource. It is called hydro. Yet, this administration figured out a way to get to an environmentally benign high-quality, high-producing energy source, hydropower. Why did they do what they did? Here is what they did.

They said we will equate hydro in relation to Btu per kilowatt-hour of 10,315 when other nations of Europe, Sweden, and Norway, say if you do anything over 3,000 in a Btu to kilowatt-hour equivalent, you throw it out of proportion. It is impossible when you look down through the ramifications of this tax application to understand the whys and the wheres other than one thing. Any energy industry in this country that is energy intensive loses. And because this Nation has had the great wisdom to keep its energy costs low, and its productivity high, almost every industry takes a substantial hit.

Now it is not the board of directors, Madam President, and it is not the stockholders that lose. It is the thousands and thousands of working men and women who get the pink slips. That is who loses here.

In Idaho, farmers, ranchers, working men and women, and small business people are dependent upon a relatively inexpensive energy source that now soars through the roof on a very phony improperly applied formula. You are darned right.

The Senator from Arkansas is right. This legislation needs to be fixed. Why do we not send that message tonight to the White House, that it is a bad tax proposal and it ought not go any further?

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair. I thank the chairman.

The measure before the Senate has a lot of attraction for those of us who have been concerned about the Btu tax effect on an energy-intensive industry like agriculture. Just this evening, Madam President, I have confirmed through the administration that if the barge tax is allowed to stand as recommended, the tax in addition to its known hit on family farmers would also cost them 8 cents a bushel to transport corn from Omaha, NE, to New Orleans. This is unconscionable. It is ridiculous. It must be changed and it will be changed.

There are those speeches on the floor tonight—I am not questioning the intensity or the sincerity of those that are making these statements though—that this is the time to foreclose forever under consideration any type of a tax on energy.

I simply say that yet—while I understand they are concerned, and agree with many of them—yet to support this amendment at this juncture without a matter of appreciation and understanding that we currently have of its full effect on the economy as a whole and the President's package as a whole would be untimely.

In addition to the very legitimate concern relative to agriculture, it is also the possibility that the Btu tax might also severely adversely affect the whole economy of the country. These answers are not yet all into the many questions that we impose. If this amendment is adopted, it would put the Finance Committee in a straitjacket. And it would impair if not eliminate the Finance Committee's options to fashion a compromise that would likely be more acceptable to this Senator and probably the Senate as a whole.

The final decisions on these matters, especially for new revenues to meet the worthy deficit reduction goals of the President, should justifiably be made in the committee deliberations—and with the understanding that they would be deliberating this—and then afterwards, finally resolved in the upcoming debate and important votes as part of the reconciliation process.

Therefore, given the fact that all final decisions on the Btu tax, or any possible version thereof, should be made during the committee's deliberations and through the reconciliation debate and votes, I believe it is not wise at this point to rush to a decision we might afterward determine to be too hasty.

This is not the proper time to formally decide the fate of the Btu tax. That matter can and will come to a decision at a later date, only a few weeks down the legislative road.

I would emphasis that the deliberations and negotiations are ongoing with the White House on this and other substantial matters with regard to beginning that all-necessary deficit reduction decisions.

Let us not rush to judgment. It is always easier to kill something than to try to make it work. Constructive criticism, a give-and-take on the ideas and concepts is the only way to reach a deficit reduction goal that is fair to all.

Madam President, I suggest a no vote on the amendment before us.

I reserve the remainder of my time. I yield the floor.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FEINGOLD). The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas tells us that we dare not, we must not embarrass the President of the United States at this early point in his Presidency. We dare not embarrass the President, so we must keep $95 billion in gross new taxes on the American people, but we dare not embarrass the President.

We can deprive 600,000 Americans of their jobs, but we dare not embarrass the President of the United States. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska tells us that to cut $70 billion from the net number of taxes which the Finance Committee must raise will make that committee's task more difficult. Only in the U.S. Senate could we hear, seriously presented, the proposition that to reduce the new tax load by $70 billion will make the tax writing committee's process more difficult.

We dare not lower that tax burden on the American people $70 billion, because it will make it harder on 11 Senators to come up with their answers. This is not reality, Mr. President, in any respect whatsoever. Reality is the 600,000 jobs which will be destroyed by this tax. Reality is that it takes $95 billion in gross new taxes to produce $38 billion in income for the Federal Government to use on new spending programs. Reality is a tax on hydropower described by my colleague from Idaho, which treats hydropower at almost three times the tax of dirty coal in the imposition of a tax which is supposed to help the environment and will have the opposite effect. Reality in my State is an increase in the production cost of aluminum, which will drive at least 10,000 jobs out of the State and out of the United States of America. Many of the defenders of this proposal oppose the North American Free-Trade Agreement, because it will drive jobs to Canada and Mexico, and they vote for a proposal which will have 10 times the adverse impact that even their dreams call for in that respect.

Reality is the President of the United States going to the Boeing Co. and sympathizing with workers losing their jobs, and imposing a tax of between $1 billion and $1.5 billion a year on an airline already losing billions of dollars a year. Reality is the impact on the farms of America, which Senators on the other side say, "we will take care of it." How? By increasing taxes on others? Reality, Mr. President, is the request of the people of the United States that we cut spending before we raise taxes.

The Nickles amendment does exactly that. It accords with the will of the American people, and it is more important than a potential embarrassment to the President of the United States, or adding to the difficulties of 11 majority members of the Finance Committee who, somehow or other, will find it harder to raise $320 billion in new taxes than $395 billion in new taxes.

Mr. NICKLES. How much time is remaining, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A total of 6 minutes is remaining on your side.

Mr. NICKLES. I yield to the Senator from Missouri for 2 minutes.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of my colleague. I had the opportunity earlier today to talk in broad generalities about the impact of the President's proposal on the economy of this country—the jobs that we would lose, the inflation that this could cause, and the slow-down in economic growth. But I think maybe tonight I will just tell you that I have had the opportunity to talk to many farmers around the State of Missouri, and farmers in Missouri are very sophisticated these days. They have to be good businessmen and women to know how they are going to earn a living, how they are going to keep their families together, how they are going to achieve the goals they have set for themselves and their families.

They have it down to the last cent, and they know what the costs are. They know what their inputs are. They know how much this is going to cost them. We can come up with estimates by various organizations, say $700 to $1,000 for a small farm, maybe $1,500 for a larger farm. Well, the farmers throughout Missouri can tell you specifically what their direct costs will be, costs in terms of diesel fuel, and propane for drying, and transportation costs. But they can only give you an estimate of how much their fertilizer costs are going to go up. Some people said anhydrous ammonia would go up $62. Other equipment they buy is going to have an added cost impact. I have seen, I think, reliable estimates, based on a DRI study of 1987 that a 17.7-cents-per-billion Btu would cost a million jobs. This is more, and it will cost more.

I urge my colleagues to join me in "taking the horse meat out of the rabbit stew" and voting with Senator NICKLES and Senator SHELBY.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] is recognized.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, when President Clinton came before a joint session of Congress, he gave a speech, and I heard both Republicans and Democrats say they were impressed with the speech. Indeed, it seems to me that the speech itself changed the dynamic of the debate in America. He did come and tell the American people the truth.

We have a deficit that, unless we do things definitely now, will radically change the nature of our country, and we have to deal with it. He told us it was going to take cuts in spending and new taxes to get the job done. Well, things were changed for a while, Mr. President, and since that time, I have heard from a variety of interest groups. They say: "We like the idea of reducing the deficit, except we do not like this particular cut; and would you, Senator KERREY, help us restore this particular cut?"

And then came a group of people that said: "Well, Senator, we like the idea of reducing the deficit, but we would like for you to help us fight this particular tax increase." I do not know how it is possible.

Of course, I have heard a lot of people come to the floor and talk in campaigns about the need to make tough choices. Now is the time to make tough choices. I hear many colleagues saying: "Do you not have some easier tough choices?" Well, there are none, Mr. President.

This morning, I had the Congressional Research Service come over and make a presentation to me about what is going on with our entitlement programs, a subject I hope we get to spend some time on. I intend to vote for spending cuts this year. I doubt that I am going to be able to vote for the stimulus package. I heard a presentation, and I expect to come to the floor and share it with my colleagues.

Twenty-five percent of the taxable income today in America goes for the top five entitlement programs. Those entitlement programs do not affect the 90 million American workers. That number will grow to 50 percent in the year 2020. An awful lot of us may not be around then, but our kids and grandkids will be, Mr. President.

If we really look into the future, then we are going to have to get real serious and look people dead in the eye that are part of our political base and say: no, we cannot be all things to all people. It is impossible to reduce the deficit and restore economic health to this country, unless we are prepared to risk, as the President did, our political careers, too.

I will vote "no" on this amendment, Mr. President, because I am coming to the task and will join the President of the United States in making sure that we end this year with serious and meaningful deficit reduction.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I will be brief, and I will tell my colleagues that we are getting ready to vote in a few moments. I heard people say we are going to fix agriculture in a little bit. The Senator from Wyoming says: "Are we going to raise heating oil in the Northeast?" I know some want to exempt aviation. Are we going to do that to increase the tax on coal? I just will tell my colleagues this is a punitive tax that will put hundreds of thousands of people out of work, and we need to kill this tax now.

Now is the time to kill it. Let us take that direction away from the Finance Committee and say you do not have to raise that $73 billion. Let us tell the Appropriations Committee you do not have to spend that $73 billion.

And for those of my colleagues who are worried about us not having enough money to spend, I will tell them over the next 5 years we are going to spend $8.1 trillion. This is less than a 1-percent cut. I might mention we are spending $1½ trillion a year right now. That figure is so large you cannot comprehend it. It is more than $6,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

I think we need this amendment to make sure we will not put an additional tax burden and additional spending burden on our future generations.

I hope my colleagues will agree to this amendment offered by myself and Senator SHELBY.

I yield the remainder of our time to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes 30 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if I might have one additional minute.

Mr. SASSER. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to break my closing remarks into two parts.

First, I have not been able to respond to the very lengthy statements from that side of the aisle laying the total claim for this budget deficit on Republican Presidents and implicitly on Republican Senators.

I am very pleased that the President of the United States does not think that. I am going to quote from his speech he gave to the American people.

> I tell you this is not to assign blame for this problem. There is plenty of blame to go around in both branches of government and both parties.

I would also remind those who think the Republicans were the only ones that wanted to reduce taxes in 1981, the vote was 89 to 11. As I recall, we had about 51 Senators. Where did all the rest of them come from?

And then I would ask you—I looked at the charts that my good friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, put up here, and he said the last 4 years have been the years that the deficit really went up.

I submit you could do another chart and say those are the years that the

Democrats controlled both Houses by the largest numbers. You could have another chart up along side of it.

That is one reason perhaps that the deficits went up so high. In this body, the Democrats owned the U.S. Senate; in the other House the Democrats had 80 or 90 House Members long on their side.

How in the world can you stand here tonight and talk about those fellows on that side? They were for the rich. How about those fellows on that side? Eighty-nine Senators voted for that tax cut if that was a tax cut for the rich.

So I submit the President of the United States is correct in saying there is plenty of blame to go around.

Having said that, let me suggest that the truth of the matter about this amendment is very simple. I have now looked at how much domestic spending there is in the United States, and let us make this very clear. The domestic spending of the United States in the next 5 years is going to increase, I say to my friend from Oklahoma, by $815 billion.

I do a little arithmetic, and I divide it by five and on average there is a $175-billion increase in the domestic budget every year.

How in the world can we be harming people in the United States when in this amendment we say do not put on the fuel tax, the energy tax, $72 billion net to the Government and take $72 billion out of this increase? Let us do the arithmetic. The budget of the United States, when we are finished with the Nickles amendment, over the next 5 years the domestic budget will grow $743 billion.

I cannot believe that the American people believe we ought to be putting more taxes on while the budget is growing that much. I think they believed that the President said we are going to sacrifice, but the sacrifice was not all in favor of the Government and against the taxpayers.

So I submit this amendment would send a clear message that we do not need 72 billion dollars worth of new taxes, including the most onerous around, the Btu tax, and we do not need $72 billion in program increases when the budget will be increasing $743 billion on the domestic side.

Frankly, I think it is very simple.

The other point I would make for those who say do not do anything, we will fix this tax up in committee, it seems to me then the budget resolution does not mean anything if you are going to fix them all up and in effect the committee is going to take everything that is affected out.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I strongly support the Nickles amendment. From the very first day President Clinton proposed the British thermal unit [Btu] tax, I have had serious concerns about its potential impact in my State.

I've concluded the energy tax would impose a heavy burden in South Dakota and other rural States. Farmers, ranchers, and small businesses would be heavily impacted. They represent the foundation of South Dakota's economy. They also are fuel-dependent industries. Farmers consume enormous amounts of energy in growing and processing agricultural products. Most important, they have few, if any, ways to pass through increased energy costs. They have to absorb them.

With each passing day, we are learning more and more that agriculture and rural America could be burdened unfairly by the Btu tax. South Dakota's farmers and ranchers cannot afford to pay thousands of dollars in extra taxes. The proposed Btu tax could add 7.5 cents to the cost of a gallon of gasoline; 8.3 cents for diesel fuel; and 2.3 cents for propane. This tax would hit every aspect of agriculture: planting, cultivating, harvesting, heating and drying, and irrigation.

The Btu tax would hit South Dakota corn growers especially hard. The fuel cost-per-acre for corn production in South Dakota already has risen from $21.78 in 1988 to $23.98 in 1990. The Btu tax would increase these costs by an additional 7 to 10 percent. That equates to an additional $1.70 to $2.40 per acre.

However, we also need to look beyond fuel and energy production costs. Fertilizer and pesticide prices would increase as well. For corn growers, drying costs would increase. In South Dakota, those costs already are over $11 per acre for corn. Individually, some cost increases may not seem that great, but when one begins to look at the bottom line, one will conclude that rural America is being asked to shoulder a very heavy burden.

Some numbers being discussed are alarming. The Fertilizer Institute estimates the proposed tax would result in a $4,515 loss in income for the typical 1,500 acre wheat producer. They also estimate the annual loss of income for the typical 700 acre corn producer would be $5,159.

The livestock industry is South Dakota's largest industry—valued at nearly $9 billion. The National Cattlemen's Association estimates that cow-calf operators could face $5.52 in additional taxes per beef cow. This will cost South Dakota cattlemen more than $5 million each year. The rancher's bottom line also is not encouraging.

Farmers have no control over the market. They will be unable to pass these costs through. Mr. President, I know of no South Dakota farmer who could afford to sacrifice $5,000 of his or her hard-earned income each year.

Most alarming, the March 17 Ag Commodities News and Views reported:

U.S. Farmers aren't going to like what an EPA representative reportedly said at a Friday meeting regarding the Clinton Administration's energy tax proposal—Inside government sources reveal the following: "An EPA staff member was asked what would be the benefits to U.S. agriculture by leaving Clinton's energy tax package as it is. The EPA staff member's response was, "There would be fewer farmers."

Small businesses, often associated with agriculture, consume vast amounts of fuel to travel great distances in rural States like South Dakota. With small business profit margins as narrow as they are, a 10-percent increase in energy costs could force some to lay off their employees, and could put others out of business. Small businesses are the backbone of our Nation. Yet, this tax could break the backs of small business.

Obviously, Mr. President, I should not have to point out the climate differences that exist in our country. Not only does South Dakota have long, cold winters; it has hot, humid summers. While hot and humid is great for corn growth, it also requires large amounts of energy for heating and cooling our homes, schools, and hospitals.

Northern States Power [NSP] serving residents in the most populated portion of South Dakota estimates an increase of 31 cents per kilowatt hour. NSP estimates that the tax would result in an increase of 4.1 percent for residential electrical rates and up to 6.7 percent for businesses. They also estimate 5-percent increases residential gas rates, and business customers would face increases of up to 10.7 percent.

How will these estimated rate increases affect school districts, those living on a fixed income, or hospitals? School districts are very concerned about what an increased utility bill would do to their budgets. We cannot add to their financial burden. Increasing our school's utility bills would decrease their ability to invest in our children.

Out of the 64 counties in South Dakota, 4 are on the top 10 list of the poorest counties in the Nation. Many of the people in these counties receive assistance under the Low Income Energy Assistance Program [LIEAP]. Many run out of LIEAP funds well before the long South Dakota winter is over. What will happen to these people when the cost of energy is increased? Yes, the administration has pledged to increase LIEAP funding. Yet, LIEAP lately has been in desperate need of additional funding. There is no guarantee LIEAP will be fully funded. What will LIEAP recipients do if there is no additional funding?

Mr. President, let there be no misunderstanding: South Dakotans are more than willing to do their fair share in helping reduce our enormous deficit. I've talked to them. I've read their letters. I've heard their phone calls. They are ready to do their part. The issue

here is fairness. The proposed Btu tax is unfair to the people of South Dakota.

Instead of finding creative ways to tax Americans, we should focus our attention on constructive ways to cut wasteful government spending. I've said it before—the cuts must come first. The Nickles amendment would do. I urge my colleagues to join me and others in supporting the Nickles amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, in evaluating the Btu tax, it seems to this Senator that the whereas just don't add up to the therefores.

The administration has clearly articulated three objectives for the Btu tax: According to "Vision of Change," the tax is designed: To reduce environmental harm; to decrease the country's dependence on foreign energy, and to promote energy conservation.

It will do little to encourage conservation or curb energy consumption. The proposal will make our foreign oil dependence worse according to some experts. And it is theoretically flawed if its objective is to encourage clean energy sources that are good for the environment.

ENVIRONMENTAL OBJECTIVE

What is the environmental justification for taxing clean natural gas at the same level as dirty, high sulphur, eastern coal?

This tax is supposed to encourage the use of natural gas by taxing oil at almost twice the rate of gas and coal, but according to CBO the design of the President's tax may encourage coal use because the demand for coal generated electricity may benefit from the relative price changes that take place as a result of the tax.

CBO says that a Btu tax is a blunt tool for achieving environmental goals. "If it were feasible, it would be better to tax the pollution itself rather than the fuel."

The "Environmental Whereases" don't jive with an "Environmental Therefore" to tax clean neutral gas at the same rate as dirty eastern coal.

ENERGY SECURITY

CBO estimates that the tax proposed by the President would cause imports to fall slightly—by about 150,000 barrels per day in the first year after full application—about 2 percent of our average net imports of 6.9 million barrels per day.

To finish the quotes from the CBO testimony, "the benefit associated with energy security would be small" if Congress were to enact a Btu tax. "The U.S. would remain heavily dependent on foreign supplies for its oil and more important, the world would remain dependent on insecure sources of supply."

Philip K. Verleger testified before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. It was his opinion that the Btu tax may actually increase U.S. dependence on imports of oil as well as the dollar value of petroleum imports because the tax may exert a greater negative effect on domestic oil production than it does on consumption.

The Btu tax will have a negative impact on domestic oil production, no doubt about that.

We could lose more EOR production in California's San Joaquin Valley alone to more than offset any reduction in gasoline consumption that might occur nationwide.

In my own State of New Mexico, the tax could cost producers an additional $700 million per year. It will cause wells to be shut-in and jobs to be lost.

We will lose refinery capacity.

If the "whereas objective" is conservation, the administration has the wrong "Therefore" in a Btu tax.

Sixty-five percent of petroleum is used for transportation. If the administration's objective is conservation, it has to do more than a 7.5-cent gasoline tax increase.

THE REAL THEREFORES ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROPOSAL

What are the correct therefores associated with this tax?

If this tax goes into effect, the American manufacturing sector and its workers, pensioners, and customers will be the losers. Our foreign competitors will be the winners.

A Btu tax hits farmers who produce our food twice. Farmers would pay the tax on grain drying, irrigation pumps, confinement facilities, and vehicles, and fuel to run their tractors. They would also pay the Btu tax on the energy used to create the tools of their trade like fertilizer.

According to the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Btu tax will cost American farmers $600 million per year.

In Luna County, NM, this tax will increase the energy bill of farmers by about $4,069 a year. In Luna County, the farmers grow chiles, onions, lettuce, sorghum, and wheat. These crops are not subsidized crops, but they are crops that need a lot of cultivation. A farmer puts a lot of hours on his tractor in order to earn his living. This Btu tax is the opposite of a farm subsidy. Instead of paying farmers to produce, it taxes them if they produce.

These are taxes on rural America, one of the hardest hit sectors of our economy in the past decade. These are American workers who are up at dawn and work til dark. They aren't rich.

Since the farmers' cost of farming will go up, they may have to raise the price of their products. A Btu tax is nothing more than a tax on food.

The Air Transport Association has estimated that the airline industry will pay an additional $1.2 billion per year in higher costs when the tax is fully implemented. Add this tax to the $6 billion that the industry has lost in the last 3 years and another therefore will be more airline bankruptcies;

New Mexico has struggled to gain adequate air service. The last thing we need is airline service cutbacks.

The President said he didn't want to tax the low-income Americans, and yet this Btu tax substantially increases their tax burden.

The elderly will be hurt most. The lowest income elderly—families in the first income quintile—will see their taxes go up by 45 percent due to the energy tax. Most elderly do not work, so they would not benefit from the earned income tax credit. Most are not poor enough to qualify for LIHEAP or food stamps.

For many low-income families, the Btu tax will be associated with heat or eat and Btu will come to stand for "Buy thermal underwear."

The administration claims to want to impose a Btu tax because it would combat pollution by improving environmental quality, promote energy efficiency, enhance national energy security and not discriminate against any geographic area.

Instead, what we have is a perverse hidden tax that is going to work like an import fee on domestic production. We are going to tax our farmers; bankrupt our airlines; make us less competitive; make us more oil import dependent. This is the wrong proposal.

According to the American Petroleum institute the Btu tax would have the following impact on New Mexico based on 1990 data.

Increase taxes paid by New Mexicans of $536 per family of four.

New Mexico households would pay an additional $21.4 million in taxes on the electricity they use to heat, cool, and light their homes.

New Mexicans use about 1 billion gallons of gasoline a year and can expect to pay an additional $110 million in additional gasoline taxes.

Businesses in New Mexico would pay an additional $76 million in additional energy taxes for their goods and services.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, by proposing cuts in spending and revenue increases, President Clinton has demonstrated that he is serious about reducing the deficit and has stopped the run from economic reality. It's about time that we have had that kind of Presidential leadership. By proposing targeted investments in areas such as education, transportation, and conversion from a cold war oriented industrial base, President Clinton has showed that he has a vision of how to promote economic development in a way that translates into high paying jobs.

The Nickles amendment strikes at both elements of the Clinton Economic Program. It substantially reduces the anticipated revenue and spending levels with the result that President Clinton would not be able to deliver on the program for economic growth that he

promised during the 1992 campaign. It is for that fundamental reason that I will vote against the amendment.

My vote against the Nickles amendment should not be taken as unequivocal support for the Btu tax itself. The budget resolution before us does not mandate a Btu tax. Instead, it leaves it up to the Finance Committee to recommend specifically how that revenue target can be met. I am still exploring the impact of the Btu tax on consumers and employers, particularly in my home State of Michigan. I am open to considering other proposals that would be consistent with the revenue projections in the budget resolution, and I would urge the Finance Committee to consider a range of options to meet its revenue target.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by my colleague from Oklahoma, Mr. NICKLES.

Like many of my colleagues from the West and rural States, I have reservations about the Btu tax. I am concerned about how it might adversely impact several important industries in my home State of Montana: Agriculture, coal, and aluminum production.

Unfortunately, while the amendment before us today may address these concerns, its passage would create far more problems than it could ever solve:

At a time when the American people are demanding that Congress act to address this country's problems, passage of this amendment would only mean more gridlock. It would amount to an undeserved rebuke of a President, who has shown the courage to confront this Nation's problems;

And, at a time when we should be doing more to invest in our young people, our physical infrastructure, and our environmental infrastructure, this amendment would gut the President's investment initiative;

In closing, while this tax and some other aspects of the President's economic plan must change, I intend to be a part of the solution; not a part of the problem; not a guardian of gridlock. If Congress and the administration work together, I am confident we can resolve these problems and pass a plan that will mean a better future for this Nation.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to address my colleagues today on the potential effects of the proposed Btu energy tax on the ratepayers of the Pacific Northwest. I have serious concerns regarding the application of a fossil fuel-based Btu tax on hydroelectric energy.

As I understand it, the proposed Clinton Btu tax is applied to hydropower based on the "average fossil fuel Btu input required to generate equivalent energy." On a per kilowatthour basis, however, several Northwest energy experts tell me, hydro will be taxed at two to three times the rate of coal and other fossil fuels.

As you know, Mr. President, Btu is short for British thermal unit, or the amount of energy required to raise the temperature of 1 pound of water 1 degree fahrenheit. Hydroelectricity, however, does not generate heat. It uses the pressure of falling water to turn turbines to generate electricity. Therefore, the Btu is not directly compatible with hydropower. Yet, despite this fact, the proposed Btu tax applies not only a Btu baseline to hydro, it applies a coal-based Btu equivalent to hydro.

Coal and hydro, however, are different in many ways. For example, to generate 1 kilowatthour of electricity by burning coal, it takes 10,300 Btu's. To generate 1 kilowatthour of electricity by using the falling water pressure of hydropower, it takes the equivalent of 3,400 Btu's. Additionally, coal plants are 36-percent energy efficient while hydroelectric plants are 85- to 95-percent energy efficient.

Clearly, because hydroelectricity does not generate heat and is three times more energy efficient than the coal resource, it is incompatible to attempt to equate the two energy resources on the same tax scale. But that is exactly what the Btu tax does. It applies coal's Btu baseline to 10,300 Btu's per kilowatthour to hydro. This application will cause hydro to pay almost three times the amount of tax per kilowatthour as a fossil fuel plant will pay. For example, the administration's estimates that electricity rates for energy generated by fossil fuels will increase by 4 percent. Hydro's rate increase, however, will be three times that or 12 percent. This 12-percent increase has been confirmed by several Northwest energy users including the Direct Service Industries, American Public Power, the hydro industry and the Bonneville Power Administration.

Essentially, a rate increase of this magnitude could have devastating effects on my region of the Pacific Northwest. Allow me to take a moment to outline the current Northwest energy picture. Hydroelectric energy accounts for at least 62 percent of the energy produced in the Northwest. We are currently in the midst of a 7-year drought in the West which has significantly reduced water availability for electricity generation through hydro. On top of that, we are fighting an extremely costly battle to bring back threatened and endangered Columbia River salmon.

Even before the Btu tax came into the picture, Bonneville Power Administration ratepayers were faced with a 15-percent rate increase, which will take effect this fall, to help pay for costs associated with salmon and low water levels. If a 5-percent Btu tax were added to the existing 15-percent rate increase, the Pacific Northwest could be looking at a 20-percent rate increase this fall. Additionally, when Bonneville completes its next rate case in 1995, rates could jump another 16 to 20 percent to compensate for fish, the remaining 7 percent of the Btu tax, Power Marketing Administration repayment reform and possible low water levels. All in all, over the next 5 years, the Pacific Northwest ratepayers could be encountering a 40-percent electricity rate increase.

This is a worst case scenario, Mr. President, but I must be frank with my colleagues when I say a rate increase of this magnitude would endanger virtually every manufacturing sector of my region's economy. We have 10 to 15 aluminum and other metals manufacturing plants in the Northwest employing over 10,500 workers. Boeing Aircraft, which maintains plants in Seattle, WA and Portland, OR, announced several weeks ago it would be eliminating 28,000 jobs, with more cuts on the way. Other energy intensive industries operating in the Northwest, including pulp and paper manufacturing and chemical manufacturing, would also be distressed.

Mr. President, the stated goals of the Btu tax proposed by the administration are to: First, raise revenue: second, increase energy efficiency; third, improve the environment by reducing fossil fuel use; fourth, reduce foreign oil imports; and fifth, strengthen U.S. economic performance.

A tax on the order of the proposed 12-percent Btu tax on hydro would not help the administration achieve these goals in my region. Although the tax would surely help raise an immediate source of revenue, it would make hydropower uneconomical and have the unwanted effect of forcing my region to look elsewhere for its major sources of fuel.

What other sources of fuel will the Northwest acquire—coal, oil, natural gas, nuclear energy? All of these energy resources are less efficient and pollute the environment with particulate matter, radioactive waste, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide and other so-called greenhouse gasses. Replacing clean, energy efficient, renewable hydro energy with fossil and nuclear fuels would prevent the administration from achieving its goals of improving energy efficiency, reducing fossil fuel use, reducing greenhouse gasses, and backing out foreign oil imports. Instead, my region would be forced to turn to other, less attractive means of meeting its energy needs.

Not only will the proposed Btu tax cause the Pacific Northwest to look to other less efficient and less environmentally benign energy sources, it will obliterate the administration's goal of improving our Nation's economy. As I stated earlier, the economy of my region would suffer under the rate increase burdens imposed by efforts to save the salmon, low-water conditions and an unfair 12-percent rate increase due to the Btu tax. Basic energy inten-

sive industry in my region will either go out of business or look elsewhere for a more economical place to operate—most likely beyond U.S. borders.

I am not arguing the Northwest should be exempt from contributing its fair share to the Clinton economic plan. The Northwest should, however, be treated equally with other regions of the country which are also largely dependent on one resource for the bulk of their energy. If the Midwest and Northeast must endure 4-, 6-, or 7-percent rate increases due to the Btu tax, so should the Northwest. But, my region should not be unfairly penalized at a time so crucial to its economic and environmental future.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I am supporting the Nickles amendment to strike the Btu tax from the budget resolution until a more equitable solution to reducing the deficit, increasing energy efficiency and enhancing American industrial competitiveness can be found.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the Nickles amendment, Senator KENNEDY be recognized to offer an amendment relative to the 1998 funding levels for Head Start; that the amendment be debated this evening and that when the Senate recesses this evening, the Senate stand in recess until Friday, March 19, at 9 a.m.; that following the prayer on Friday, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date and the time for the leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that the Senate resume consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, the budget resolution, with the time before 9:10 a.m., equally divided and controlled between Senators KENNEDY and DOMENICI; that the Senate vote on the Kennedy amendment at 9:10 a.m.;

That following the disposition of the Kennedy amendment, Senator GRASSLEY be recognized to offer an amendment relating to domestic discretionary freeze, and that a vote occur on or in relation to the Grassley amendment at 11:30 a.m.;

Following the disposition of the Grassley amendment, the next three first-degree amendments to the resolution be the following in the order listed if the offeror of the amendment is present to submit the amendment: DeConcini amendment, on community policing, Pressler amendment, on the Small Business Administration, and Wellstone amendment, sense of the Senate on ethanol;

That any votes ordered with respect to the amendments listed above occur beginning at 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, March 23, with 10 minutes for debate, equally divided in the usual form prior to each vote; that no second degree amendments be in order to any of the amendments listed in this agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The text of the agreement follows:

Ordered, That at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, March 19, 1993, the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 18, the Concurrent Resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, with the time until 9:10 a.m. to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Domenici).

Ordered further, That at 9:10 a.m. on Friday, March 19, 1993, the Senate vote on the Kennedy amendment, No. 183.

Ordered further, That upon the disposition of the Kennedy amendment, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Grassley) be recognized to offer an amendment, relative to domestic discretionary freeze, with a vote on, or in relation to, the Grassley amendment to occur at 11:30 a.m.

Ordered further, That following the disposition of the Grassley amendment, the next three first degree amendments in order to the resolution be the following, in the order listed, if the offeror of the amendment is present to submit the amendment:

DeConcini—Relative to community policing;

Pressler—Relative to the Small Business Administration; and

Wellstone—Sense of the Senate relative to ethanol

Ordered further, That any votes ordered with respect to the above three amendments occur beginning at 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, March 23, 1993, with 10 minutes for debate, equally divided and controlled, prior to each vote.

Ordered further, That no second degree amendments be in order to any of the amendments listed in this agreement.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of Senators, as a result of this agreement, the vote which will shortly occur will be the last rollcall vote today. There will be two votes tomorrow, one at 9:10 a.m. and one at 11:30 a.m. After the vote at 11:30, there will be no further rollcall votes until Tuesday at 2:15 p.m. However, the three amendments listed here will be offered and those votes scheduled for Tuesday after 2:15 p.m.

The Senate will return to this resolution at 9 a.m. on Monday and will be in session throughout the day and the evening at which time I understand the managers are going to work up a schedule for amendments to be offered and debated at that time, and those votes to be stacked over to Tuesday afternoon. However, Senators should be aware that we will be on the resolution and if no Senators are present time will run against the resolution throughout the day and in the evening on Monday and that the same practice will be followed on Tuesday morning between 9 a.m. and the time that we begin to vote at 2:15 p.m.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Republican leader, the Senator from Tennessee, and the Senator from New Mexico, and all those who cooperated in putting together this agreement. This enable us to proceed with this measure in a way that accommodates all Senators to the maximum degree possible.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, for the Senators on our side we might ask to submit amendments on Monday while we are in session on this resolution. We clearly are going to provide them with an opportunity to debate their amendment before we vote on it if stacked for 10 minutes or so, are we not?

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, yes. It is my intention that every Senator will have an opportunity to debate his amendment in that fashion until we get to the end of the 50 hours.

I want to make one further statement so every Senator is fully informed as to the schedule. As I said, the Senate will be in session for a long day on Monday. There will be long days on Tuesday and Wednesday as well.

In my discussions with the managers and the distinguished Republican leader, I have made clear that it is my intention that the Senate complete action on this bill by the close of business on Wednesday night whenever that is. We are going to proceed and try to get it done in that way.

I apologize to any Senators for any inconveniences caused by that, but there will be lengthy sessions Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, with votes commencing at approximately 2:15 p.m. on Wednesday.

Mr. SASSER. May I inquire of the majority leader with regard to the 10 minutes that will be allocated prior to each vote. Will that 10 minutes be equally divided?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes. It is my intention that we follow that practice here.

And I make a parliamentary inquiry: The 10 minutes of debate, that time would be counted against the resolution that is used for debate between votes; am I correct in my understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time will be charged against the resolution.

Mr. MITCHELL. So what I hope is that the practice, or at least the pattern, we have set here will be followed, so that Senators will have, in fact and in perception, the full opportunity to debate their amendments in a way that accommodates the schedules of as many Senators as possible.

May I inquire of the managers if this arrangement is acceptable and agreeable to them?

Mr. SASSER. It is satisfactory with me, I say to the leader.

So there will be 10 minutes before each amendment when they are stacked, 5 for the proponents and 5 for the opponents?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is correct.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

$3.86 in taxes for every $1 in spending cuts[1]

President's plan—modified:

	1994–1998
Gross new taxes	360
User fees	18
Total new revenues	378
Tax cuts	(64)
Net new taxes & fees	313
Non-defense spending cuts	131
Non-defense spending increases	(124)
Net non-defense spending cuts	7
Defense spending cuts	74
Net spending cuts	81
Total new taxes & spending cuts	394
Debt service savings	64
Total deficit reduction	458

[1] $313 billion net new taxes and fees / $81 billion net spending cuts = $3.86.

Items which increase the deficit are shown in (parenthesis).

Dollars in billions, compared to the CBO capped Baseline.

Details may not add due to rounding.

CBO capped baseline	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	Total 94–98	Change 93–98
Revenues	1,143	1,214	1,290	1,355	1,413	1,481	6,753	338
Defense	294	275	268	276	283	291	1,393	(3)
Non-defense	253	264	272	279	287	294	1,396	41
Subtotal, discretionary	547	539	540	555	570	585	2,789	38
Social Security	302	319	335	351	368	385	1,758	83
Other mandatory	471	501	541	563	602	656	2,862	185
Subtotal, mandatory	773	820	876	914	970	1,041	4,621	268
Offsetting receipts	(65)	(69)	(73)	(74)	(76)	(79)	(370)	(14)
Debt service	198	211	231	251	271	293	1,255	95
Outlays	1,453	1,501	1,574	1,645	1,734	1,840	8,295	387
Deficits	(310)	(287)	(284)	(290)	(322)	(360)	(1,542)	(50)

Change to baseline	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	Total 94–98	Change 93–98
Revenues		36	46	63	76	74	295	
Defense		3	5	(10)	(34)	(37)	(74)	
Non-defense		4	(0)	2	8	14	28	
Subtotal, discretionary		7	5	(9)	(26)	(23)	(46)	
Social Security		0	0	0	0	0	0	
Other mandatory		1	(1)	(7)	(11)	(17)	(35)	
Subtotal, mandatory		1	(1)	(7)	(11)	(17)	(35)	
Offsetting receipts		(3)	(3)	(5)	(4)	(4)	(18)	
Debt service		(2)	(6)	(11)	(18)	(27)	(64)	
Outlays		3	(5)	(31)	(59)	(72)	(163)	
Deficits		(33)	(51)	(93)	(135)	(146)	(458)	

President's plan—mod.	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	Total 94–98	Change 93–98
Revenues	1,143	1,251	1,336	1,418	1,488	1,555	7,048	412
Defense	294	278	273	265	250	253	1,319	(41)
Non-defense	253	268	272	281	295	309	1,424	56
Subtotal, discretionary	547	545	545	546	544	562	2,743	15
Social Security	302	319	335	351	368	385	1,758	83
Other mandatory	471	502	540	556	591	639	2,827	168
Subtotal, mandatory	773	821	875	907	959	1,024	4,585	251
Offsetting receipts	(65)	(71)	(76)	(78)	(80)	(83)	(388)	(18)
Debt service	198	209	225	240	253	265	1,192	67
Outlays	1,453	1,504	1,569	1,615	1,675	1,768	8,132	315
Deficits	(310)	(254)	(233)	(197)	(187)	(214)	(1,084)	96

Details may not add due to rounding.
Includes $12 billion in stimulus spending.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 182 proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES].

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 40 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Bennett	Faircloth	McConnell
Bond	Gorton	Murkowski
Boren	Gramm	Nickles
Brown	Grassley	Packwood
Burns	Gregg	Pressler
Chafee	Hatch	Roth
Coats	Hatfield	Shelby
Cochran	Helms	Simpson
Cohen	Jeffords	Smith
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Specter
Craig	Kempthorne	Stevens
D'Amato	Krueger	Thurmond
Danforth	Lott	Wallop
Dole	Lugar	Warner
Domenici	Mack	
Durenberger	McCain	

NAYS—53

Akaka	Breaux	Daschle
Baucus	Bryan	DeConcini
Biden	Bumpers	Dodd
Bingaman	Byrd	Dorgan
Boxer	Campbell	Exon
Bradley	Conrad	Feingold
Feinstein	Kohl	Nunn
Ford	Lautenberg	Pell
Glenn	Leahy	Pryor
Graham	Levin	Reid
Harkin	Lieberman	Riegle
Heflin	Mathews	Rockefeller
Hollings	Metzenbaum	Sarbanes
Inouye	Mikulski	Sasser
Johnston	Mitchell	Simon
Kennedy	Moseley-Braun	Wellstone
Kerrey	Moynihan	Wofford
Kerry	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

Robb

So the amendment (No. 182) was rejected.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NICKLES. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Massachusetts, is recognized.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I ask if the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts would withhold for 2 minutes to allow the distinguished Senator from Alabama to make a statement which I indicated he could make following this vote. I was not aware that the Senator from Massachusetts would be recognized immediately after this vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will be glad to withhold.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alabama.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I voted against the Nickles amendment after very careful consideration. I have great reservations about the Btu tax and, as the legislative process continues on the President's program, I will be endeavoring to work with all key officials to see if we cannot modify it considerably or substitute other forms of revenue enhancement to replace the Btu tax.

But the Nickles amendment abolishing the Btu tax completely, in my judgment, was a killer amendment. It would have killed the President's program; it would have killed his efforts to reduce the deficit. If the President's program on reducing the deficit is killed, I seriously doubt that the momentum in support of deficit reduction can be rebuilt in the next 4 years.

The Nickles amendment would have also killed the President's program of investing in the future of America's infrastructure, both physical and human. For these and other reasons, I voted against the Nickles amendment

I thank the Chair, I thank the managers of the bill and I thank Senator KENNEDY for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 183

(Purpose: To ensure that fiscal year 1998 funding levels of the Head Start Program are consistent with the levels requested by President Clinton in his investment program)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself, Senator DODD, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator MURRAY, Senator KOHL, Senator RIEGLE, and others, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for himself, Mr. DODD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. RIEGLE, proposes an amendment numbered 183.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. . ASSUMPTIONS.

In setting forth the budget authority and outlay amounts in this resolution, Congress assumes that the Head Start program will be funded at the level requested by the President for fiscal year 1998.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield such time as I might use.

Mr. President, I rise tonight to offer an amendment in support of President Clinton's plan to invest in America's children. The President knows well that if we are to keep faith with tomorrow's schoolchildren and our future work force—we must take action now. And that is precisely what this budget does. By finally putting us on a path to full funding of Head Start for all eligible children and families—the President has moved to fulfill a promise made to America's most vulnerable children more than a quarter of a century ago.

Head Start is a premier social program—a long-term experiment that works—and the key to a better and brighter future for millions of American children and families.

For nearly 30 years, the Head Start Program has been providing comprehensive early childhood education, health, mental health, nutrition, and social services to low-income children and their families. More than 12 million children and families have been given a head start in life—and millions more await the opportunity.

Study after study has documented the effectiveness of the Head Start model. From social and cognitive improvements to critically important health screening and increased access to immunizations—Head Start has changed children's lives for the better.

In 1990, it was Gov. Bill Clinton who convinced the Nation's Governors and President Bush to declare our No. 1 education goal to be that by the year 2000, all American children would enter school ready to learn. Recognizing that if we fail to intervene early we may never regain the ground lost, or be able to reach the remainder of our education goals—fully funding Head Start became a cornerstone of that commitment.

And Head Start is not only a early childhood development program but a comprehensive family support program which promotes active parent involvement and self sufficiency. A study released by the Bush Department of Education documented that "Head Start programs involve parents far more than any other early education or care program."

Low-income children and families today face enormous and increasing challenges, struggling to survive in neighborhoods plagued by lack of opportunity, violence, and drugs.

And while Head Start alone will not eliminate poverty in America, the program is helping families to cope and children to succeed. They are entering school ready to learn. We can no longer ignore the benefit of decades of valuable experience and forsake the futures of millions more children. President Clinton knows that while the price of success is high—the cost of failure is far higher—a price our country can ill afford.

What Head Start needs is the long awaited and universally advocated steady infusion of resources necessary to expand both program enrollment and to enhance program quality. For more than a decade, blue-ribbon panels and advisory groups of all stripes have reemphasized that while expanding the number of children served, the Head Start Program must also invest more in each child and intensify the direct services available to families in need.

Never has this been more true. Yet during the decade of the 1980's, while homelessness, substance abuse, AIDS, and family violence were on the rise, the Reagan-Bush administrations gradually eroded the program's quality and effectiveness in an effort to serve more for less.

During the Head Start reauthorization of 1990, our committee heard from Head Start parents, program directors, and child development experts who pleaded for more and better trained staff to help families address their growing problems. They testified that in many programs, family service staff were required to manage caseloads of 150 families, as local programs were instructed to accommodate more children with grossly inadequate resources. Moreover, witnesses testified that many Head Start staff received such low wages they are themselves forced to depend on food stamps and other Government programs to help support their families.

When the Senate unanimously passed the Head Start reauthorization, we entered into a social contract with Head Start eligible children and families intended to reverse these years of neglect. At the core of this promise were two essential commitments. First, enrollment would be expanded to ensure access to Head Start services for all eligible children being left behind. And second, that 25 percent of funding increases would be set aside to strengthen program quality and enhance Head Start's family focus. President Clinton understands, as we do, that program quality can never be sacrificed for program expansion. He is determined to ensure that these intertwined goals move forward hand in hand.

More than for any other social program, a broad-based coalition of child advocates, educators, and CEO's have called for full funding of Head Start now before its too late. Jim Renier, CEO of Honeywell told our committee

that failure to follow through on Head Start put "our free enterprise economy, our democratic system, and the American dream itself" at stake. And affirming their commitment to this goal, CED is here today releasing their fourth report in 5 years calling for full funding of Head Start. This should tell us something.

Dr. Ernest Boyer, former Commissioner of Education, has said that the failure to fully fund Head Start was an "immoral, obscene, waste of human talent that is surely a precursor to economic decline and civic sickness." If we had a dollar for every report that recommended universal access to Head Start—we would have served all eligible children and families years ago.

Democrats and Republicans have called for full funding of Head Start for years—perhaps decades. Presidents have campaigned on Head Start, and Presidents have invested in Head Start. Now we need the sustained action proposed by President Clinton to reaffirm our commitment to a time-tested program with a proven track record of success.

If we are serious about our children and our well-intentioned national education goals, it is time to put our resources where our rhetoric have been—in Head Start. It is time to stop praising the program and start paying for the program. That is what President Clinton has committed to do.

After decades of promises—President Clinton has put forward a vision and a budget that embodies a plan for phasing in full funding of Head Start by the year 1999. The President knows that we do not have a single child to waste. That each and every eligible child needs and deserves a Head Start. And he has a plan to ensure that by the year 2000—we will have accomplished this goal.

By passing the budget resolution on the floor today—we take a critically important step toward fulfilling a dream. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment—affirming the President's investment in the Head Start Program, our children, and our future.

Mr. President, I want to review the action Congress has taken in recent years. In 1990, the Congress passed the Head Start reauthorization, which set targets for phasing in full funding of $7.67 billion by 1994. That Act was signed by President Bush. Unfortunately, we have seen that we have not appropriated the funds to keep pace with these targets. And we have seen over the years that although under President Bush there had been requests for funding increase in the Head Start program, that actually Congress took not only the recommendations but went beyond these recommendations in 1990, 1991 and 1992. In 1993, President Bush proposed $2.8 billion, and the Congress appropriated that $2.8 billion. In sum, the previous administration signed an authorization bill calling for $7.67 billion in 1994. President Clinton's 1994 budget request provides a plan to reach that $7.67 billion that President Bush agreed to and signed, instead of reaching that figure in 1994, he does it in 1998.

So, as you can see, this is an extremely reasonable and responsible approach. We have the previous administration whose President committed to and signed that full funding authorization. We now have the action of the Budget Committee to move us forward toward that full funding. What we are basically saying is that with this budget, we are really committed to achieving this worthwhile goal once and for all.

Mr. President, we have seen that Head Start is not a program isolated in and of itself. Our committee is looking at the chapter 1 program reauthorization, a $6.7 billion program that has been extremely effective in working with disadvantaged children. We understand, as we stated both in the reauthorization of 1990, and in consideration of the ESEA, that when the children complete the Head Start Program and begin the K-12 experience, the chapter 1 program must be coordinated with the transitional activities of the Head Start Program. I am confident that President Clinton's elementary and secondary education reform program is going to recognize the linkage that is necessary between Head Start and the early grades, which basically are the target for the chapter 1 programs. This is part of a continuing and ongoing experience which I think all of us understand is essential and necessary.

One of the key elements of the 1990 reauthorization is a recognition that we had to give greater attention and focus to the issues of Head Start quality and quality control. And we provided a set aside to strengthen the quality of Head Start programs nationwide. We believe, by and large, and the record will reflect, that quality deterioration began in the 1980s, where the cost per child in Head Start actually decreased by 13 percent. This occurred because the administration at that time wanted to increase the enrollment with inadequate funds and frequently HHS required enrollment expansion that far exceeded the available resources. It was basically a numbers game. They talked about the Head Start Program and what they effectively would do is require additional students without any money to support them thereby threatening the fundamental integrity of the program.

In 1983, for example, HHS required that nearly 20,000 children be added to the program despite a $40 million decrease in funding after adjusting for inflation. And in 1988, HHS required that 2,500 children be added to the program despite a $26 million decrease in funding. Similarly, in 1989, 2,000 children were added despite a $25 million decrease in real dollars.

So we had a decade where there was pressure to expand the program without the adequate funding and while many of us resisted, unfortunately we saw that some children and programs paid the price. We made adjustments in the 1990 reauthorization program recognizing that fact. And I believe that with the kind of support that this budget resolution provides for the Head Start Program, we will get back to the kinds of success we have seen the Head Start Program provide for children, and families, success which will be carried through with the Education Neighborhood School Reform Act which this President has also committed to, providing $800 million over 3 years.

One of the elements we will be including in that act is the mentoring program to try to help target children who can be identified who are educationally at risk or otherwise at risk. So we are trying to have a compromise and continuous approach and hopefully we will also include the one-stop shopping services either in the schools or in facilities linked to the schools to try to provide additional kinds of help and assistance to so many of the children that are at risk, particularly in the inner cities of this country.

So, Mr. President, this is an extremely important program. It is in many respects a lifeline for millions of children in this country. We welcome the strong commitment and leadership shown by President Clinton. Through this particular vote, we provide an opportunity for this body to demonstrate the overwhelming support for the Head Start Program.

That is the purpose of this amendment. We believe it is of fundamental and basic importance to our children, our future, and to the country itself.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield such time as the Senator from California may use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I rise to support the resolution before us on Head Start. I think—and I look at Head Start not as an economic stimulus but as a major investment in the future of this country. One thing we know, Mr. President, as a country, we do not value education the way we should—not like our competitors in the free world. We find that we underfund education. We find that our fifth and sixth graders cannot read. We find we graduate youngsters from high school that cannot read or write, multiply or add, recognize China

on a map, count change in their pocket, or fill out an employment application.

Yes, Mr. President, in my State, 20 percent of all of the students in the largest public school system in the world today do not finish high school; 20 percent drop out. Many are truants, and many find themselves alienated very early on because they cannot compete; they do not know the routine; they cannot adjust to the discipline.

I have found that it is too late by the time a youngster is in the eighth or ninth grade. The time to keep a youngster out of a gang is in grade 3 or 4. And I believe that Head Start, now provided for only 25 percent of the youngsters that need it and want it, can be a major change. It is a jump start because everybody in this body knows the value of early childhood education.

I do not think there is one U.S. Senator, Democratic or Republican, who would think the children cannot learn better than they learn today. And I would think, also, that everyone in this body understands that prior to the age of 6, a child learns their values. They learn the difference between right and wrong. They learn certain a routine and certain discipline, and they gain by their environment.

Head Start is early childhood education, because what it does is take the parent and the child, in a special program for 1 year, and teaches them the routine, the discipline of learning. If there is a problem in the environment, it seeks to work it out. If there is a problem in the family, it seeks to provide the right kind of counseling. Yes, not only is it a jump start, Head Start is also the right start for a young child.

I think we are just coming to know the value of creating a skilled work force. We are finally admitting that our economy is not national. It is, in fact, global. And we are finding that our competitors produce a more skilled work force in this economy than we do.

Most of them have longer school days. Most of them have shorter vacations. Few of them have the kind of dropout rate we do. Few of them have the truancies we do. And the routine and discipline of learning is acquired early on in their lives.

I ran very strongly on full funding of Head Start in California. I think it rang a bell with people because if there is one place people want to invest, it is in our future. And if we invest in our future, what better investment is there than our children, because if our children cannot go into the work force and know the discipline, the routine, and have the ability of gaining an education, then we are lost as a society; then America quickly becomes a second-rate power.

So I am very pleased to say thank you to the President of the United States for making the effort to fully fund Head Start. And for those who would quibble about a stimulus, I would only say, if you really believe that early childhood education is something that can turn around an underfunded, ailing, public education system in this country, then you are going to take the number one step, which is to fully fund Head Start for children that need it and want it.

Mr. President, I often say our children today know the floor plan of Nordstrom's better than they know the map of the United States. And, indeed, how sad it is.

In Orange County, CA, a woman went into court to sue the school district of her city because her child was in the fifth grade and that child could neither read nor write. Head Start is not going to cure every educational problem or dilemma or challenge. What Head Start is going to do is, for that very young youngster, remove them from a home, with their families, counsel with them, work with them, and begin to teach them the elements of learning much earlier on than we do in our system.

I think Head Start has worked for the 25 percent of children who have had it. One thing has been shown. I think one study showed that children who have Head Start are actually 30 percent better able to act, to graduate from high school; and 60 percent better able to get a job by the age of 19.

Those are very important statistics. I think they indicate that this is a program that is well worth every dollar spent.

Mr. President, I am proud to support this resolution. I am proud that the sense of the Senate is that for the first time in history, this Nation is going to put some major dollars into education, and we are going to do it in the way that we can get the most dividend. And, of course, that is Head Start.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. KOHL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. KOHL. Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, in the next few days, as well as the next few months, we are going to be debating our budget.

We are going to be doing our best to strike the right balance between deficit reduction and increment spending. We are going to freeze some programs, cut some programs, and invest in new programs. There will be genuine differences of opinion on whether we can afford to invest in certain things, and a time when our checkbooks will indeed be in the red.

Mr. President, if there is one thing that we should be able to agree on, it is that we must continue to invest in education and the well-being of our Nation's children. We all understand that educational opportunities and excellence is the key to our Nation's economic security and future. So Head Start is a program in which we must continue to invest.

Some question the long-term positive effects of Head Start. And others suggest that the grants should be competitive. But I do not think I have ever heard anyone say that Head Start is a bad program. The debate is only about how good it is. Should we give it a 9 or a 10? Should we spend money renovating facilities and creating safe environments, or should we increase the wages of Head Start workers or change the age of eligible children?

But all of these things, Mr. President, are about making it an even better program. We all agree that Head Start is a very, very good program. Yet, between 1981 and 1989, Head Start programs suffered a 13-percent funding reduction.

Between 1981 and 1989, the percentage of 3- to 5-year-old eligible children actually enrolled in Head Start declined.

To his credit, President Bush increased Head Start funding by 58 percent during his first 2 years. So now we are spending $2.8 billion on Head Start and, yes, that is a lot of money. It is understandable that some might suggest we should freeze or slow down spending on this program. But even with these significant increases in the past 2 years, only 28 percent of economically needy and eligible children in our country have access to the education and services provided under Head Start.

And I believe that we have an obligation to serve all of the eligible children in our country.

In my own State of Wisconsin, 17.5 percent of all children under 6 are being raised below the poverty line; 54 percent of our native American children are being raised in poverty, and a devastating 61 percent of our African-American children under the age of 6 are starting their lives in poverty.

Yet, we are serving only 31 percent of those 3- to 5-year-olds through Head Start. The question before us is whether the other 69 percent are also going to get a headstart in life.

Reaching this goal will not happen without investments. If we are serious, if we really care about our country and the future of our country's children, then we must support and fully fund the Head Start Program.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, given Head Start's impressive record of success, it is long past time to extend its advantages to all of our eligible children. I have taught preschool, and I would guess that I am the only one on this floor that can claim that experience. I have seen the difference it can

make for individual children, and whether it is to encourage a child to enjoy music, or to help a child learn basis skills, or to give a child the confidence he or she needs to deal with his or her peers, preschool experience makes a difference.

And I know how important and how effective Head Start is. We need to invest more in Head Start so that all of our children—no matter who they are or where they come from, or how much money they have—enter school equally ready to learn. That is what America is all about.

Over the past 12 years, poverty rates for children have climbed substantially in my State and in this Nation. Currently, one out of every four preschool-age children is poor and, therefore, eligible for Head Start. Yet, in 1992, Head Start served only 29 percent of eligible children. We need to remedy that failure.

As the mother of two children, it is my responsibility to see that they receive the schooling they need. As a country, we have the same responsibility to all of our children. Head Start recognizes that all children, but especially low-income children, need high-quality early childhood education to prepare them for school.

Research clearly shows, and my teaching experience confirms, that the sooner a child begins an early childhood development program, and the more comprehensive its approach, the greater the positive effects on that child. A recent study of early childhood education programs by the Department of Education finds that Head Start programs are much more likely to provide comprehensive services, such as health care and nutritious meals, and to involve parents in their child's learning. It also finds that Head Start programs are more likely to meet national accreditation standards for good quality early childhood programs.

For middle-class children, preschool programs have become a common experience. My own children had the opportunity to go to preschool for several years. All children, from the poorest to the more well off, deserve the same exposure. Given the serious problems low-income families face today, these children need 2 years of Head Start to get ready for elementary school.

About 80 percent of Head Start sites follow the part-day school year schedule typical of traditional preschools. The lack of full-year Head Start programs is especially problematic, because low-income children tend to suffer a greater loss of school-related skills over the summer. One of the things I learned as a preschool teacher is that our children lose a great deal that they learn over the summer, and the full-year programs are extremely important, especially for Head Start children so they do not lose their educational gains and the needed support services during the summer months.

Full-day, full-year Head Start services are essential to many families as well. Many low-income families cannot use Head Start because the parent works full time. Since Head Start was designed to meet the educational needs of children and not to provide child care for low-income women, it does not fit the job schedules of the working poor. We need to fund Head Start to provide full-day, full-year sessions for the children of low income parents with jobs. Until we do, low income mothers will have to piece together child care arrangements for the rest of the workday and year. And I personally know how difficult that is.

Currently, one-third of Head Start children live in families where the head of the household works full-time outside the home. The number of such families who want to use Head Start is likely to grow with an increased national focus on helping low-income families become self sufficient. Full-day, full-year Head Start programs for preschool children will complement jobs, JTPA, adult education, literacy, and other self-sufficiency services for their parents.

Head Start recognizes the vital role that parents play in children's learning and helps them become more actively involved in it. It includes them in the program as decisionmakers and provides parent support services. It encourages parents to volunteer in their children's classrooms. Head Start also trains parents and hires them as staff. Research indicates that Head Start programs have positive effects on the parents of the children enrolled in them. This program strengthens families and helps children realize their full potential.

Investing in Head Start makes financial sense, because it saves money. We can invest $1 for children to attend Head Start today, or we can spend $3 for special education, drug abuse programs, Medicaid, welfare, or prisons for them tomorrow.

In short, Head Start is the best program for meeting the needs of low income preschoolage children. Over two decades of experience with Head Start provides convincing evidence of its effectiveness. This program gives at risk preschool children an early educational experience that improves their changes of later academic success. Children enrolled in Head Start achieve immediate gains in cognitive test scores, socioemotional functioning, and health and nutritional status. Head Start improves school readiness substantially for children whose native language is not English, and for those from economically disadvantaged families. It boosts children's ability to participate in regular elementary school classes. They are less likely to be retained in grade or be placed in special education classes in elementary school, and they also have better attendance rates.

These outcomes demonstrate that Head Start programs produce significant and lasting changes. It equips children to do better in school and makes a difference in their adult lives. All of our children deserve access to Head Start. By funding it fully, we, as a Nation, are investing in the most important form of capital there is—human capital.

Our children are our most critical resource for the future. Let us ensure that they all have a head start in life.

I encourage the support of this amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally charged against the two sides.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

PAN AMERICAN COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE IN HONDURAS (ZAMORANO)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues a unique American college which recently celebrated the 50th anniversary of its founding while being widely acclaimed as the premier, and most successful, university-level international agricultural institution in Latin America. I am speaking of the Escuela Agricola Panamericana, better known as Zamorano.

Zamorano, located on 15,000 acres in the picturesque Yeguare Valley in Honduras, Central America, has been a model of continuity and stability within Latin America's sometimes unpredictable political environment while providing a top quality education to the region's future leaders, entrepreneurs, and food producers. Zamorano is, essentially, a large working farm where the students are responsible for the production. Zamorano teaches students to overcome fear of failure by giving them the opportunity to make mistakes and learn from them—the basis of the Zamorano educational principle of learning by doing, in agriculture and related fields. All students are encouraged to develop the farmer's persistence and lifelong habits of honesty, hard work, discipline, and confidence in one's own abilities.

The Zamorano curriculum is geared toward graduating students with immediate professional competence and leadership ability. Zamorano's Agronomo program requires students

to successfully complete 33 months of dawn-to-dusk training, equally divided between the field and the classroom. This intensive schedule compresses into 3 years the equivalent of 4½ years of college in the United States. The program also includes practical, fieldwork modules not seen in other colleges today. During each of the three 11-month periods, students focus on a different area of agriculture, beginning with horticulture, then agronomy, and finally animal science. The day begins with a 5 a.m. wake-up bell. While some first-year students work in large vegetable fields, second-year students drag nets through fishponds or use machetes and hoes to weed and cultivate field crops such as corn, beans, sugarcane, rice, or sorghum. Third-year students might handle milking of the cows, or learn to cut meats in the animal science lab.

At the dairy plant, students help produce milk, butter, yogurt, ice cream, sour cream, and 16 types of cheese. In the meat sciences laboratory they make frankfurters, sausages, and other processed meats. At the food processing plant, they turn out jellies, marmalades, salsas, sauerkraut, and pickled okra and beans. Most of the food produced at Zamorano supplies the campus dining hall or is sold, along with ornamental plants, at the campus store or through commercial outlets in the capital of Honduras. In addition, the agronomy department produces almost 40 percent of the certified seed for Honduras. The students thus learn to participate in funding their own education while learning to produce for real markets. Much like farmers, they produce the food for their plates, and excess production is sold to help support operation of the college. At the same time, they are learning to help their neighbors and the poor hillside farmers through extension programs in which all students participate.

The curriculum also includes basic sciences such as botany, physics, chemistry, mathematics, agricultural administration, management, and engineering. In addition to practical specialties like computer training, forestry, fisheries, and English. Zamorano has also recently started a new Department of Natural Resources and Conservation Biology, which will help to provide care and resource management for the Uyuca Cloud Forest Preserve near the college, for which management responsibility has been delegated to Zamorano by the Government of Honduras. The students get a balanced view of agricultural science and technology—both the physically demanding uncomfortable and repetitive side and the innovative high tech side.

Up to an additional 2 years may be spent by qualified students in the Ingeniero Agrónomo program, which gives top Agrónomo graduates the opportunity to specialize by doing research and exploring their particular interest under close faculty supervision. As in any graduate program, Ingeniero Agrónomo students work on their own projects, and must present and defend a thesis. Students often opt to complete their Ingeniero Agrónomo degree in two work/study years, usually teaching part-time in order to help cover the costs of their advanced degree. Combined with their Agrónomo degree, Ingeniero Agrónomo graduates receive the equivalent of 6 years of formal education at any U.S. college of agriculture. Many of these students go on to obtain graduate-level degrees at top educational institutions in the United States.

After its founding in 1942, Zamorano grew slowly until 1979 when it entered a period of extensive expansion and improvement under the leadership of Dr. Simon E. Malo, a Zamorano graduate [1954] who had been a professor at the University of Florida. Dr. Malo gathered an outstanding team of professors and personnel, adding 32 teaching positions and 110 courses. Field lab modules were enhanced and research activities escalated. Graduates of the Agrónomo program increased from an average of 65 to 200 a year. Today, Zamorano is one of only two colleges outside the United States to earn, because of their quality and size, a chapter of Gamma Sigma Delta, the U.S. honor society for agriculture. In 1981 Zamorano changed to a coeducational system, recognizing the vital role of women in farm production. Female undergraduates now account for about 15 percent of the student body. Zamorano is committed to increasing that percentage, and to remaining the international institution, free of political influence, that it has always been.

Zamorano believes that well-trained human resources are the most important asset—the real wealth—of a region or country. The college has also recently increased its outreach efforts in response to the immediate and pressing needs of the surrounding communities and the land that is their livelihood. One of Zamorano's many community efforts is its Rural Development Program, which enlists the assistance of both students and graduates. The goal of this program is to improve the way of life of small farmers within the local area, and to incorporate the needs and conditions of the environment into the teaching, training, and research activities of the college. Extension agents, who are all Zamorano graduates, reside in local communities. These agents serve as bridges between the communities and the college, introducing new ideas to the farmers and helping them to implement new technology. Agent-supervised modules bring Zamorano students to the small farms to work hand-in-hand with the farmers to help solve their problems, and to form an understanding of rural conditions and attitudes. This effort is broader than just an agricultural development program; factors such as nutrition, health, and education are inextricably entangled, and only 1 in 3 Honduran farmers are literate. Additional rural outreach efforts by Zamorano include the Literacy Program, house construction projects, a Rural Schools Program, and a world-renowned Integrated Pesticide Management Program. The latter program has been financed at its beginning partially by USAID.

The tropical American region is one of the world's richest ecosystems in species diversity. However, population pressures and struggling economies are leading to the destruction of forest, land, and water resources far exceeding natural renewal rates. During the annual dry season alone, fires in Honduras destroy tens of millions of dollars' worth of potential forest products. Since Zamorano initiated the Uyuca Biological Reserve cloud forest in 1983, students have planted more than 800,000 trees, including 75 new species. One species is the much researched insecticide-producing neem tree. This tree is not only good for firewood, but also grows well in poor soil. Zamorano encourages small farmers to plant other firewood species in private and community wood lots, in order to lessen random forest destruction. Also on Zamorano's agenda is a program to bring urban children to the cloud forest to show them where their water comes from. The college believes it is critical that these children—the voters and consumers of the future—understand what is happening to their water sources and the entire ecological system.

Agriculture is the economic lifeline of the hemisphere's tropical regions, representing about 80 percent of the region's gross production, and providing employment to about 45 percent of the economically active population. The need for increased food production grows more critical as growing populations flood the cities, leaving fewer and fewer rural farmers to produce the food. The strain on the land is significant. One of Zamorano's priorities continues to be preserving the region's resources while expanding its economic potential. While offering its farm as an example of ecological awareness, Zamorano also actively extends its influence toward the betterment of the hemisphere in many other ways, including the following:

First, protecting natural resources through training, extension, and direct intervention;

Second, creating jobs through graduates' entrepreneurial efforts;

Third, modernizing farming methods by developing and introducing new technologies;

Fourth, diversifying agricultural products to improve diets, export earnings, and stabilize economies;

Fifth, improving production efficiency and reducing post harvest losses;

Sixth, introducing new knowledge through agricultural research; and

Seventh, forming cosmopolitan leaders of the hemisphere, imparting the "American" ideals and practices of the Founders and affirming its Latin American history, culture, and essential identity.

At the heart of Zamorano's prominence among Latin American colleges of agriculture is its continuity and stability—its internally maintained and unwavering ability to provide educational excellence year after year. By controlling 90 percent of its funds, Zamorano maintains virtual financial and political independence, and self-sufficiency, and continues to teach despite changes in surrounding political or economic influences. Zamorano is currently undertaking a capital initiative, to recognize its 50th anniversary by building its endowment and scholarship funds, completing a student center, providing needed seed and grain processing equipment, and endowing two faculty chairs. This capital initiative is moving forward under the strong and able leadership of Mr. George P. Gardner, a long-time Trustee of the college, past chairman of United Fruit Co., and articulate spokesperson for this unique and very important institution.

I would urge my colleagues to take notice of the outstanding record of this college, which is bringing hope for the future to so many while performing so well today. My best wishes to Zamorano as it moves forward in the coming years to even higher accomplishments than in its illustrious past.

PATTERNS OF GLOBAL TERRORISM

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, on March 5, 1993, I delivered remarks on the bombing of the World Trade Center in New York and the threat international terrorism poses to Americans. As part of my statement, I asked unanimous consent that a letter to Secretary of State Christopher be printed in the RECORD. The letter laid out a series of recommendations for the State Department for including HAMAS and other violent Islamic fundamentalist organizations in its annual report on terrorism.

Unfortunately, a page of that letter, signed by many of my colleagues, was inadvertently deleted. I now ask unanimous consent that a complete version of the letter to Secretary Christopher be printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that the State Department's response to the letter be included in the RECORD. The State Department responded by saying that:

Violent activities of HAMAS during 1992 will be included within the report in the context of the annual report on international terrorism and as a part of our report on the violence of the Intifada which is increasingly associated with HAMAS.

I commend the State Department for this action.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, March 12, 1993.

Hon. FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LAUTENBERG: Thank you for the letter from you and your colleagues to the Secretary urging the inclusion of information on HAMAS in the Department's annual report, Patterns of Global Terrorism, to be published in April 1993. I have been asked to respond on the Secretary's behalf.

I want to assure you that evident activities of HAMAS during 1992 will be included within the report in the context of the annual report on international terrorism and as part of our report on the violence of the Intifada which is increasingly associated with HAMAS.

With regard to fund raising activities in the United States, the Department's report deals with international terrorism as the Justice Department has the responsibility for countering terrorist activities inside the United States. The report will describe, to the extent that can be done in an unclassified publication, the support HAMAS and other fundamentalist groups engaging in terrorism violence overseas receive from government and non-government sources in the Middle East. As you know, HAMAS has emerged only relatively recently as a group involved in terrorism.

We appreciate your words of support for our counter-terrorism policy, including for our continuing efforts to discourage other countries from directly or indirectly providing support to terrorist groups.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. BRADTKE,
Acting Assistant Secretary,
Legislative Affairs.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, February 26, 1993.

Hon. WARREN CHRISTOPHER,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY CHRISTOPHER: Enclosed is a letter I have circulated in the Senate expressing support for your reported decision to include the activities of Hamas in the State Department's annual report on terrorist organizations.

The letter also urges the State Department to include the activities of other violent Islamic fundamentalist organizations in the Middle East and recommends that the report address a number of specific issues.

I hope the State Department's report will respond to the issues we have addressed in this letter. I look forward to working with you in the future on this and other issues of mutual interest.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. LAUTENBERG.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, February 25, 1993.

Hon. WARREN CHRISTOPHER,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY CHRISTOPHER: We are writing to express our support for your reported decision to include the activities of Hamas in the State Department's annual report on terrorist organizations. We also believe the State Department report should include the activities of other extremist Islamic fundamentalist groups, also supported by Iran, which use violent tactics and have increased in strength in the Middle East in the last year.

It is important to obtain a better understanding of Hamas, which opposes the Middle East peace process, and other violent Islamic fundamentalist groups, which are destabilizing forces in the region. When the report is issued in April we believe it should address a number of important issues.

First, in light of recent news reports that fund-raising for Hamas may be taking place in the United States, we believe the report should include a thorough review of the organization's activities and operations—including fund-raising—in the United States. Such review should be carried out by the appropriate domestic law enforcement agencies.

Second, we believe the report should include information on the level of financial assistance and other support Hamas and other violent Islamic fundamentalist organizations receive from foreign governments, particularly Iran.

Third, we believe the report should include information on the level of assistance and support provided to Hamas and other violent Islamic fundamentalist organizations by non-governmental organizations and individuals in foreign countries, such as Jordan, Iran, Syria, Saudi Arabia, and Sudan.

Fourth, we believe the report should include an analysis of the location of the command and control of Hamas and other violent fundamentalist Islamic organizations, and an overview of military and training operations both inside Israel and elsewhere in the Middle East.

Finally, we would appreciate receiving supplementary reports on Hamas and other violent Islamic fundamentalist organizations. It is important for the Congress and the public to have a fuller understanding of these newly emerging groups which support violence and terrorism.

The militant Islamic Hamas, which supports violent tactics, is a dangerously destabilizing force in the Middle East. It is clear that this group rejects the peace process and supports violence. The Hamas covenant reads ". . .There is no solution to the Palestinian problem except by Jihad. The initiatives, proposals, and International Conferences are but a waste of time, an exercise in futility."

Additionally, the group is irrevocably opposed to Israel's existence. Numerous Israelis have been brutally killed by Hamas terrorists and the group claims responsibility for the recent kidnapping and murder of Moshe Toledano, a civilian border patrolman. When Hamas recently took responsibility for the brutal killing of two Israeli soldiers, Hamas issued a statement saying ". . . Hamas and its armed wing 'Izz-al-din al-Qassam will continue to wage a merciless war until the total liberation of all the land of Palestine".

Israel is not the only country that is threatened by the increasing support from militant Islamic fundamentalist groups similar to Hamas which use terrorist tactics. Violent fundamentalist Islamic organizations are a destabilizing force throughout the Middle East. In the last year, these groups have grown in strength in the region, particularly in Egypt, Algeria, and Tunisia.

Like Hamas, these groups are supported by Iran, are committed to overthrowing governments across the region, and raise the specter of destabilization in the region.

We believe that including Hamas and similar Islamic fundamentalist groups that use violent tactics in the annual report on terrorist organizations is a useful step which will provide a greater understanding of the problems these groups pose in the Middle East. Ultimately, other governments and their citizens must be discouraged from providing financial support for organizations which foster terrorist activities. We encourage you to work toward that end. The United States and the international community must be vigilant in efforts to rid the world of terrorism.

We look forward to working with you on this vital matter, and appreciate your attention to this request.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Grassley, Edward M. Kennedy, John D. Rockefeller, Conrad Burns, Alfonse D'Amato, Larry Pressler, Slade Gorton, Arlen Specter, Phil Gramm, Frank R. Lautenberg, Christopher Dodd, Paul Simon, Herb Kohl, Patty Murray, Russell Feingold, Dale Bumpers, Daniel Inouye, Tom Harkin.

Connie Mack, Bob Smith, Malcolm Wallop, Dan Coats, Don Nickles, Bob Packwood, Jesse Helms, Orrin Hatch, Ernest Hollings, Kent Conrad, Dennis DeConcini, Barbara Mikulski, Daniel Akaka, Daniel Moynihan, Richard Bryan, Harry Reid, Claiborne Pell, Carl Levin, Paul Sarbanes, Donald W. Riegle.

Carol Moseley-Braun, Joseph Lieberman, John Danforth, Dirk Kempthorne, Larry Craig, Charles Robb, Richard Shelby, Harris Wofford, Christopher Bond, Bennett Johnston, Barbara Boxer, Howard Metzenbaum, Dianne Feinstein, Hank Brown, Mitch McConnell, John McCain, Robert Kerrey, Richard Lugar, Bill Bradley.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, hardly a day goes by in which we do not learn of a new tragedy caused by the proliferation of guns in our society.

But this week there is some good news. The National Rifle Association's failed campaign to overturn gun control legislation in New Jersey may herald a new era of common sense on the gun issue. The American people are sick of the arms race on our streets, and they are making themselves heard. They want us to pass the Brady bill quickly, they want a ban on semiautomatic assault weapons, and they want more robust enforcement of existing licensing requirements.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a column in today's Washington Post. Wade Henderson, the Washington director of the NAACP, has made a very persuasive argument that gun control is both a civil rights issue and a public health imperative. I welcome the heightened involvement of the NAACP in this struggle, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Henderson's column be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANGRY AND DEPRESSED ABOUT GUNS

(By Wade Henderson)

The news of Conchita Campfield's death really jolted me. Conchita was a 15-year-old Hyattsville honor student who was shot after a party last weekend when a fight broke out between several youths and spilled onto the street. One of the youths pulled a handgun and fired several shots into the crowd. A 20-year-old boy was arrested and charged with first-degree murder in Conchita's death.

Certainly Conchita's age had something to do with the anger and depression I felt. Perhaps the news struck home because of my own daughters who are close in age to Conchita. I was horrified that one so young could die so violently under otherwise innocent circumstances in which any teenager could easily have been the victim. I was frightened at the thought that there are few ways to protect a child from the escalating, random violence that has become a defining characteristic of urban living.

I was also angry because I realized that Conchita died innocently—like so many other young African Americans—in part, because of easy handgun availability. In this instance, Conchita was killed as a result of the lethal combination of some young man's rage plus the ready access of a high-powered handgun.

At one level, Conchita's death had little impact on public consciousness. We have become impervious to the tragedy of young people dying at the hands of their peers. After all, there has been a 2,100 percent increase in juveniles charged with homicide from 1982 to 1990, so some degree of numbness is understandable. But the question remains: What are we as a nation going to do to stop the steady escalation of gun-related violence?

Unfortunately, the debate over handgun violence has lacked the genuine sense of urgency needed to compel Congress to act. As a result, America is losing its soul to a cancer of violence, but the solutions to the problem are thwarted by the National Rifle Association and mired in political indifference on Capitol Hill.

As I thought more about Conchita, I reminded myself that violent crime is an American dilemma, not an isolated racial issue. Nonetheless, it is time for the NAACP, as the nation's largest civil rights organization, to respond to the growing and disproportionate number of African Americans victimized by crime, as well as the high incidence of African Americans—particularly young African American males—ensnared in the criminal justice system. For too long now, the black community has been silent on these issues.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People took a step toward addressing this problem when it recently joined Jim and Sarah Brady in urging Congress to swiftly pass the Brady bill. The NAACP also supports Gov. Douglas Wilder's "one-gun-a-month" initiative, which was recently enacted in Virginia. While we recognized that neither bill will resolve the problem of gun violence, they offer some useful relief.

Gun-related violence is a barrier to the full enjoyment of civil rights. It undermines respect for the rule of law. The NAACP's efforts to promote democratic participation, economic empowerment, educational opportunity and other aspects of a progressive civil rights agenda are compromised if African Americans are not safe in their homes and communities. Even as we pursue these other concerns, we must also seek to reduce the violence.

Modest handgun restrictions such as the Brady bill are a health-related imperative for African Americans. Firearm deaths of young black men have reached crisis proportions. According to a recent study by the Federal Centers for Disease Control, homicide is the leading cause of death for black males aged 15 to 24, and firearms were involved in about 80 percent of these homicides. In some areas of the country, it is now more likely for a black male between his 15th and 25th birthday to die from homicide than it was for a U.S. soldier to be killed in Vietnam.

We feel a special obligation to involve young African Americans in the national debate over gun control. In addition to our legislative network, the NAACP will utilize its Youth and College division in a national lobbying campaign in support of the Brady bill.

Young people are on the front line of one of today's most challenging social crises. Their participation in the campaign to pass the Brady bill has two purposes. First, there are few advocates who bring greater moral authority to the debate about gun-related violence than the young people of our nation who are most often victimized and who have much to lose if controls are not enacted. Second, we hope to demonstrate that they are not powerless to affect issues that have a direct impact on their lives.

The NAACP's support for the Brady bill is a reflection of a broader understanding of civil rights advocacy in the 1990s. We urge Congress to act quickly and to enact the Brady bill as separate legislation. We want to avoid the problems encountered last year, when the Brady bill was incorporated into an omnibus crime control legislation. This measure is simply too important to be held hostage to the illusion of comprehensive crime control.

We are too late to save Conchita, but perhaps we can honor her memory through our actions to save other children.

TRIBUTE TO DR. BILLY F. ANDREWS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Doctor Billy F. Andrews who is being honored in my State of Kentucky as he steps down as chairman of the department of pediatrics at the University of Louisville School of Medicine. For the past 23 years, countless children, students, and faculty personnel have been touched by Dr. Andrews' undying commitment to the health and well-being of the youngest of our society. His efforts and dedication to pediatric medicine have been recognized worldwide and the department of pediatrics has prospered under his stewardship.

In recognition of his service, I ask unanimous consent that "The Children's Bill of Rights," composed by Dr. Andrews in 1968 and which has been a hallmark for pediatricians over the past quarter of a century, be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the writing was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHILDREN'S BILL OF RIGHTS

We hold these truths to be self-evident:

That each newborn infant is the most perfect and helpless of all of the creation;

That each newborn is as individual as the stars of our universe;

That each newborn has the inalienable right to be born wanted, loved and protected; and while growing to maturity within and without the womb that every measure possible, as is known, be undertaken to afford the very best environment, nutrition and opportunity for growth and development;

That proper shelter, nutrition, clothes, education and health measures be provided each child to assure that each, with maturity, can assume the full responsibilities of adulthood and citizenship;

That the personhood of each child be fully appreciated and that each be informed of all matters including health as they grow in intellect and in capability; and that they learn to be involved, as maturity allows, and to participate in all decisions concerning their well-being;

That when and if correction is deemed necessary it will be applied with the greatest of respect and care and without mental or physical abuse;

That we shall as a society make every effort to establish for the children of today a firmer footing than we have ourselves enjoyed in all ways;

That we have witnessed from the very mistakes of nature much that has greatly benefited all of mankind and that infants and children with birth defects shall be our responsibility to rear to the fullest potential possible that they, too, shall share the rights to Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness which is their birthright;

And that we fully realize that the level of civilization attained by any society will be determined by the attention it has paid to the welfare of its infants and children.

Therefore, in full awareness of these truths, we vow upon our honor and all we hold to be sacred to do our very best to bring about a better world for those who succeed us in order to repay our predecessors for our own gift of life.

—BILLY F. ANDREWS, M.D.

MAY 19, 1968.

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Federal debt—run up the U.S. Congress—stood at $4,214,305,813,377.83 as of the close of business on Tuesday, March 16.

Anybody remotely familiar with the U.S. Constitution is bound to know that no President can spend a dime of the taxpayers' money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by the Congress of the United States. Therefore, no Member of Congress, House or Senate, can pass the buck as to the responsibility for this long-term and shameful display of irresponsibility. The dead cat lies on the doorstep of the Congress of the United States.

During the past fiscal year, it cost the American taxpayers $286,022,000,000 merely to pay the interest on reckless Federal spending, approved by Congress—spending of the taxpayers' money over and above what the Federal Government has collected in taxes and other income. This has been what is called deficit spending—but it's really a form of thievery. Averaged out, this astounding interest paid on the Federal debt amounts to $5.5 billion every week, or $785 million every day—just to pay, I reiterate for the purpose of emphasis, the interest on the existing Federal debt.

Looking at it on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes $16,407.08—thanks to the big spenders in Congress for the past half century. The interest payments on this massive debt, average out to be $1,127.85 per year for each man, woman and child in America. Or, looking at it still another way, for each family of four, the tab—to pay the interest alone, mind you—comes to $4,511.40 per year.

Does this prompt you to wonder what America's economic stability would be like today if, for the past five or six decades, there had been a Congress with the courage and the integrity to maintain a balanced Federal budget? The arithmetic speaks for itself.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of section 5 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the budget through March 11, 1993. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues, which are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 287), show that current level spending is below the budget resolution by $2.1 billion in budget authority and $0.5 billion in outlays. Current level is $0.5 billion above the revenue floor in 1993 and above by $1.4 billion over the 5 years, 1993–97. The current estimate of the deficit for purposes of calculating the maximum deficit amount is $392.4 billion, $28.4 billion below the maximum deficit amount for 1993 of $420.8 billion.

There has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues since the last report, dated March 10, 1993.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 15, 1993.

Hon. JIM SASSER,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report shows the effects of Congressional action on the budget for fiscal year 1993 and is current through March 11, 1993. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 287). This report is submitted under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, and meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the 1986 First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget.

Since my last report, dated March 9, 1993, there has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER,
Director.

THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 103D CONG., 1ST SESS., AS OF MAR. 11, 1993

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 287)	Current level [1]	Current level +/− resolution
On-budget:			
Budget authority	1,250.0	1,247.9	−2.1
Outlays	1,242.3	1,241.8	−0.5
Revenues:			
1993	848.9	849.4	+0.5
1993–1997	4,818.6	4,820.0	+1.4
Maximum deficit amount	420.8	392.4	−28.4
Debt subject to limit	4,461.2	4,119.7	−341.5
Off-budget:			
Social Security outlays:			
1993	260.0	260.0	.....
1993–1997	1,415.0	1,415.0	.....
Social Security revenues:			
1993	328.1	328.1	(2)
1993–1997	1,865.0	1,865.0	(2)

[1] Current level represents the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest U.S. Treasury information on public debt transactions.

[2] Less than $50 million.

Note: Detail may not add due to rounding.

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 103D CONG., 1ST SESS., SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MAR. 11, 1993

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS			
Revenues	.....	.....	849,425
Permanents and other spending legislation	764,283	737,413	.....
Appropriation legislation	732,061	743,943	.....
Offsetting receipts	(240,524)	(240,524)	.....
Total previously enacted	1,255,820	1,240,833	849,425
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
ENTITLEMENTS AND MANDATORIES			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	(7,928)	962	.....
Total current level [1]	1,247,892	1,241,794	849,425
Total budget resolution [2]	1,249,990	1,242,290	848,890
Amount remaining:			
Under budget resolution	2,098	496	.....
Over budget resolution	.....	.....	535

[1] In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include the following in emergency funding (in millions of dollars): P.L. 102–229, BA, 0, Outlays, $712; P.L. 102–266, BA, 0, Outlays, $33; P.L. 102–302, BA, 0, Outlays, $380; P.L. 102–368, BA, $926, Outlays, $5,850; P.L. 102–381, BA, $218, Outlays, $13; P.L. 103–6, BA, $3,322, Outlays, $3,322; total BA, $4,467, Outlays, $10,310.

[2] Includes revision under Section 9 of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget.

Notes: Amounts in parentheses are negative. Detail may not add due to rounding.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE POLICY EXCLUDING GAYS AND LESBIANS FROM SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, last month the Senate adopted legislation directing the Armed Services Committee to "conduct comprehensive hearings on the current military policy with respect to the service of homosexuals in the military services." I also made a commitment to our colleague, Senator METZENBAUM, last year during the Senate's consideration of the national defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1993 that the Armed Services Committee would hold comprehensive hearings on this subject this year.

I want to announce today that the Armed Services Committee will begin our hearings on the Department of Defense policy, excluding gays and lesbians from service in the armed forces, during the week of March 29.

I said during the Senate's consideration of this matter, earlier this year, that the committee would begin our hearing in March. With the press of business facing the committee later in the spring, it is essential that we begin our hearings on this important matter this month.

During the past several months, the Members and staff of the Armed Services Committee have met with a large number of individuals and groups on this issue. the committee has received a large number of requests to testify—and suggestions for witnesses—from Members of Congress, advocacy groups, current and former members of the military, and the general public.

My own position on this issue is a matter of public record. I support the current policy that excludes homosexuals from serving in the Armed Forces. However, I fully intend for these hearings to be fair, thorough, and objective. I intend to listen carefully to all of the witnesses who testify. As I said in my remarks to the Senate back in January, my final judgment on this issue will be affected by the testimony we receive from a wide range of witnesses. Although the committee will not be able to hear from every individual and group who has asked to testify in person, the committee will hear testimony from representatives of all sides of this issue.

Our opening hearings will set the context for the committee's review. We will examine the historical and legal background of the current Defense Department policy, including the role of unit cohesion in the development of combat capability. This first phase of our hearings will also closely examine the experience of foreign countries, with respect to the service of gays and lesbians in their Armed Forces, although this hearing will probably take place sometime next month.

Later in our hearing process, the committee will hear from advocacy groups, both those who favor the current policy and those who want to see the current policy changed. I also intend for the committee to conduct as a series of field visits to military installations to hear the views of a broad cross-section of military members on the issues raised by the proposal to change the current policy.

Finally, Mr. President, the committee will hear from the senior civilian and military leadership of the Defense Department, on this issue, after the Defense Department has completed the review that has been ordered by the President.

Mr. President, this is an important and emotional issue, and I want to assure my colleagues that the Armed Services Committee will conduct the comprehensive hearings, on this issue, directed by the Senate in a fair and impartial manner.

MOTOR-VOTER

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate conducted five rollcall votes on the so-called motor-voter bill. I was quite ill and was not able to be here on the floor to cast my vote.

Had I been able to come to the Senate floor, I would have voted against tabling, or killing, the following amendments: No. 111, which I cosponsored and which would have exempted States from motor-voter mandates if they could certify they would have to raise taxes to comply with the bill; No. 112, which would have provided for registering people to vote upon their induction into the armed services; No. 128, which would have provided civil penalties for those who fraudulently use voter registration to obtain certain benefits and privileges of citizenship; and No. 129, which would have provided for a study to determine the extent of noncitizen participation in the voting process. These amendments were tabled by wide margins. Lastly, I would have voted against final passage of the motor-voter bill.

My position on motor-voter legislation is well known. I am opposed to the motor-voter mandate. My State of South Dakota, which has one of the highest voter registration rates in the country, does not need Congress imposing yet another unfunded Federal mandate to accomplish something it already is doing quite well.

If a State wants to adopt motor-voter legislation, it can do so anytime it so desires. The South Dakota Legislature has taken a look at motor-voter legislation and rejected it, no doubt due to the fact that over 89 percent of eligible persons in my State already are registered to vote. As is often said in my State, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."

TO MARK THE PASSING OF REPORTER ELLEN ABRAMS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to ask the Senate to take a moment to remember a distinguished member of the Connecticut press corps who suffered an untimely death Tuesday after being hit by a car while jogging.

Ellen Abrams, a reporter with the ABC affiliate WTNH-TV channel 8, was committed to delivering news to the people of Connecticut. She always brought good humor and a positive attitude to her work. For my part, I must say it was a delight to know her.

Ellen began her career in journalism at WCNX radio in Middletown, CT, and later became the State Capitol correspondent for the Connecticut Radio Network.

In 1986, she joined WTNH as a general assignment reporter. She quickly became known for her thorough, insightful reports, particularly on crime and criminal justice issues in the Greater Hartford area.

Her television series on the prison system in Connecticut, entitled "Equal Justice?" received several awards including a regional Emmy nomination.

Ellen will be remembered for her dedication to informing the public and perhaps more importantly, her belief that journalism helped build a better and stronger society.

My condolences go out to her husband, Peter Darby, a Hartford police officer, and her mother and sister.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has two announcements on behalf of the Vice President.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to title 46, section 1295(b), of the United States Code, as amended by Public Law 101-595, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; and

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], at large.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194(a), as amended by Public Law 101-595, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], at large.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 1:10 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker signed the following enrolled joint resolutions:

S.J. Res. 22. Joint resolution designating March 25, 1993, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy."

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution to proclaim March 20, 1993, as "National Agriculture Day."

The enrolled joint resolutions were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

At 2:24 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 416. An act to extend the period during which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code remains in effect, and for other purposes.

H.R. 965. An act to provide for toy safety and for other purposes.

H.R. 1109. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to establish reemployment rights for certain merchant seamen.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following measures, previously received from the House of Representatives for concurrence, were read, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 965. An act to provide for toy safety and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1109. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to establish reemployment rights for certain merchant seamen; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 18, 1993, he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled joint resolutions:

S.J. Res. 22. Joint resolution designating March 25, 1993, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy."

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution to proclaim March 20, 1993, as "National Agriculture Day."

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-662. A communication from the Chairman of the Defense Base Closure Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the submission of certified materials; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-663. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide funding for the resolution of failed savings associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC-664. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the status of extensions regarding the requirement of Section 13 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-665. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs) of the United States Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the allocation of funds to Haitian refugee applicants; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-666. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, United States Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States in the sixty day period prior to March 11, 1993; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-667. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of his intention to sign an Executive order to extend the waiver of the application of the relevant export criterion of the Atomic Energy Act for an additional 12 months from March 10, 1993; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-668. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Board's implementation of its administrative responsibilities; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-669. A communication from the Acting Director of the United States Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the performance management and recognition system; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-670. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to its Freedom of Information Act activities for calendar year 1992; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DECONCINI, from the Select Committee on Intelligence:

Special Report entitled "Committee Activities of the Select Committee on Intelligence, United States Senate, January 3, 1991 to October 8, 1992" (Rept. No. 103-23).

By Mr. FORD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 27. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Hanna Holborn Gray as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (Rept. No. 103-24).

By Mr. FORD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 28. A joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Barber B. Conable, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (Rept. No. 103-25).

S.J. Res. 29. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Wesley Samuel Williams, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (Rept. No. 103-26).

S. 564. A bill to establish in the Government Printing Office a means of enhancing electronic public access to a wide range of Federal electronic information (Rept. No. 103-27).

By Mr. FORD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Con. Res. 13. A concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to commemorate the days of the remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KERREY (for himself, Mr. EXON, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 610. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to exempt the triple base acreage of the producers on a farm from the highly erodible land and wetland conservation requirements of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 611. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the establishment of limitations on the duty time for flight attendants; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 612. A bill to protect the privacy of telephone users by amending section 3121 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. RIEGLE):

S. 613. A bill to prohibit the importation of goods produced abroad with child labor and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 614. A bill to establish a commission on the commercial application of certain defense-related facilities, equipment, processes, and technologies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 615. A bill to enable Indian tribal governments to provide facilities necessary to carry out essential governmental functions; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

S. 616. A bill to increase the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. SIMON (for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. REID, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. ROBB):

S. 617. A bill to authorize research into the desalinization of water and water reuse and to authorize a program for States, cities, or any qualifying agency which desires to own and operate a desalinization of water reuse facility to develop such facilities; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. GLENN, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 618. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit the admission to the United States of nonimmigrant students and visitors who are the spouses and children of United States permanent resident aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

S. 619. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide improved services to beneficiaries under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 620. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to overturn the new limitations placed on private enforceability of State plan requirements by Suter v. Artist M., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KERREY (for himself, Mr. EXON, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 610. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to exempt the triple base acreage of the producers on a farm from the highly erodible land and wetland conservation requirements of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 1985 AMENDMENT ACT OF 1993

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, given that we are on this budget resolution—I had a longer statement—I will try to condense it. I came to the floor to talk about the philosophy underlying the farm programs. I am not a Representative who has fought either cuts in the program or reforms in the Department of Agriculture. Indeed, I think the Department of Agriculture needs rather radical reform. I have even discussed the possibility that the farm program could be assigned to some other department and we may not need a Department of Agriculture altogether.

I do not want to be identified as someone who has merely come to the floor fighting changes in farm programs. I did not vote for the 1990 farm program. I did not like its direction. It seemed to me that it continued a policy of providing subsidies, and I did not believe it was necessary for us to do it in the way that it was done.

So I am not here today merely to argue against cuts, Mr. President. I am here to introduce a piece of legislation that comes as a consequence of my concern that indeed the taxpayers and consumers are willing to withdraw their support for a farm program altogether. As the occupant of the Chair understands, the farm program is put in place out of equal concern for consumers as well as producers. Unfortunately, the scales have been altogether too unbalanced in favor of the consumers as opposed to producer interests.

Mr. President, I saw very vividly in 1988 when I was campaigning for the opportunity to serve the people of Nebraska what happens when we disregard the intent of the farm program. For all the year 1987 and a part of 1988, the real concern that was going on in America as to our farm programs was we had too big a surplus; that surpluses were causing the farm program to be too expensive; that surpluses were causing commodity prices to be low. Everyone was describing it as a surplus, Mr. President, until back-to-back droughts in 1987 and 1988 converted that surplus into an inventory. Suddenly, people were concerned that perhaps we did not have enough stocks on hand to protect the consumer against potential increases in prices that would occur if those ending stocks get too low.

I have heard far more than I would like, Mr. President, people describing with a considerable amount of ignorance why the farm program is there in the first place. I understand there is deteriorating support, and that is one of the reasons why I am here today.

There is a specific provision in the 1990 farm program called triple base. It is a program under which farmers are told the Government will no longer provide benefits at a certain percentage of crop land base; that farmers would be required to adhere to the very costly conservation and environmental restrictions.

Mr. President, it is because of this triple-base situation that I rise today to introduce legislation intended to establish a simple principle: When the public withdraws benefits from farmers, the public at that point forfeits the right to tell farmers how to farm.

This bill simply says that on a farmer's so-called triple base, or unpaid acreage, the farmer will no longer be subject to the conservation compliance and wetlands protection requirements of current law. Period.

Chief Justice John Marshall declared in 1821 that, "The power to tax involves the power to destroy." If he were around today, observing the role of the Federal Government in our daily lives, Justice Marshall would be tempted, I think, to revise his earlier maxim. The modern-day mutation might be: "The authority to confer benefits involves the authority to impose mandates."

Certainly no segment of our society has come to understand this truth better than American farmers.

There is a perception out there among much of the general public that when the Government pays benefits to farmers, it simply writes out a check; the farmer's only obligation is to cash it. The corn farmer gets a check, the cotton farmer gets a check, and they both get a check simply because they are farmers.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

In a typical example, Mr. President, in order for a corn farmer in Nebraska to be eligible for farm program benefits, that farmer must—go to the local ASCS office and sign up for the farm program; agree to idle a certain percentage of farmland equal to whatever the acreage reduction requirement is for that year; plant a cover crop on this set-aside acreage to protect it against erosion, and control weeds on that ground; and have in place a conservation plan for the entire farm that requires the farmer to farm in certain ways, such as planting specific crops, farming on the contour, constructing terraces on hillsides, establishing perennial covers on waterways, leaving a specified amount of crop residue on the field following harvest, consulting the local Soil Conservation Service office before repairing any ruts created during a wet harvest, and so on and so on and so forth.

Mr. President, you are familiar with the restrictions placed once a farmer has signed up for that program.

In addition, a farmer has to fill out a mountain of paperwork describing the nature of the farming operation, whether it is organized as a corporation or partnership, how many people are involved in the operation, and so forth, in order to make sure that the farmer does not run afoul of the farm program payment limitations.

The consequence of all this regulation is to make sure the farmer is never alone when out in the field. In a sense, today's farmer has two people riding along on the tractor. On one fender is USDA, making sure the farmer is adhering to all farm program and conservation requirements. On the other side is the taxpayer, ready to take away farm program payments if the farmer makes a misstep.

Mr. President, some people may ask why I am introducing this bill. After all, I count myself as a very strong supporter of the conservation compliance requirements that were first enacted in the 1985 farm bill. I even consider myself a supporter of so-called swampbuster provisions—especially if we can bring some reason to the process of defining and regulating wetlands.

But there is one thing I support more than all of these, and that is the farm program itself, and the need to ensure its effectiveness. After all, it is the farm program that helps to guarantee an abundant supply of affordable food for consumers. And more to the point, our farm price support program helps make it possible for farmers to afford the conservation measures that the public, including farmers, tend to support.

For some reason that I do not understand, Mr. President, many people fail to grasp this nexus between our farm and conservation programs. They don't seem to realize, for example, that participation in the corn program has fallen from 90 percent to 75 percent over the past 6 years. Or if they do, they do not seem to recognize that this drop in participation coincided with a steady decline in farm program support levels coupled with the deeper bite of conservation requirements tied to farm program eligibility.

I only wish, Mr. President, that every American could seize this relationship in the way that the Europeans apparently have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article from Hoard's Dairyman entitled, "German Farmers are Paid to Keep the Countryside Attractive."

This article goes on to describe how German farmers are paid under a program whose title is translated as, "market relief and countryside care premiums." Under the program, 43,000 German farmers are "earning $70 million in special grants from federal and regional governments this year for adopting less intensive methods of production and keeping the countryside tidy." Millions of dollars to keep the countryside tidy. The farmer pictured in the article is paid $117 per acre to "keep the countryside neat."

What a contrast this is with the sense of conservation on the cheap that seems increasingly to pervade our farm programs.

Nothing better exemplifies this trend toward conservation on the cheap than the triple base concept that was introduced with enactment of the 1990 farm bill. Under triple base, farmers were told that, as a cost reduction measure, the government would no longer provide benefits on 15 percent of each farm's cropland base acreage. On those triple base acres, farmers would no longer receive Federal payments. However—however—farmers would still be required to follow stipulated conservation practices on these free acres.

The principle up until 1990 had been: benefits equal mandates. The new principle, apparently, is: forget the carrot, use the stick.

What really caused me to say, enough, however, was the proposal in the proposal in the administration's budget to push the size of the triple base requirement from 15 to 25 percent of a farm's cropland base, with no relief provided on the regulatory side. I simply believe that it is time to reverse this infringement, to stop it once and for all.

By my estimation, this bill, once enacted, will potentially free at least 32 million acres of cropland to be farmed as farmers want to farm it. That total would rise to at least 53 million acres if the administration's proposed increase in the triple base requirement is adopted.

To those who might be alarmed by the lifting of conservation and environmental edicts on tens of millions of acres, I would say this: First, the overwhelming majority of farmers share a conservation ethic that will ensure this land is cared for. They do not need the government telling them how to live it.

Second, if you are indeed concerned about achieving the conservation goals that we have established for our Nation, then please give some thought, considerable thought, to joining us in attempting to strengthen farm income so that we can reach our environmental objectives.

If we stay on our current course, farmers are going to be left with no farm program and little income—only mandates and edicts. If the public is set on withdrawing farm benefits, then I intend to see that the public disengages the mandates and edicts that accompany these benefits. My message will be: You cannot have it both ways. If you are going to take away the carrot, then put away the stick. Do not expect to get conservation on the cheap. Cheap conservation will prove as costly to our rural economy, and to strength as a nation, as cheap food.

The aforementioned article is printed at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMAN FARMERS ARE PAID TO KEEP THE COUNTRYSIDE ATTRACTIVE

(By Norman Dunn)

Self-sufficiency is the key to Georg and Christof Mayer's 50-cow dairy unit in Germany's Baden-Württemberg region. Except for 25 percent soybean meal mixed in the grain rations, all feed for the 12,100-pound-average-yield Fleckvieh herd is home-grown on the 148-acre farm.

In comparison with Germany's average $20.35 (U.S. dollars) per 100 pounds producers' milk price, this father-and-son team's average for their 4 percent fat and 3.5 percent protein milk is high at $21.94 per 100 pounds—their creamery sells the milk at a premium in bottles.

But this year, the Mayer family has another income coming onto the farm: along with 43,000 German farmers, they've signed on as "caretakers of the countryside" in a new European Community (EC)-approved program of grants on trial in their area.

While they still come under the EC milk quota and grain compensation schemes, these farmers are earning $70 million in special grants from federal and regional governments this year for adopting less intensive methods of production and keeping the countryside tidy.

If the Mayers cut the stocking rate on some of their pastures, or stop using herbicides on small grains or cut back grass and undergrowth on steep banks, they're awarded a certain number of points per acre under the new voluntary program called MEKA—the German initials for "market relief and countryside care premiums."

At the end of last year, these points were added up and exchanged for hard cash at a rate equivalent to $13.80 per point and with a payment limit of $153 per acre.

"The MEKA program is a new concept for supporting farmers' incomes and, at the same time, rewarding them for activities that help the whole rural society," explains Georg Mayer.

"This is a picturesque region just west of Stüttgart, and we get lots of holidaymakers in the summer. That's why getting paid through MEKA for keeping the landscape neat and tidy is so useful here. The spin-off from tourism helps the villages and farms through bed and breakfast and farm shops."

STOP FLOW OFF THE FARM . . .

He adds that badly needed extra income for farmers should also help stop the flow of young people from the farms.

How does MEKA affect the Mayers' business?

"First, we keep our stocking rates below 0.7 cows per acre," explains son, Christof. "For this move away from intensive stocking, we get 1.25 points per acre—or the equivalent of $17.25 per acre extra at the end of the year."

The Mayers farm where a lot of fruit is grown. Orchards total 650 trees; for leaving the trees standing and for mowing between the trees, 4 points per acre are awarded—or $55.

The grass from these areas is good quality, say the Mayers, and is used for zero-grazing the cows and young stock. One of the changes made to win MEKA points features forage corn. Four points or $55 are awarded per acre for substituting another silage crop for corn—a move to discourage corn where there are soil erosion and nitrate seepage problems.

The Mayers have started to grow a 25 percent red clover and 75 percent meadow grass pasture instead. "Because we're pretty high up here anyway (1,755 feet above sea level) our corn was never top-yielding. We're now getting more feed value from our red clover silage mix in comparison," says Christof. "And, of course, we use much less fertilizer with the pasture."

STILL GROW SOME CORN . . .

Fifteen acres of corn still are grown, though. A mix of first-cut clover silage and corn silage produced maintenance plus 26.5 pounds milk last autumn. Christof feeds for the remaining production in the all-year-round calving herd a 40:40:20 mix of milled home-grown wheat, barley and oats plus 25 percent soyameal.

Fifty milkers and a six-point herringbone parlor with free stall housing and automatic slurry scraping means the Mayers have one of the most modern dairying set-ups in the region, where the average milking herd is between 17 and 18 cows.

This family also differs because it has stayed with the traditional Fleckvieh red and white breed instead of changing over to Friesian/Holstein milkers. The reason: "They perform well on simple homegrown feed, and the bull calves and old cows sell for much higher prices than black and whites," explains Christof. Barren cows fetched the equivalent of $1,040 last fall with three-week bulls making up to $480.

Meanwhile, the Mayers have stopped using plant growth regulator and herbicide in cereals (4 points and 2 points per acre respectively).

Less intensively grown grain is a real alternative to set aside, feels Christof. No growth regulator means nitrogen fertilizer applications have to be cut—thus helping to avoid any nitrate pollution dangers in ground water.

"If we have a special problem with weeds in cereals—with docks, for instance, then we can apply for special permission to use herbicide," adds Georg.

There are many other ways of winning points under MEKA: introducing green manure crops for ploughing in between maincrops, for instance, or reducing output by drilling grain at a minimum six and two-third inches between rows.

Farmers also are rewarded by MEKA for keeping rare farm breeds. For instance, the Hinterwälder cow which has evolved in the Black Forest to graze extremely steep banks is worth 10 points or $138 bonus a head per year.

"Our extra income will be $117 per acre for our orchards and permanent pastures," reckons Georg. "And much of this is money for tidying up the landscape which we do anyway."

On arable land, the MEKA measures taken by the Mayers give an average extra income of $108 per acre.

"Last year, our grain yields didn't suffer because of lack of herbicide or growth regulator. Wheat will top 5,300 pounds (88 bushels) per acre. We always choose high-yielding cereal varieties that stand well anyway.

"To earn our points, we haven't really changed our farming," he adds. "Instead, MEKA offers extra incentives to do more for the environment and the countryside."

Best of all, says Georg Mayer, MEKA means more income for farms—especially in disadvantaged areas—and a better quality of life all-round our in the country.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I concur wholeheartedly in the eloquent words of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, and am pleased to join as an original cosponsor of this bill.

As the Senator from Nebraska points out—quite cogently in my view—what is threatened here is the very viability of Federal farm programs. If we take, and take, and take—without giving anything in return—why wouldn't a farmer just say "to heck with it," simply forgo farm program benefits and plow fencerow to fencerow. That would be disastrous both to farm prices and conservation practices.

But that is the path we are now taking.

Increasing the nonpaid acres to 25 percent, yet expecting farmers to fully comply with their conservation compliance and wetland protection requirements of current law, will provide many farmers with but another reason to opt out of farm program participation.

And I would suggest to those who view this as an anticonservation, antienvironmental measure, that farmers are the Nation's first conservationists. No one, anywhere, has their livelihood as intricately linked to the land as farmers. In Iowa, the rich soil is our most valuable resource. Farmers know well the benefits preventing soil erosion through a variety of means. Farmers also recognize the cost, waste, and potentially harmful effects of overapplication of farm inputs on their land. Farmers recognize that it is not only their bottom line which dictates many conservation practices, but also a desire to farm in a conservation-friendly manner, in ensuring the viability of their land, and the quality of their ground water.

Absolving farmers from conservation compliance and wetland protection requirements on their nonpaid acres will, in all likelihood, not change the practices already performed by most farmers. But, as the Senator from Nebraska ably stated, if the public is set on withdrawing farm benefits, then the public must disengage the burdens that accompany these benefits.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 611. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the establishment of limitations on the duty time for flight attendants; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

FLIGHT ATTENDANT DUTY TIME ACT

• Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on behalf of our country's flight attendants, I am introducing legislation that would amend the Federal Aviation Act to provide restrictions on the duty-time hours for flight attendants.

Currently, the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA] limits the number of hours that airplane pilots, flight engineers, flight navigators, dispatchers, and air traffic control operators perform. However, flight attendants' duty-time hours are not regulated. As a result, factors such as fatigue and exhaustion threaten a flight attendant's ability to service customers in a safe and satisfactory manner. In addition to providing the various services and conveniences during a flight, flight attendants are responsible for performing routine safety procedures and must be alert and prepared throughout the flight. Flight attendants are trained and prepared to handle emergencies such as, rapid depressurization, cabin fires, passenger illness, and terrorist attacks. Their job is of vital importance to the survival and safety of every passenger and aircraft that exist. In order to ensure safe and proper travel for everyone, the measures and time restrictions stated in this bill must be implemented.

For 15 years now, the FAA has promised to issue some form of flight-duty time stipulation for flight attendants and have not kept their promise. Furthermore the Department of Transportation [DOT] reported that there was no conclusive evidence to prove that a correlation between a flight attendant's fatigue and passenger safety ever existed. However, it is not difficult to understand that a flight attendant who has been on her feet and working for nearly 20 hours will not be able to respond to emergencies or other potential safety hazards in a manner necessary for such situations. Both the FAA and the DOT have acknowledged numerous instances in which flight attendants have been required to work as many as 24 consecutive hours.

Regardless of the dangers that overworked flight attendants pose to the safety of their customers and themselves, the DOT has persistently refused to include them in its protective class of safety sensitive aviation employees. Yet, the DOT has determined that flight attendants are safety sensitive employees. This conflict and inconsistency in position is simply not in the best interest of those who utilize the airways for transportation or employment.

Mr. President, we request unanimous consent that the text of our bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 611

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Flight Attendant Duty Time Act".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. App. 1421–1433) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 614. DUTY TIME OF FLIGHT ATTENDANTS.

"(a) RULEMAKING PROCEEDING.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall initiate a rulemaking proceeding for the purpose of establishing limitations on duty time for flight attendants, including minimum rest requirements.

"(b) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Except in any case in which the prohibitions referred to in subsection (c) take effect, the Secretary shall issue, not later than 240 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, final regulations establishing limitations on duty time for flight attendants, including minimum rest requirements as follows:

"(1) For a domestic flight, a maximum of 14 hours of actual duty time, plus a maximum of 2 additional hours spent deadheading to return to the flight attendant's domicile, and a minimum of at least 10 consecutive hours of rest after each duty period.

"(2) For an international flight, a maximum of 16 hours of actual duty time and minimum of at least 12 consecutive hours of rest after each duty period.

"(3) For a long-range international nonstop flight, a maximum period of actual duty time no more than 4 hours greater than the scheduled duty time, with a maximum period of actual duty time no greater than 20 hours, and a minimum consecutive rest period equal to at least twice the scheduled flight time.

"(4) For all flight attendants, a minimum of eight 24 consecutive hour periods of rest at their domicile per calendar month and at least one 24 hour consecutive period of rest within every 7 days.

"(5) For all flight attendants, at least a continuous 1 hour rest break on any flight scheduled for 8 hours or more of flight time in a designated rest area.

"(c) MANDATED PROHIBITIONS.—If the Secretary does not initiate a rulemaking proceeding under subsection (a) before the 60th day following the date of the enactment of this Act or does not issue final regulations under subsection (b) before the 240th day following such date of enactment, no air carrier may after such date operate an aircraft using a flight attendant who has been on duty more hours, or who has had fewer hours of rest, than those required by paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (b).

"(d) MODIFICATION OF MANDATED PROHIBITIONS.—The Secretary may issue regulations modifying the prohibitions contained in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (b) if the Secretary determines that such modifications are in the interest of safety and transmits a copy of the modifying regulations to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives. The modifying regulations may not take effect until the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the transmittal of the modifying regulations to such committees.

"(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

"(1) AIR CARRIER.—The term 'air carrier' means any air carrier which is subject to the provisions of part 121 or part 135 of title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

"(2) DEBRIEFING TIME.—The term 'debriefing time' means a time period of at least 30 minutes for domestic flight and of at least 45 minutes for international flight after the block-in time of the last flight or segment of a flight.

"(3) DESIGNATED REST AREA.—The term 'designated rest area' means a passenger seat, sleeper seat, or bunk of an aircraft assigned for crew rest purposes.

"(4) DOMESTIC FLIGHT.—The term 'domestic flight' means any flight or segment of a flight worked by a flight attendant totally within the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia.

"(5) DUTY TIME.—The term 'duty time' means all time worked for an air carrier at any place and in any capacity and, with respect to flying, shall begin at the required report time and shall end at the conclusion of the debriefing time, or when released by the carrier, whichever is later. Duty time accrues until the crewmember is given a required rest period by the carrier. Time spent deadheading, either on an aircraft or by surface transportation, to or from an assignment by an air carrier, time spent ferrying, and time spent attending meetings and training shall also be considered duty time. Duty time continues—

"(A) throughout a rest period of a shorter duration than that contained in subsection (b)(1), (b)(2), or (b)(3), as the case may be; and

"(B) during in-flight rest periods contained in subsection (b)(5).

"(6) INTERNATIONAL FLIGHT.—The term 'international flight' means any flight worked by a flight attendant for which a take off or landing is scheduled outside the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia.

"(7) LONG-RANGE INTERNATIONAL NONSTOP FLIGHT.—The term 'long-range international nonstop flight' means a single nonstop international flight scheduled for 8 hours or more of flight time.

"(8) REPORT TIME.—The term 'report time' means a time period of at least 30 minutes prior to the scheduled departure time of the first flight or segment of a flight in a flight attendant's duty period or the time the flight attendant is required to report to work, whichever is earlier.

"(9) REST.—The term 'rest' means uninterrupted time free from all duty.

"(10) SCHEDULED FLIGHT TIME.—The term 'scheduled flight time' means the elapsed time based on the time shown in schedules given by an air carrier to a travel agent.

"(11) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Transportation.

"(f) TREATMENT OF DUTY PERIOD WITH DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL FLIGHT SEGMENTS.—A duty period with domestic and international flight segments shall be treated as domestic flying for the purpose of calculating duty and rest requirements under this section if the majority of the flight time during that duty period is on a domestic segment or shall be treated as international flying if the majority of the flight time during that duty period is on an international segment.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by adding at the end of the matter relating to title VI the following:

"Sec. 614. Duty time of flight attendants.
"(a) Rulemaking proceeding.
"(b) Final regulations.
"(c) Mandated prohibitions.
"(d) Modification of mandated prohibitions.
"(e) Definitions.
"(f) Treatment of duty period with domestic and international flight segments.".•

• Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today I join my colleagues, including the senior Senator from Hawaii who, I would note, has been a steadfast champion of these issues, as an original cosponsor of the Flight Attendant Duty Time Act of 1993.

This bill would provide flight attendants with what I consider to be basic rights of all working people. Those rights should include a minimum rest period and maximum duty time. I also strongly support policies that encourage individuals to spend time with their families, to participate in community activities, and to know they are entitled to their own free time.

One of the most important features of this bill is that it would give flight attendants, many of who are mothers and fathers, the ability to plan the time they spend at home with their families each week and each month. To help carry out the policy, this bill includes a provision to ensure an additional 2 hours of what is called deadheading time to allow flight attendants to return to their homes at the end of domestic trips.

As we fly back and forth to our States, most of us take for granted that during our trips flight attendants are always there to provide a pillow, a blanket, or something to eat or drink. We too often overlook the fact that their primary responsibility is as safety professionals who are charged with protecting the lives, the health and the well being of their passengers.

We expect flight attendants to react to all sorts of in-flight contingencies, from taking care of young unaccompanied children, to solving minor medical problems and even spotting and confronting security situations. Fortunately, as passengers, few of us have ever had to confront a genuine in-flight emergency. However, we would be horrified if we were experiencing a critical in-flight situation and our flight attendants were so exhausted after a 17-to-30 hour day that they could not respond quickly and expertly to an emergency.

It is just this type of situation that makes it so important that we support and pass the Flight Attendant Duty Time Act of 1993. By establishing maximum duty time and minimum rest periods, this bill helps insure that flight attendants will be at their peak, mentally and physically prepared to assist all passengers; including young, elderly and disabled persons, in all circumstances including and especially emergency situations.

The FAA requirements for flight attendants are primarily based upon the assumption that they are the vital human link in assisting passengers immediately during emergency landings and evacuations. Seconds count in these situations where post crash fires and fumes are major killers, and flight attendants must be rested enough to act quickly with clear heads. Studies have shown that every second gained in an evacuation can mean saving another life. During an evacuation, the flight attendant, by far, is the most important member of an airplane's crew. We must take action to ensure that flight attendants have the necessary support to ensure the safety of the people aboard our Nation's airlines.

It is time for our country's policies to catch up with the rest of the world. The basic protections in this bill have been adopted by 23 other countries, and the Federal Aviation Administration has promised Congress for 15 years that it would issue a rule establishing maximum work days and minimum rest periods for flight attendants. It is time that we give this work force, dominated by women, the basic rights that their counterparts in other aviation jobs acquired years ago. I urge my colleagues to join in support of this important legislation.•

By Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 612. A bill to protect the privacy of telephone users by amending section 3121 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY ACT OF 1993

• Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I introduce the Telephone Privacy Act of 1993 with my distinguished colleague from Colorado, HANK BROWN.

Once again American ingenuity has developed a new technology. This new device is known as caller identification [ID]. And it has begun to change the way we use the telephone.

Caller ID is really very simple: when your phone rings, caller ID displays on a screen the number of the person placing the call. If you know the number, you know who is calling. And based on that information, you can decide whether or not to answer the call.

Caller ID is already being offered in a variety of jurisdictions—including Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia—and it will soon be in place in many more States, including Wisconsin. Indeed, this technology is developing so rapidly that some telephone companies soon expect to offer caller ID serves that display the name of the person calling you as well as their telephone number.

In my judgment, caller ID is a welcome development. it can tell us who is calling without requiring us to talk to the caller. And it can allow people to decide if they want to take the call before picking up the phone. As a result of this feature, caller ID will enhance our privacy.

But in my view caller ID also has the potential to invade our privacy and reduce our rights. Telephone companies can force our phone numbers to be displayed every time we make a call even if we have an unlisted number or we do not want people to know where we are calling from. In addition, since the recipient of the call knows the number of the person calling them, they can use a device known as a reverse directory and easily obtain the caller's name and address. That is, caller ID without any restriction can give the person you are calling your name, your phone number and your address—whether you want them to have it or not.

I believe that unrestricted caller ID violates our fundamental right to privacy. For example, people have the right to call a crisis hotline, or a telephone marketer, or even the IRS to ask for help without saying who they are and where they live. Senators and other public figures should be able to call the Washington Post—whose reporters have caller ID on all their phones—without revealing their home phone numbers and addresses. And consumers should be able to call a business and ask for information without being compelled to identify themselves. In my judgment, there is no justification for such forced disclosure. And yet with unrestricted caller ID, every time you place a call to any person or organization, for any reason, you disclose a lot of information about yourself.

In addition to privacy concerns, there are practical problems with unrestricted caller ID: it can be dangerous. Consider a few examples. Undercover officers sometimes call drug dealers from precincts to arrange buys. If a target recognizes where the call comes from, it could ruin the bust or, even worse, result in the death of a policeman. And battered women often take refuge with friends but call home to check on things. If their spouses know where they are staying, further abuse could result.

The point is simply this: phone companies cannot determine when it is safe to reveal our numbers and addresses. There are too many variables that even the phone company cannot foresee.

Fortunately, there is a simple way to realize the benefits of caller ID while avoiding its potential problems: just allow consumers to retain their freedom of choice. Let us decide when we want to reveal our phone numbers and when we do not using another new technology which gives us that choice. It is known as per-call blocking. Per call blocking works this way: when you want to make a call without revealing your number, you simply press a few digits on the phone and the display of your number is blocked. With this per-call blocking option, people can display their numbers when calling friends and family—and they can keep their phone number confidential when they want to.

A growing number of phone companies—and a growing number of States—have recognized the importance of protecting a caller's right to privacy and offer a blocking option. But in order to ensure that all telephone customers retain this crucial freedom of choice, we are introducing the Telephone Privacy Act of 1993.

It would require that telephone companies that offer caller ID give callers, at a minimum, the option of per call blocking. That way consumers can block the display of their telephone numbers on a per call basis without charge.

To accommodate States which have already considered this issue, the proposal "grandfathers in" State laws and regulations which authorize per line blocking if a State has such a system in place at the time that the amendment is enacted. To address the special problems of battered women shelters, the measure requires telephone companies to offer additional privacy safeguards for them. In addition, the legislation will prevent potential abuses by 800 and 900 phone services but it will not block automatic number identification.

As a result of these simple steps, the proposal protects the privacy of callers while ensuring the value of the caller ID service. It would also move the caller ID technology toward a uniform Federal standard rather than a patchwork of inconsistent State laws.

Mr. President, our approach—centered on requiring free per call blocking—makes sense. It balances our need for privacy with our desire to see the caller ID technology develop.

Just as important, Mr. President, is the fact that per call blocking does not reduce the value of caller ID. Let me give you a few examples.

First, blocking will not reduce law enforcement's ability to deter obscene and harassing phone calls. In fact, the telephone technology that makes caller ID possible also makes it possible to stop telephone terrorists without in any way undermining the privacy of law-abiding citizens.

We all know that a few telephone companies market caller ID as the only way to reduce obscene and harassing phone calls. But that's false advertising: the truth is we have the technology—and with this bill the ability—to protect victims and ensure privacy at the same time. Here is how.

Built into the software which makes caller ID operate are other capabilities. For example, there is call trace, which allows a victim of an abusive call to automatically forward the number of the caller to the authorities—merely by dialing a three-digit code. Then there is call return, which allows the recipient to automatically redial the number of the person who just called. And finally, there is call reject, which allows an individual to block all calls to his or her phone from a particular line—forever preventing calls from a telephone harasser. So with the use of these services—call trace, call reject, and call return—harassing phone calls can be stopped.

And best of all, Mr. President, these protective services work even when a number is blocked, and you do not have to subscribe to caller ID at all to use them. In virtually every State in which caller ID is available, phone companies offer these services to everyone, whether they have caller ID or not.

Second, far from reducing the value of caller ID, this legislation is essential to securing its future. Right now, there are serious questions being raised about the legality of caller ID. Most experts, including the Congressional Research Service, have concluded that caller ID is a trap and trace device that violates Federal law. And last year the Pennsylvania Supreme Court agreed: the Court ruled that caller ID violated a provision in the Pennsylvania wiretap statute which is virtually identical to a provision in the Federal version. This legislation would resolve the ambiguities in our Federal wiretap statutes and ensure the legality of caller ID. And it would prohibit States from making caller ID illegal.

Finally, there is one more reason to pass this legislation. Per call blocking already exists—but only for the wealthy. There is a 900 service that charges people a few dollars a minute and allows them to place their calls through a third party intermediary. It is the intermediary's number which is displayed; the recipient of the call never gets to see the phone number of the person actually making it. The existence of such a service supports the essential thrust of our proposal, which is that there are times when you do not want someone you are calling to have your number. But the fact that such a

service even exists also is unfortunate because blocking should be a matter of equity as well as privacy. Phone companies should make it available to everyone—rich and poor alike.

Mr. President, during the 102d Congress the Judiciary Committee favorably reported my measure by a 10 to 1 vote. That's not surprising, because it is a joint product of the Committee—Senators LEAHY, BROWN, BIDEN, and THURMOND have all contributed to it and deserve praise.

But since that time we have made, I believe, several important improvements. At the request of Senator THURMOND, we authorized the use of caller ID by most governmental entities, so that they too can receive the benefits of this valuable technology. We also removed the requirement that telephone companies provide blocking from pay phones—in order to deter harassing calls from phone booths. And at the suggestion of Senator METZENBAUM we have provided consumers with greater flexibility by requiring telephone companies to offer Call Trace—free or for a charge—wherever they offer caller ID.

Mr. President, this legislation is clearly a compromise, but it is a fair and balanced one. Simply put, without compromise we do not have legislation. And without Federal legislation we do not protect telephone privacy at all in New Jersey, Virginia, Indiana, Mississippi, and the other States that permit caller ID but mistakenly prohibit blocking.

In conclusion, Mr. President, this measure allows us to expand the use of caller ID while protecting the privacy rights of individuals. We ensure caller ID can grow by making it clear that it is legal under Federal wiretap laws. We protect privacy by ensuring that callers—when they want—will have the right to withhold their numbers. And we allow vigorous pursuit of obscene and harassing phone callers.

Mr. President, ED MARKEY, who chairs the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, has agreed to introduce a companion measure in the House. And a wide variety of groups support this legislation. We have the backing of the Consumer Federation of America, the American Civil Liberties Union, Public Citizen, Ameritech and the Direct Marketing Association.

Why do so many different organizations favor our approach?

The answer is simple: The Telephone Privacy Act of 1993, Mr. President, is a balanced piece of legislation. It is a measure that is needed. And it is a proposal that ought to become law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 612

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Telephone Privacy Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to protect the right to privacy of telephone users by enabling them to limit the dissemination of their telephone numbers to persons of their choosing;

(2) to encourage the use of new services which discourage harassing and obscene telephone calls even though information identifying the caller may be blocked; and

(3) to require government entities to give public notice of their use of caller identification service.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) PROHIBITIONS.—Section 3121 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§3121. General prohibition on pen register and trap and trace device use; exceptions

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this section, no person may install or use a pen register or a trap and trace device without first obtaining a court order under section 3123 of this title or under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

"(b) EXCEPTIONS.—(1)(A) Subject to paragraph (2), the prohibition of subsection (a) does not apply with respect to the installation or use of a pen register or a trap and trace device by a provider of electronic or wire communication service—

"(i) relating to the operation, maintenance, or testing of a wire or electronic communication service or to the protection of the rights or property of such provider, or to the protection of users of that service from abuse of service or unlawful use of service;

"(ii) to record the fact that a wire or electronic communication was initiated or completed in order to protect such provider, another provider furnishing service toward the completion of the wire communication, or a user of that service, from fraudulent, unlawful or abusive use of service;

"(iii) with the prior consent of the recipient of the communication when the communication may be relevant to an ongoing criminal or counterintelligence investigation;

"(iv) in connection with the provision of call return service; or

"(v) in connection with the provision of caller identification service to a user of that service, if the service provider—

"(I) permits the recipient of a communication to use call trace; and

"(II) permits the originator of a communication to block caller identification—

"(aa) on a per call basis without charge;

"(bb) on a per line basis with or without charge, in a State in which it is authorized by statute or regulation prior to the date of enactment of this clause, and at the request of the originator; and

"(cc) on a per line basis without charge at the request of an originator that is a victim of domestic violence protected by court order, a victim's service program, or a battered women's shelter or other organization providing safe haven for victims of domestic violence.

"(B) Subparagraph (A) (iv) and (v) shall not be construed to require a provider of electronic or wire communication service to enable an originator of a communication to block caller identification—

"(i) on the emergency assistance telephone line of a Federal, State, or municipal police or fire department or on a 911 emergency line;

"(ii) on calls within a customer's system; or

"(iii) of a communication made from a public pay telephone.

"(2) The exception afforded by paragraph (1) does not apply to a communication to a governmental entity on a line that is publicized or represented as ensuring the confidentiality of the originator of a communication, such as an anonymous tip line or a confidential information line.

"(3) The prohibition of subsection (a) does not apply with respect to the use of information that a subscriber to an automatic number identification service or charge number service receives, to the extent that the use consists of—

"(A) use for billing and collection, routing, screening, and completion of the originating telephone subscriber's call or transaction, or for services directly related to the originating telephone subscriber's call or transaction;

"(B) reuse or sale after the recipient orally notifies the originator of the recipient's desire to reuse or sell the information and extends to the originator an option to limit or prohibit such reuse or sale;

"(C) use for the purposes of—

"(i) performing a service or transaction that is the subject of the communication;

"(ii) ensuring the quality of network performance, the maintenance of security, or the effectiveness of call delivery;

"(iii) compiling, using, or disclosing aggregate information;

"(iv) complying with law or a court order; or

"(v) offering to an originator of a communication with which the recipient has an established customer relationship a product or service that is directly related to products or services that the originator has previously obtained from the recipient of the communication; or

"(D) use for any lawful purpose if there is available to the originator of the communication the ability to block caller identification to the recipient—

"(i) on a per call basis without charge; or

"(ii) on a per line basis with or without charge in a State in which it is authorized by statute or regulation prior to the date of enactment of this clause and offered in combination with blocking on a per call basis without charge.

"(4) Nothing in paragraph (3) affects the provision or use of automatic number identification or charge number information by a provider of electronic or wire communication service.

"(c) CIVIL ACTION.—(1) An originator of a communication that is aggrieved by the knowing or intentional failure of a provider of communication service to allow blocking of caller identification as described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(v) may recover from the provider in accordance with section 2707.

"(2) An originator of a communication that is aggrieved by the knowing or intentional use of caller identification information by the recipient of the communication in violation of subsection (b)(3) may recover from the recipient in accordance with section 2707.

"(d) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—(1) Whoever knowingly violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(2) Paragraph (1) does not apply to the use of information that is made available to the recipient of a communication through an automatic number identification or charge number service.

"(e) PREEMPTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no State may prohibit, in any way other than in accordance with subsections (a) and (b), the making available by providers of electronic or wire communication services or the use by their customers of caller identification service.

"(f) INTENT OF CONGRESS.—This section is intended neither to endorse nor to facilitate the use of blocking of caller identification by originators of obscene or harassing telephone calls, nor is it intended to limit the enforcement of laws prohibiting such telephone calls.".

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3127 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (5);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(7) the term 'automatic number identification or charge number' means an access signaling protocol in common use by common carriers that uses an identifying signal associated with the use of a subscriber's telephone to provide billing information or other information to the local exchange carrier or any other interconnecting carriers;

"(8) the term 'block' means to prevent or control, and the term 'blocking' means a service that allows the originator of a call to prevent or control, the transmission of information that identifies the originator to the recipient of the call;

"(9) the term 'caller identification' means the transmission of information that identifies the originator of a wire communication to the recipient of the communication;

"(10) the term 'call return service' means a service provided to a user of a communication line that enables a recipient of a communication on that line to initiate a return communication to the originator without disclosing to the recipient the identity of the originator (except in connection with the provider's regular billing process); and

"(11) the term 'call trace service' means a service provided to a user of a communication line that enables a recipient of a communication on that line to cause the identity of the originator of the communication to be disclosed to the service provider's security personnel and to law enforcement officials without disclosing to the recipient the identity of the originator.".

SEC. 4. NOTICE BY GOVERNMENT ENTITIES OF USE OF CALLER IDENTIFICATION SERVICE.

(a) FEDERAL ENTITIES.—A Federal Government entity that uses caller identification service shall publish in the Federal Register and have printed in any phone directory in which its number is listed, for the guidance of the public, notice of the government entity's use of caller identification service within a reasonable time after initiating that use. The Federal Register notice shall describe the scope and purpose of that use.

(b) STATE AND LOCAL ENTITIES.—A State or local government entity that uses caller identification service shall make available and publish in the official publication of that State or local government entity and have printed in any phone directory in which its number is listed, for the guidance of the public, notice of that government entity's use of caller identification service within a reasonable time after initiating that use. The official publication notice shall describe the scope and purpose of that use.●

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. RIEGLE):

S. 613. A bill to prohibit the importation of goods produced abroad with child labor and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

CHILD LABOR DETERRENCE ACT

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Child Labor Deterrence Act of 1993. The bill I'm introducing today prohibits the importation of any product made, whole or in part, by children under the age of 15 who are employed in industry or mining. It is identical to a bill I introduced last August.

Mr. President, UNICEF and the International Labor Organization [ILO] estimate that hundreds of millions of children worldwide under the age of 15 are employed. Many of these children begin working in factories at the age of 6 or 7. They are poor, malnourished, and often work 60-hour weeks for little or no pay.

The situation is as deplorable as it is enormous. In many developing countries children represent a substantial part of the work force and can be found in such industries as glass, metal works, textiles, mining, and fireworks manufacturing.

According to the ILO, children under the age of 15 constitute approximately 11 percent of the work force in some Asian countries, 17 percent in parts of Africa, and a reported 12–26 percent in many countries in Latin America.

We know, for example, that between 5 to 10 million children are illegally employed in Mexico—often in hazardous jobs. In Mexico, 13-year-old girls have been found working 48-hour weeks making electric wiring strips for General Electric in Nogales, and making dashboard components for General Motors at their Delnosa plant.

Mr. President, let me just say that when the administration negotiates a side agreement on workers' rights with Mexico, it should contain an enforceable ban on products produced by child labor. As I have stated many times on the Senate floor, when people ask me what's my bottom line on the Mexican trade agreement, it's simply this: "Our country ought not to import any item from any country that permits the employment of child labor, period. That ought to be our policy." And, I'm determined to make that our country's policy.

The bill I'm introducing, however, is not only about Mexico and the NAFTA negotiations. It goes beyond that.

In Bangladesh, as many as 50,000 children are reported to be working in the garment industry. A former Catholic Sister recently wrote in a newsletter of her visit to the Saraka garment factory in November 1992. She said that 60 percent of the 500 workers in the factory were boys and girls under the age of 13. She tells of a 9-year-old girl who pleaded with her: "Please, can you take me with you? I don't want to stay here anymore." During her visit, the children informed the former Sister that if a child is sick and is absent for 1 day without notification they are docked 3 days' pay.

Mr. President, the United States accounts for more than 50 percent of export earnings from the garment industry in that country.

Conditions in the carpet-weaving industry in Nepal, Pakistan, China, and India are no better than the Bangladesh garment industry.

In Pakistan, the ILO reported in 1991 that an estimated half of the 50,000 children working as bonded labor in Pakistan's carpet-weaving industry will never reach the age of 12—victims of disease and malnutrition.

In India, according to a New York Times report, an estimated 300,000 to 1 million children in that country work in the weaving industry—making carpets for 12 to 16 hours a day. The United States imports over 40 percent of India's carpet exports.

I have press reports from India of children freed from virtual slavery in the carpet factories of northern India. Twelve-year-old Charitra Chowdhary recounted his story—he said, "If we moved slowly we were beaten on our backs with a stick. We wanted to run away but the doors were always locked."

In September, shortly after the Child Labor Deterrence Act was first introduced, about 150 children freed from the carpet industry protested in New Delhi calling for "Childhood not wages."

Mr. President, that's what this bill is about—children, whose dreams and childhood are being sold for a pittance—to factoryowners and in markets around the globe.

It's about protecting children around the globe and their future. It's about eliminating a major form of child abuse in our world. It's about breaking the cycle of poverty by getting these kids out of factories and into schools. It's about raising the standard of living in the Third World so we can compete on the quality of goods instead of the misery and suffering of those who make them. It's about assisting Third World governments to enforce their laws by ending the role of the United States in providing a market for goods made by children and encouraging other nations to do the same.

Mr. President, unless the economic exploitation of children is eliminated, the potential and creative capacity of future generations will forever be lost to the factory floor.

This legislation is not about imposing our standards on the developing world. It's about preventing those manufacturers in the developing world who exploit child labor from imposing their standards on the United States. And, it's about telling those who willingly and knowingly buy and sell goods made on the backs of a child, telling these traffickers of misery that we will not tolerate their dirty trade any longer. They are forewarned. If manufacturers and importers insist on investing in child labor, instead of investing in the future of children, I will work to assure that their products are barred from entering the United States.

Mr. President, as I said last August when I first introduced this bill, it is time to end this human tragedy and our participation in it. It is time for greater government and corporate responsibility. No longer can officials in the Third World or U.S. importers turn a blind eye to the suffering and misery of the world's children. No longer should American consumers provide a market for goods produced by the sweat and toil of children. By providing a market for goods produced by child labor, U.S. importers have become part of the problem by perpetuating the impoverishment of poor families. Through this legislation, importers now have the opportunity to become part of the solution by ending this abominable practice.

There is hope, however, Mr. President. Already, as a result of introducing this bill last August, foreign governments, manufacturers, and importers have begun to take corrective action. According to information I have received, the Oriental Rug Importers Association representing importers from China, Pakistan, Nepal, and India have formed a committee to deal with child labor issues. The Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers and Exporters Association [BGMEA] and the Government of Bangladesh have warned that country's garment industry of the dire consequences of violating Bangladesh law and employing children. The Asian-American Free Labor Institute and the BGMEA have now agreed to cooperate to solve the child labor law violations. American corporations are developing corporate codes of ethics that prohibit the use of child labor in the manufacture of their products. I also have a report from the Economic Times about steps being taken by the Government of India, carpet manufacturers, and importers to end the export of products made by child labor. The proposal being discussed consists of an elaborate labeling system and independent inspections by NGO's that could become a model for other industries currently employing child labor.

I have been informed that the Government of India will require the registration of carpet looms by March 31 and has taken several other steps to prevent the exploitation of children in the carpet industry. And, if the economic exploitation of child labor in India's carpet industry is eliminated, neither manufacturers nor United States importers should fear the passage of this bill.

Mr. President, countries do not have to wait until poverty is eradicated or they are fully developed before eliminating the economic exploitation of children. In fact, the path to development is to eliminate child labor and increase expenditures on children such as primary education.

Mr. President, the Child Labor Deterrence Act of 1993 is intended to strengthen existing U.S. trade laws and help Third World countries enforce their child labor laws. The bill directs the U.S. Secretary of Labor to compile and maintain a list of foreign industries and their respective host countries that use child labor in the production of exports to the United States. Once the Secretary of Labor identifies a foreign industry, the Secretary of Treasury is instructed to prohibit the importation of a product from an identified industry. The entry ban would not apply if a U.S. importer signs a certificate of origin affirming that they took reasonable steps to ensure that products imported from identified industries are not made by child labor. In addition, the President is urged to seek an agreement with other governments to secure an international ban on trade in the products of child labor. Further, any company or individual who would intentionally violate the law would face both civil and criminal penalties.

Mr. President, the bill places no undue burden on U.S. importers. I know of no importer, company, or department store that would willingly promote the exploitation of children. I know of no importer, company, or department store that would want their products and image tainted by having it publicly known that their products are produced by child labor. These entities take reasonable steps to ensure the quality of their goods; they should also be willing to take reasonable steps to ensure that their goods are not produced by child labor.

Mr. President, I am proud to be joined by Senators CONRAD, INOUYE, GRASSLEY, ROCKEFELLER, METZENBAUM, FEINGOLD, CAMPBELL, DORGAN, and RIEGLE in introducing the Child Labor Deterrence Act of 1993. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill and the article from the Economic Times that I mentioned be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 613

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Child Labor Deterrence Act of 1993."

SEC. 2. FINDINGS, PURPOSE, AND POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Principle 9 of the Declaration of the Rights of the Child proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 20, 1959, states that ". . . the child shall not be admitted to employment before an appropriate minimum age; he shall in no case be caused or permitted to engage in any occupation or employment which would prejudice his health or education, or interfere with his physical, mental, or moral development . . .".

(2) Article 2 of the International Labor Convention No. 138 Concerning Minimum Age for Admission to Employment states that, "The minimum age specified in pursuance of paragraph 1 of this article shall not be less than the age of compulsory schooling and, in any case, shall not be less than 15 years.

(3) According to the International Labor Organization, worldwide an estimated 200,000,000 children under age 15 are working, many of them in dangerous industries like mining and fireworks.

(4) Children under the age 15 constitute approximately 11 percent of the workforce in some Asian countries, 17 percent in parts of Africa, and a reported 12–26 percent in many countries in Latin America.

(5) The number of children under age 15 who are working, and the scale of their suffering, increase every year, despite the existence of more than 20 International Labor Organization conventions on child labor and laws in many countries which purportedly prohibit the employment of under age children.

(6) In many countries, children under the age 15 lack either the legal standing or means to protect themselves from exploitation in the workplace.

(7) The employment of children under the age of 15 commonly deprives the children of the opportunity for basic education and also denies gainful employment to millions of adults.

(8) The employment of children under the age of 15, often at pitifully low wages, undermines the stability of families and ignores the importance of increasing jobs, aggregated demand, and purchasing power among adults as a catalyst to the development of internal markets and the achievement of broad-based, self-reliant economic development in many developing countries.

(9) Adult workers in the United States and other developed countries should not have their jobs imperiled by imports produced by child labor in developing countries.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to curtail the employment of children under age 15 in the production of goods for export by—

(1) eliminating the role of the United States in providing a market for foreign products made by underage children; and

(2) encouraging other nations to join in a ban on trade in such products.

SEC. 3. UNITED STATES INITIATIVE TO CURTAIL INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN PRODUCTS OF CHILD LABOR.

In pursuit of the policy set forth in this Act, the President is urged to seek an agreement with governments that conduct trade with the United States for the purpose of securing an international ban on trade in the products of child labor.

SEC. 4. IDENTIFICATION OF FOREIGN INDUSTRIES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE HOST COUNTRIES THAT UTILIZE CHILD LABOR IN EXPORT OF GOODS.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF INDUSTRIES AND HOST COUNTRIES.—The Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") shall undertake periodic reviews using all available information, including information made available by the International Labor Organization and human rights organizations (the first such review to be undertaken not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Act), to identify any foreign industry and its host country that—

(1) utilize child labor in the export of products; and

(2) has on a continuing basis exported products of child labor to the United States.

(b) PETITIONS REQUESTING IDENTIFICATION.—

(1) FILING.—Any person may file a petition with the Secretary requesting that a particular foreign industry and its host country be identified under subsection (a). The petition must set forth the allegations in support of the request.

(2) ACTION ON RECEIPT OF PETITION.—Not later than 90 days after receiving a petition under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) decide whether or not the allegations in the petition warrant further action by the Secretary in regard to the foreign industry and its host country under subsection (a); and

(B) notify the petition of the decision under subparagraph (A) and the facts and reasons supporting the decision.

(c) CONSULTATION AND COMMENT.—Prior to identifying a foreign industry and its host country under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with the United States Trade Representative, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury regarding such action;

(2) publish notice in the Federal Register that such an identification is being considered and inviting the submission within a reasonable time of written comment from the public; and

(3) take into account the information obtained under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(d) REVOCATION OF IDENTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may revoke the identification of any foreign industry and its host country under subsection (a) if information available to the Secretary indicates that such action is appropriate.

(2) REPORT OF SECRETARY.—No revocation under paragraph (1) may take effect earlier than the 60th day after the date on which the Secretary submits to the Congress a written report—

(A) stating that in the opinion of the Secretary the foreign industry and host country concerned does not utilize child labor in the export of products; and

(B) stating the facts on which such opinion is based and any other reason why the Secretary considers the revocation appropriate.

(3) PROCEDURE.—No revocation under paragraph (1) may take effect unless the Secretary—

(A) publishes notice in the Federal Register that such a revocation is under consideration and inviting the submission within a reasonable time of written comment from the public on the revocation; and

(B) takes into account the information received under subparagraph (A) before preparing the report required under paragraph (2).

(e) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall—

(1) promptly publish in the Federal Register—

(A) the name of each foreign industry and its host country identified under subsection (a);

(B) the text of the decision made under subsection (b)(2)(A) and a statement of the facts and reasons supporting the decision; and

(C) the name of each foreign industry and its host country with respect to which an identification has been revoked under subsection (d); and

(2) maintain in the Federal Register a current list of all foreign industries and their respective host countries identified under subsection (a).

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON ENTRY.

(A) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), during the effective identification period for a foreign industry and its host country the Secretary may not permit the entry of any manufactured article that is a product of that foreign industry.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the entry of a manufactured article—

(A) for which a certification that meets the requirements of subsection (b) is provided;

(B) that is entered under any subheading in subchapter IV or VI of chapter 98 (relating to personal exemptions) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States; or

(C) that was exported from the foreign industry and its host country and was en route to the United States before the first day of the effective identification period for such industry and its host country.

(b) CERTIFICATION THAT ARTICLE IS NOT A PRODUCT OF CHILD LABOR.—

(1) FORM AND CONTENT.—The Secretary shall prescribe the form and content of documentation, for submission in connection with the entry of a manufactured article, that satisfies the Secretary that the importer of the article has undertaken reasonable steps to ensure, to the extent practicable, that the article is not a product of child labor.

(2) WRITTEN EVIDENCE.—The documentation required by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall include written evidence that the agreement setting forth the terms and conditions of the acquisition or provision of the imported article includes the condition that the article not be a product of child labor.

SEC. 6. PENALTIES.

(a) UNLAWFUL ACTS.—It is unlawful—

(1) during the effective identification period applicable to a foreign industry and its host country, to attempt to enter any manufactured article that is a product of that industry if the entry is prohibited under section 5(a)(1); or

(2) to violate any regulation prescribed under section 7.

(b) CIVIL PENALTY.—Any person who commits any unlawful act set forth in subsection (a) is liable for a civil penalty of not to exceed $25,000.

(c) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—In addition to being liable for a civil penalty under subsection (b), any person who intentionally commits any unlawful act set forth in subsection (a) is, upon conviction, liable for a fine of not less than $10,000 and not more than $35,000, or imprisonment for 1 year, or both.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—The violations set forth in subsection (a) shall be treated as violations of the customs laws for purposes of applying the enforcement provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, including—

(1) the search, seizure and forfeiture provisions;

(2) section 592 (relating to penalties for entry by fraud, gross negligence, or negligence); and

(3) section 619 (relating to compensation to informers).

SEC. 7. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary shall prescribe regulations that are necessary or appropriate to carry out this Act.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

(1) MANUFACTURED ARTICLES.—A MANUFACTURED ARTICLE SHALL BE TREATED AS BEING A PRODUCT OF CHILD LABOR IF THE ARTICLE—

(A) was fabricated, assembled, or processed, in whole or part;

(B) contains any part that was fabricated, assembled, or processed, in whole or in part; or

(C) was mined, quarried, pumped, or otherwise extracted, by one or more children who engaged in the fabrication, assembly, processing, or extraction—

(i) in exchange for remuneration (regardless to whom paid), subsistence, goods or services, or any combination of the foregoing;

(ii) under circumstances tantamount to involuntary servitude; or

(iii) under exposure to toxic substances or working conditions otherwise posing serious health hazards.

(2) CHILD.—The term "child" means an individual who has not attained the age of 15.

(3) EFFECTIVE IDENTIFICATION PERIOD.—The term "effective identification period" means, with respect to a foreign industry or country, the period that—

(A) begins on the date of that issue of the Federal Register in which the identification of the foreign industry or country is published under section 4(e)(1)(A); and

(B) terminates on the date of that issue on the Federal Register in which the revocation of the identification referred to in subparagraph (A) is published under section 4(e)(1)(B).

(4) ENTERED.—The term "entered" means entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, in the customs territory of the United States.

(5) FOREIGN INDUSTRY.—The term "foreign industry" includes any entity that produces a manufactured article in any possession or territory of a foreign country.

(6) HOST COUNTRY.—The term "host country" means any possession or territory of a foreign country that is administered separately for customs purposes and on which a foreign industry produces a manufactured article.

(7) MANUFACTURED ARTICLE.—The term "manufactured article" means any good that is fabricated, assembled, or processed. The term also includes any mineral resources (including any mineral fuel) that is entered in a crude state. Any mineral resource that at entry has been subjected to only washing, crushing, grinding, powdering, levigation, sifting, screening, or concentration by flotation, magnetic separation, or other mechanical or physical processes shall be treated as having been processed for the purposes of this Act.

(8) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary", except for purposes of section 4, means the Secretary of the Treasury.

[From the Economic Times, Dec. 26, 1992]

STEPS TAKEN TO END CHILD LABOUR IN CARPET INDUSTRY

(By Sunil Raman)

A small but significant step towards ending child labour in the carpet industry has

been taken by some manufacturers and exporters in cooperation with foreign importers.

At a meeting here on Monday, it was decided to discuss the modalities for forming a working group to implement the labelling system for carpets not woven by children. The meeting was attended by the Association of Carpet Manufacturers Without Child Labour, a 50-member body, Obeetee, a major exporting firm, Indo-German Export Promotion Programme and South Asian Coordination Against Child Servitude.

Earlier, a draft proposal for the labelling system had been accepted at a meeting of these four organisations on December 3, which was also attended by representatives of the U.S. and German embassies.

According to the proposal, once a manufacturer or an exporter joins the scheme, he would be required to submit "a detailed and complete list" of his manufacturing units including the contractors or loom owners with whom he has business relations. The inspection would be carried out by trained inspectors appointed by independent regional or local NGOs, who have no stakes in the carpet trade.

A detailed inspection would then be carried out. A label with a graphic symbol and code numbers giving the name of the actual exporter, the loom owner, the individual loom (every loom is to be marked by a small tamper-proof number plate), and the specific carpet would be affixed on such carpets.

The right to use the label would be provided only to individual manufacturers/exporters, not to groups or association of entrepreneurs. Moreover, the right would be on an annual basis, renewable after regular inspections.

There is a proposal to register the label in Germany as well. It is reported that the U.S. embassy here has responded favourably to such a mechanism.

This development comes in the wake of a bill introduced in the U.S. Senate in August this year by Mr. Tom Harkin, to prohibit "the import of any product, made whole or in part, by children under the age of 15, who are employed in industry or mining."

The purpose of the Child Labour Deterrence Act of 1992 "is to curtail the employment of children under the age of 15 in the production of goods for export by: Eliminating the role of the United States in providing a market for foreign products made by under-age children; and encouraging other nations to join in a ban on a trade in such products."

The bill directs the U.S. secretary of labour to "compile and maintain a list of foreign industries and their respective host countries that use child labour in the production of exports. Once a foreign industry and its host country has been identified as utilising child labour, the secretary of the treasury is directed to prohibit the entry of any manufactured article from that foreign industry."

The bill is slated to be re-introduced in January and sources said the new U.S. administration would seriously consider the issue.

While India's exports of carpets to Germany showed a sharp fall because of the success of the campaign against using child labour, those to the U.S. increased from 15 to 40 percent.

The Indian carpet industry would be jeopardized if the U.S. Congress approves the bill. However, the development of an independent inspection and monitoring system would go a long way in helping the industry from facing any ban. The proposed labelling system is expected to come into force by March next and could become a precedent for other industries employing child labour.

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 614. A bill to establish a commission on the commercial application of certain defense-related facilities, equipment, processes, and technologies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE ACT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill to create the Commission for the Study of Dual-Use Application of Facilities and Resources at White Sands Missile Range Act. With the end of the cold war, the demise of communism, and the resurgence of democratic principles across the world, the United States can now expand its attention and resources to economic growth and job creation in the American economy.

Last week, President Clinton outlined his goals for the technology portion of our defense conversion efforts, and the Secretary of Defense released a booklet produced by the Advanced Research Projects Agency [ARPA] titled, "Program Information Package for Defense Technology Conversion, Reinvestment, and Transition Assistance."

This booklet lists seven DOD laboratories from my State of New Mexico that have at least 25 percent of their in-house budget dedicated to RDT&E. Five of those laboratories are located at White Sands Missile Range. Only one other State ties with New Mexico for the number of DOD laboratories listed, at one specific location, that have 25 percent of their in-house budget dedicated to RDT&E activities—Maryland's Aberdeen Proving Group.

The March 15, 1993, edition of Defense News reports that the President's plan includes $4.7 billion in developing dual-use technologies with civilian and military applications over the next 5 years; a total of $255 million in fiscal year 1994. The best defense conversion program that can be devised has to start with growth of the American economy, and I commend the President for his efforts to focus on this issue.

Mr. President, the enormity of RDT&E efforts going on at White Sands Missile Range leads me to introduce this measure. This bill will assist the President by first determining exactly what resources at White Sands Missile Range have a dual-use application to private industry, and second by acting as a model for all Department of Defense high technology installations in determining both the method and the need for focusing specific DOD resources to specific private sector initiatives.

I might tell my friends in the Senate that White Sands is currently involved in some of this very work. For example, White Sands Missile Range's electromagnetic radiation effects facilities are being used to test air bags for Chrysler, Honda, and Nissan. This testing is to assure that the air bag system will not erroneously deploy due to spurious electromagnetic radiation. White Sands Missile Range's shock and vibration facilities are being used to test shipping crates for Phillips Electronics. Phillips Electronics was experiencing a large failure rate in their electrical transformers after shipping. White Sands Missile Range is subjecting the crates to a series of vibration and shock tests. Finally, White Sands Missile Range's large temperature test facility is being used to test the heating and cooling system in General Electric's trailer-sized magnetic resonance imaging system. I believe that these examples are just the tip of the iceberg of what can be accomplished, Mr. President.

The Department of Defense has spent over $2 billion in purchasing the land and equipment at White Sands Missile Range. RDT&E activities since 1981 have accounted for $4 billion—the President, and many in Congress like to talk about investment these days—well, Mr. President, these numbers add up to a great investment.

Unfortunately, despite the fact that defense spending is down in real terms by 29 percent in 1993 from the 1985 level, and despite the fact that President Clinton has suggested bringing that figure down to over 40 percent by 1997, the Department of Defense has not looked seriously at how its high technology resources can be utilized by the private sector to compensate for these new budget cuts, and more importantly, to help create growth and jobs in the American economy by utilizing existing DOD resources for private industry initiatives.

The bill I am introducing today will accomplish this by creating a Commission appointed by the Secretary of Defense. This Commission will use the White Sands Missile Range [WSMR] as a model for all high technology Department of Defense installations to evaluate their resources and the application of those resources within the private sector.

White Sands Missile Range is the largest, all overland, test range in the Department of Defense. It occupies 1,874,666 acres. The main range is approximately 37 miles wide and 100 miles long. With its unique combination of test ranges and facilities, instrumentation and equipment, laboratories and scientific personnel, WSMR supports a wide variety of research, development, test and evaluation [RDT&E] programs.

White Sands Proving Ground was established on July 9, 1945, to provide a remote testing site for the Hermes project, a program designed to further develop U.S. rocket technology. The nuclear age was soon ushered in with

the detonation of the first atomic device. This event occurred on White Sands Proving Ground at Trinity Site on July 16, 1945.

In 1952, the proving ground became one of 19 Department of Defense triservice national ranges. White Sands Proving Ground became WSMR in 1958, and in 1962, as part of a major Army reorganization, became one of the installations under the Test and Evaluation Command headquartered in Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

During the 1950's, 1960's, and 1970's, WSMR was the site of several major technological events which further shaped the course of this century. In addition to testing Army, Air Force, and Navy systems, WSMR began developing and testing droned and manned flight vehicles, testing propulsion, guidance and instrumentation systems and evaluating nuclear and meteorological effects. During the 1980's, WSMR carried on its tradition of excellence in RDT&E as exemplified by the test and evaluation of the multiple launch rocket system and Patriot, the Navy's Standard Missile, and the landing of the space shuttle *Columbia* at WSMR on March 30, 1982.

WSMR's mission is to provide and operate a national range to support RDT&E for the Army, Navy, Air Force, NASA, and other approved U.S. Government agencies and foreign governments. WSMR consists of a variety of test directorates, support directorates, and tenant organizations. The major test directorates are the Army Material Test and Evaluation Directorate, Nuclear Effects Directorate, Instrumentation Directorate, and the National Range Operations Directorate.

Mr. President, if the President of the United States has his way, we will be reducing our defense budget by over 40 percent between 1985 and 1997. I believe that the Department of Defense should evaluate the potential for use of their high technology resources and facilities within the private sector. The bill that I am introducing will use White Sands Missile Range as a model for this process.

The Commission will report back to the Congress its findings and recommendations within 1 year. I believe this legislation is necessary, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

By Mr. McCAIN:

S. 615. A bill to enable Indian tribal governments to provide facilities necessary to carry out essential governmental functions; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

INDIAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENT LEASE AGREEMENT ACT

• Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Indian Tribal Government Lease Agreement Act. This legislation is intended to promote discussion on alternative methods of financing new school construction. The bill offers one approach that Indian tribes and the Federal Government can take to significantly reduce the large backlog of new construction and rehabilitation of Indian school facilities.

Before discussing the legislation, I want to publicly thank Chairman BYRD and Senator NICKLES for everything the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee is doing under current budgetary conditions to continue annual appropriations for the construction and rehabilitation of Indian schools. This legislation is not intended to diminish their efforts. The purpose of this legislation is to stimulate discussion on alternative financing methods by which the Federal Government and Indian tribes can utilize current appropriations in a manner that will facilitate the new construction and rehabilitation of Indian schools at a quicker pace.

Last year the Committee on Indian Affairs received a firsthand report on the serious conditions existing at Indian school facilities funded by the Federal Government. The Inspector General of the Department of the Interior testified that there were:

> Life-threatening safety deficiencies, code violations, and hazardous health conditions existing in Bureau (of Indian Affairs) schools, dormitories, and other buildings. As a result, thousands of students, teachers, and other government and contract employees currently live and work in buildings that Federal inspectors and Bureau safety officers have classified as unsafe and unsanitary.

The Inspector General went on to state:

> These (Inspector General) reports reveal and describe a deplorable state of Indian education facilities which are often structurally unsound, in disrepair and poorly maintained. Further the degraded condition of Bureau of Indian Affairs classrooms, dormitories, study and recreational areas, and other related facilities, has undoubtedly had a profound adverse effect on the quality of education being provided to Indian children.

Mr. President, how many of us would be willing to send our children to schools that threatened their health and safety? How many of us would be satisfied with having to tell our constituents that the new school they need now will not be built until the end of the decade or longer, even though the existing school facility is in a terrible state of disrepair, or has been officially condemned? How ironic that our advice to the young to "stay in school" is more likely to remind Indian children of the Federal Government's neglect of Indian education than to serve as a source of inspiration to be the best they can be.

While additional appropriations for facilities construction would be a welcome start, it is important to remember that there is a backlog of new construction and rehabilitation for Indian schools and associated facilities that approaches $550 million. Budgetary and fiscal limitations make it unlikely the sufficient funds will be available to reduce this backlog significantly over the next 10 years. Thus, we must explore every reasonable alternative to expediting new school construction. The health, safety and educational well-being of Indian children demand that we do no less.

One way to finance the construction of new schools within the BIA-funded school system would be to have tribes issue bonds, finance the construction of the schools from these bonds, and then have the Federal Government lease the school facility back from the tribe.

Authority exists under the Indian Tribal Governmental Tax Status Act of 1982 for Indian tribes to issue tax exempt bonds for normal and customary "essential governmental purposes"—which would certainly include construction of new schools.

Little use of this authority has been made for governmental purposes because most of these governmental functions are funded by the BIA, IHS, or other Federal agencies at present and tribes have not had to raise funds from their own sources. The Federal Government finances the construction on a pay-as-you-go basis, and does not issue special bonds for such construction purposes.

The pressures of Federal deficits and other demands on the Federal budget have tightly limited the availability of funds for new school construction. This has resulted in a large backlog of schools that need to be replaced, major repairs undertaken or entirely new schools built.

The exact repayment schedule can vary from bond to bond and does not necessarily have to involve a set of exactly equal total payments per year, as characterizes a home mortgage. It is possible to tailor a set of principle payments to meet the specific needs of the bond issuer and purchasers. Nevertheless, as an approximation, a set of equal interest and amortization payments per year is a reasonable estimate of the future funding requirements.

The table below shows what the annual requirements would be for the payment of interest and amortization on a bond issue of $10,000,000. Annual funding requirements for larger or smaller bonds can easily be calculated by applying the appropriate multiple of $10,000,000. For example, a bond of $50,000,000 would require 5 times the annual interest and amortization payments of a bond of $10,000,000.

ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS REQUIRED TO SERVICE A $10,000,000 BOND

Term of bond	Annual appropriation required (in thousands)			
	5 percent	6 percent	7 percent	8 percent
10 years	$1,295	$1,359	$1,424	$1,490
15 years	963	1,030	1,098	1,168
20 years	802	872	944	1,019
25 years	710	782	858	937
30 years	651	726	806	888

As shown in the table, the payments on a $10,000,000 bond depend on the repayment period and the interest rate. Assuming a 20-year repayment period and 6 percent interest—in the ballpark for current tax exempt financing, the payments on a bond of $10,000,000 would be $872,000 per year. It would be possible to fund $50 million in new school construction by appropriating $4.4 million per year for 20 years.

New school construction funding of $500 million could be undertaken by appropriating $44.0 million per year for 20 years. By way of comparison, the annual appropriation levels for new school construction in FY 92 and FY 93, respectively, was $32.495 million and $34.702 million. Subtracting out the funding set-aside for specific construction projects added by the Congress, the Federal Government will have around $57 million remaining to build approximately 6 schools on the priority list.

In order for tribes to successfully issue tax exempt financing, it might be necessary for them to have a lease agreement with the Federal Government signed in advance for the school facility to be constructed. This would provide the necessary assurance to bond purchasers that the payments on the bonds would be secure. The lease agreement would presumably be for the term of the bond repayment.

Mechanically, the issuance of a bond is not complicated; it is much like obtaining a home mortgage. A decision would have to be made on the term of the bond. Current credit market conditions would then largely determine the interest rate at which the bond could be sold—in the range of 5 to 7 percent at present for tax-exempt bonds, depending on the riskiness of the bond and other factors.

The tribe would have to find an investment banker who would be responsible for doing much of the legal and other paperwork. The investment banker would find the purchasers for the bond. Once the bond was sold, the tribe would have to pay bond attorneys, investment bankers and other fees and would receive the bond revenues to be used for the purpose of financing the school construction.

States and localities all across the United States use these procedures for the financing of roads, hospitals, schools and other public facilities on a routine basis. There is a large network of investment bankers, lawyers and other financial experts available who serve this market—although it has been little used by tribes to date.

Mr. President, it is my hope that all interested parties will carefully examine this approach. I have deliberately chosen to draft this legislation narrowly so as to focus the discussion on the method rather than how broadly it might be applied. The range of projects that could theoretically be funded under this proposal is not as important as finding a consensus approach. Moreover, I want to emphasize to Federal reviewers that the schools proposed to be funded under this legislation are limited to those schools that are already on the Education Facilities Construction Priority Lists of FY 1993 and as thereafter modified. If we are prepared to commit a certain amount of funding each year for new school construction, then it is my hope that we would also be willing to consider alternative methods to utilize those funds in the most prudent manner, bearing in mind that the cost of building and repairing schools that are lower on the priority list will continue to rise under the current method. In some cases, the cost of building a new school is less than the cost of repairing the current facility.

To those in the new administration who are wondering what steps they can take to stimulate Indian reservation economies, let me encourage them to consider the multiplier effects that would occur for reservation and rural economies as a result of accelerating the construction of new schools.

To those in the new administration who are wondering what steps they can take to improve the quality of Indian education, let me encourage them to consider the positive effects that would occur from creating a healthy and safe learning environment for Indian children.

I look forward to receiving the comments of all interested parties on this legislation and to reviewing other alternatives. It is my hope that all interested parties will keep in mind that the ultimate goal of this effort is much more important than simply supplying the necessary bricks and mortar; it is about providing Indian children with the opportunity to learn.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be inserted in the RECORD immediately following my statement.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 615

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Indian Tribal Government Lease Agreement Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) The term "Indian tribal government" means the governing body of any Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community, including any Alaska Native village or regional or village corporation as defined in or established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, which is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.

(2) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) The term "Fund" means the Fund established by section 4.

(4) The term "account" means an account within the Fund established on behalf of an Indian tribal government in connection with a lease agreement entered into by that tribal government pursuant to section 3.

(5) The term "essential governmental function" means any function carried out by, or on behalf of, an Indian tribal government involving the planning, design, construction, repair, improvement, and expansion of education facilities.

SEC. 3. SELF-DETERMINATION AGREEMENTS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The Secretary is authorized, under section 102 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, to enter into lease agreements with Indian tribal governments pursuant to which the Secretary agrees to lease, for a period of years, facilities constructed by any such tribal government for use in carrying out an essential governmental function.

(b) TERMS.—Any lease agreement shall include such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary or appropriate to assure that the proceeds from bonds, sold by an Indian tribal government for the purpose of constructing a facility to be covered by such lease agreement, will be used only in the manner, and for the purposes, approved by the Secretary.

(c) INDIAN PRIORITY LIST.—In determining which Indian tribal government may enter into a lease agreement under this Act, the Secretary shall follow the Education Facilities Construction Priority list as of fiscal year 1993 or as thereafter modified.

SEC. 4. THE TRIBAL GOVERNMENT LEASE FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States the Tribal Government Lease Fund. Each Indian tribal government having a lease agreement under this Act shall have an account in such Fund.

(b) CONTENTS OF FUND.—There shall be deposited in the appropriate accounts within the Fund the following:

(1) Moneys appropriated to the accounts for payments in connection with lease agreements under this Act.

(2) Income and gains realized by the account from any investment of excess funds, and the obligations or securities comprising such investments within such account.

(3) Any other receipts of such account.

(c) EXCESS FUNDS INVESTMENT.—If the Secretary of the Interior determines that the amount of money in any such account exceeds the amount required for current needs, the Secretary of the Treasury, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, may invest such amounts as the Secretary of the Treasury deems advisable in obligations of, or obligations guaranteed by, the Government of the United States, or in such other governmental or agency obligations or other securities of the United States as he deems appropriate.

(d) DEPOSITORY.—The Secretary of the Treasury may deposit moneys of the Fund with any Federal Reserve bank, any depository for public funds, or in such other places and in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury deems appropriate.

(e) USES.—Moneys in each account within the Fund shall be administered by the Secretary in order—

(1) to effect the payment, when due, of the principal of, and any interest on, bonds issued by the tribal government having such account in connection with a facility covered by a lease agreement under this Act;

(2) to redeem such bonds; and

(3) to make payment of all expenses incurred by the Indian tribal government in carrying out its duties with respect to its account within the Fund.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION TO THE FUND; APPROPRIATIONS.

Moneys in such Fund, together with all moneys hereafter deposited in such Fund, are hereby appropriated for the purposes of this Act and shall remain available until expended. For fiscal year 1994, and each fiscal year thereafter, there are authorized to be appropriated, to each of the appropriate accounts in the Fund, such sums as may be necessary to make payments under lease agreements under this Act, and to carry out the other provisions of this Act.

SEC. 6. FULL FAITH AND CREDIT.

Any bond issued by an Indian tribal government after the date of the enactment of this Act the proceeds of which are used for the construction of a facility covered by a lease agreement under this Act shall constitute general obligations of the United States of America backed by the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

SEC. 7. AUDIT OF TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized to audit the operations of each of the accounts within the Fund in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe. Any such audit shall be conducted at the place or places where accounts of the Fund are normally kept. The representatives of the Comptroller General shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files and other papers, things, or property belonging to, or in use by or in connection with the Fund, or the Indian tribal government which pertain to the financial transactions of the Fund and which are necessary to facilitate an audit. Such representatives shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians. All such books, accounts, records, reports, files, papers, things, and property shall remain in the possession and custody of the Fund, or the Indian tribal government, as the case may be.

(b) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—The representatives of the Comptroller General shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by any person or entity which has entered into a financial transaction with or involving the Fund, or the Indian tribal government, under this Act, to the extent deemed necessary by the Comptroller General to facilitate any audit of financial transactions pursuant to subsection (a) of this section. Such representatives shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians. All such property of such person or entity shall, to the extent practicable, remain in the possession and custody of such person or entity.

(c) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall make a report of each such audit to the Congress. Such report shall contain all comments and information which the Comptroller General deems necessary to inform Congress of the financial operations and conditions of the Fund and any recommendations which he deems advisable. Such report shall indicate specifically and describe in detail any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of such audit which the Comptroller General deems to have been carried on or made without lawful authority or which is inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of this Act. A copy of such report shall be furnished to the President, the Secretary and the appropriate Indian tribal governments under this Act at the time it is submitted to the Congress.•

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

S. 616. A bill to increase the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1993

• Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, as the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am introducing today S. 616, the proposed Veterans Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 1993. I am enormously pleased that the entire membership of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has joined me as original cosponsors of this important measure—including ranking Republican member FRANK MURKOWSKI and Senators DENNIS DECONCINI, GEORGE MITCHELL, BOB GRAHAM, DANIEL AKAKA, TOM DASCHLE, BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, STROM THURMOND, ALAN SIMPSON, ARLEN SPECTER, and JIM JEFFORDS.

Mr. President, this bill would increase, effective December 1, 1993, the rates of compensation paid to veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation, or DIC, paid to the survivors of certain service-disabled veterans. The rates would increase by the same percentage as the increase in Social Security and VA pension benefits. The compensation COLA would become effective on the same date that the increase for those benefits takes effect.

Mr. President, we have a fundamental obligation to address the needs of the 2.2 million service-disabled veterans and 345,000 survivors who depend on these compensation programs. The needs of these veterans and survivors are uniquely related to veterans' enormous sacrifices on behalf of our great Nation. Addressing these needs is a top priority of mine as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

I represent a State where military service is held in the highest esteem. Ever since I entered public life, to serve the people of West Virginia, I have worked very closely with our veterans and their families. The compensation payments that this bill would adjust affect the everyday lives of over 2½ million veterans and veterans' survivors. It is our responsibility to continue to provide COLA's in compensation and DIC benefits in order to ensure that the value of these top-priority, service-connected VA benefits is not eroded by inflation. Most recently, on October 24, 1992, Congress enacted Public Law 102-510, providing a 3-percent increase in these same benefits, effective December 1, 1992.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the December 1, 1993 Social Security and VA pension COLA will be 3 percent. This is a preliminary estimate, but I expect the actual increase will be close to this estimate. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that a 3-percent COLA would cost $325 million in budget authority and $324 million in outlays over current law.

Mr. President, I am proud that Congress has provided annual increases in VA compensation rates every fiscal year since 1976 and I urge all of my colleagues to continue to support these necessary increases.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 616

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION RATE INCREASES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, as provided in paragraph (2), increase, effective December 1, 1993, the rates of and limitations on Department of Veterans Affairs disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation.

(2)(A) The Secretary shall increase each of the rates and limitations provided for in section 1114, 1115(1), 1162, 1311, 1313, and 1314 of title 38, United States Code, that were increased pursuant to section 2 of the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-510; 106 Stat. 3318; 38 U.S.C. 101 note). The increase shall be made in such rates and limitations as in effect on November 30, 1993, and shall be by the same percentage that benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 1993, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(B) In the computation of increased rates and limitations pursuant to subparagraph (A), amounts of $0.50 or more shall be rounded to the next higher dollar amount and amounts of less than $0.50 shall be rounded to the next lower dollar amount.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons within the purview of section 10 of Public Law 85-857 (2 Stat. 1263) who are not in receipt of compensation payable pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

(c) PUBLICATION REQUIREMENT.—At the same time as the matters specified in section 214(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act 42

U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 1993, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the rates and limitations referred to in subsection (a)(2)(A) as increased under this section.●

By Mr. SIMON (for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. REID, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. ROBB):

S. 617. A bill to authorize research into the desalinization of water and water reuse and to authorize a program for States, cities, or any qualifying agency which desires to own and operate a desalinization of water reuse facility to develop such facilities; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

DESALINIZATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1993

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the Desalinization Research and Development Act of 1993. I am pleased to have bipartisan cosponsors from diverse regions of the country to join me in introducing this legislation. Cosponsors of this legislation include Senators MOYNIHAN, BRADLEY, JEFFORDS, BRYAN, REID, SHELBY, LIEBERMAN, and ROBB.

This bill is identical to legislation that passed the Senate unanimously during the summer of 1992. The purpose of my bill is to restart Federal research and development into desalinization—the process of removing salt or biological impurities from water in order to make it usable for drinking or irrigation.

Desalinization technologies have become more well-known as a result of water shortages in California and disputes over water in other parts of the country and the world. However, many may be surprised to learn that there are 3,500 desalinization plants in 105 countries throughout the world and in 46 States here in the United States. The main issue that still arises with regard to desalinization is its cost. Until more cost-effective technologies can be developed, more widespread use of desalinization technologies will be precluded.

Water shortages cause problems for economic development in areas as diverse as Africa, the Middle East, and Dothan, AL. During trips to the Middle East, I have heard Israeli Prime Ministers and Egyptian Presidents talk more about water than about oil. Many poverty-stricken African nations might be able to grow food to feed their people if they could somehow convert ocean water for irrigation. And in Dothan, AL, business people worry about access to the Chattahoochee River. Examples of disputes over access to water will only continue to grow in the years ahead.

Substantial Federal resources were committed to research and development of desalinization technology in the 1950's and 1960's. According to a report by the Office of Technology Assessment, the United States was generally considered to be at the forefront of desalinization technology throughout the 1960's and into the 1970's. Once governmental support ended, however, Japanese and European companies—many of which were, and still are, indirectly supported by their governments—began getting contracts that previously would have been awarded to American firms. In the face of growing domestic water shortages and strategic international concerns, the Federal Government should renew its commitment to developing low-cost desalinization technologies that can enable U.S. firms to regain their competitive edge in this field.

My legislation has two main parts. First, during Phase I, my bill authorizes the Departments of Interior and Army to conduct a basic research and development program designed to promote more cost-efficient desalinization technologies. During Phase II, demonstration projects will be built to test the new technologies developed during Phase I. The authorization is phased in over 5 years, which is critical if we hope to make any real progress in this area. Finally, my legislation calls upon the Agency for International Development to host a conference at which countries currently using, or hoping to use, desalinization technologies would meet.

Less than 1 percent of the Earth's water can be used directly for human consumption, or agricultural and industrial uses. The world will experience ever increasing needs for fresh water in the decades ahead. It is imperative that we begin to make investments in environmental technologies like desalinization now.

I urge my colleagues to take a close look at this legislation and the positive implications it could have for their States. The Senate passed this legislation unanimously last year. I hope we can do that again this year, and get this legislation enacted into law.●

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. GLENN, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 618. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit the admission to the United States of nonimmigrant students and visitors who are the spouses and children of United States permanent resident aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SPOUSAL AND CHILDREN IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1993

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation which would permit spouses and children of permanent residents to receive visitor and student visas. This bill is designed to correct an inequity which has kept foreign individuals from visiting their spouses or parents in the United States.

Under the Immigration Act of 1990, Congress increased the number of visas for spouses and children of permanent residents. In recent years, however, a 2-to 4-year backlog in the processing of immigrant visa petitions has caused lengthy separations for many families. While applicant spouses and children have patiently waited for the day when they could legally enter the United States as immigrants, they have remained in their home countries, apart from their loved ones.

In an effort to see family members in the United States during the multiyear waiting period, many spouses and children apply for visitor or student visas. Under current State Department policy, however, U.S. consular officials routinely reject these temporary visa requests. Because the spouses and children conveyed a desire to immigrate to this country in their permanent resident petitions, American consulates imply that they would stay indefinitely in the United States against the terms of their visitor or student visas. Following this policy, consular officers deny the visas, preventing immediate relatives of permanent residents of the United States from even seeing family members in this country.

The legislation that I am introducing today—containing the same language as S. 2385, which I sponsored in the 102d Congress—would remedy this situation. It would eliminate the implication that the existence of a petition for permanent residence implies that an applicant will not return to his or her home nation and would remain in the United States after the expiration of a temporary visa. This equitable solution simply grants to immigrant family members the same opportunity to visit the United States as all others desiring to come here as visitors or students.

This legislation anticipates the possibility that some may violate the terms of their visas by overstaying the period which the visa provides. It penalizes spouses or children of permanent residents who overstay their visas by allowing the Secretary of State to delay their permanent visa petitions for 1 year if visa durations are violated.

Mr. President, this legislation has received widespread support in Congress. In the Senate, the chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Affairs, Senator KENNEDY, is a cosponsor of the bill and has formally expressed his support for the measure on the Senate floor. Additionally, the bill has garnered several bipartisan cosponsors. In the House of Representatives, Chairman ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, and four other members of the Judiciary Subcommittee on International Law, Immigration, and Refugees, wrote to the State Department

urging it to take a similar action. "We strongly urge you," wrote the subcommittee members "to consider issuing a directive instructing consular officers to take special cognizance of the fact that the existence of an immigrant petition on file need not exclude favorable consideration of an application for a visitors visa coming from the spouse or child of a permanent resident." (April 3, 1992)

During the Presidential campaign, America heard much about the importance of the intact nuclear family. By joining me in remedying this unfortunate situation, we can afford families separated by an unfortunate administrative delay a better chance to remain together as a family unit. I urge my colleagues to support and cosponsor this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 618

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ADMISSION OF CERTAIN "B" AND "F" VISA NONIMMIGRANTS WHO ARE SPOUSES OR CHILDREN OF UNITED STATES PERMANENT RESIDENT ALIENS.

Section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(o)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no alien—

"(A) who is the spouse or child of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States,

"(B) who seeks admission to the United States for purposes of visiting the permanent resident spouse or parent or for studying in the United States, and

"(C) who is otherwise qualified,

may be denied issuance of a visa, or may be denied admission to the United States, as a nonimmigrant alien described in section 101(a)(15)(B) who is coming to the United States temporarily for pleasure or as a nonimmigrant alien described in section 101(a)(15)(F).

"(2) Whenever an alien described in paragraph (1) seeks admission to the United States as a nonimmigrant alien described in section 101(a)(15)(B) who is coming temporarily for pleasure or as a nonimmigrant alien described in section 101(a)(15)(F), the fact that a petition has been filed on the alien's behalf for classification of the alien as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence shall not constitute evidence of the alien's intention to abandon his or her foreign residence.

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any alien—

"(A) who is issued a nonimmigrant visa under paragraph (1),

"(B) who was admitted to the United States, and

"(C) who remains in the United States longer than the period authorized for such nonimmigrant status,

shall be ineligible to receive an immigrant visa for a period of up to one year after the alien's priority date has been reached, as the Secretary of State may determine.".●

By Mr. RIEGLE:

S. 619. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide improved services to beneficiaries under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SOCIAL SECURITY BILL OF RIGHTS ACT OF 1993

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, at the end of the last Congress I introduced S. 3377, the Social Security bill of rights. That legislation was designed to improve the delivery of services to people who receive benefits under the Social Security Act. It guaranteed the millions of people who rely on Social Security a system that is convenient to use, prompt in its delivery of service and responsive to their concerns. Today I am reintroducing this bill.

As was the case with S. 3377, this new legislation seeks to establish a minimum level of service quality in the system and to remove some of the barriers people have encountered when enrolling in Social Security programs. The legislation also makes other benefit programs—outside of Social Security, yet crucial for many Social Security beneficiaries—more available to people who need them. Let me briefly describe some of the rights I believe beneficiaries should have.

THE RIGHT TO A CONVENIENT SYSTEM

Many Social Security beneficiaries are also eligible for a number of different benefit programs, either under the Social Security Act or programs established under other laws. Unfortunately, the process for applying for these benefits is confusing and often difficult. The problem is further exacerbated by the fact that different agencies handle different benefit applications.

Let me give my colleagues an example. A senior citizen, who receives Social Security retirement benefits, might also qualify for the Supplemental Security Income [SSI] Program if they meet the necessary requirements. This same individual might also be eligible for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP], or for health care benefits under Medicaid, or for Food Stamps. This senior citizen can apply for SSI and Food Stamps at a local Social Security office. But LIHEAP applications in most States are available at either a community action agency or a local social services office—not at the Social Security Office. In order to get a Medicaid application, this person would have to go to a State welfare office.

The current system forces people to go several places to obtain benefits. This is inconvenient, confusing, and ultimately discourages many people from applying for benefits that they need. In many areas of the country, people do not have access to adequate public transportation—they have difficulty getting to just one office, much less several offices.

The Social Security bill of rights establishes a one-stop shopping system. Social Security field offices would distribute and accept applications for the Medicaid and LIHEAP programs. To facilitate the system, SSA will establish a training program for its workers so that they may provide accurate information and advice on completing the forms. The actual processing of the application will continue to be handled by the agencies responsible for it under current law. These agencies will also continue to accept applications directly.

This bill also contains provisions to improve telephone access to local Social Security field offices. Many of my colleagues will recall that in October 1989, the Social Security Administration [SSA] began diverting telephone calls made to local Social Security field offices to a national 800 number. The number of telephone lines to the local office were cut and local office phone numbers were removed from telephone directories. Problems plagued the 800 number system. People got busy signals when they called and, once given the chance to talk to a real person, often received incorrect and misleading information.

In the Ombibus Budget Reconciliation Act [OBRA] of 1990, the Congress required SSA to restore the public's telephone access to local offices at the level generally available on September 30, 1989, and to relist the numbers of the affected offices in local telephone directories. This mandate applied to 834 offices. SSA relisted the office telephone numbers in the directories, but refused to restore many of the phone lines. As a result, local Social Security offices targeted by OBRA 1990 have 30 percent fewer general inquiry lines than they had in place on September 30, 1989.

The General Accounting Office found that busy signal rates averaged 52.5 percent in those offices where public inquiry lines were not replaced, while the busy signal rate in those offices where the lines were maintained was 43.2 percent. Both of these busy signal rates are too high, but it is important to note that restoring the telephone lines at local offices does improve the service SSA provides to beneficiaries. The provision in this bill would require SSA to restore the number of lines to field offices to the September 30, 1989, level

THE RIGHT TO OUTREACH SERVICES

Many homebound senior citizens are eligible for programs like Food Stamps, LIHEAP, and Medicaid. Unfortunately, they do not have the ability to get to a local Social Security office or a local welfare office to find out about, and apply for these benefit programs. That is why the Social Security bill of rights would create an outreach

program for homebound seniors. SSA would work with local governments and social service agencies such as Area Agencies for the Aging, local mental health systems, charity groups, and cultural organizations, to identify who these homebound seniors are. SSA personnel will then visit these seniors to explain to them what benefit programs may be helpful to them and to help them apply for benefits.

PROTECTION FROM FRAUD AND ABUSE

Mr. President, in 1988 Congress enacted a law to prevent the misuse of symbols and emblems of the Social Security Administration and the Health Care Financing Administration [HCFA]. The purpose of the 1988 provision was to prohibit organizations from conveying the false impression that their materials and their mailings were endorsed by SSA or HCFA. The provisions in my bill builds upon this framework. It extends the law's coverage to the emblems of the Supplemental Security Income and Medicaid Programs and it prevents the unauthorized duplication of SSA forms and materials. Any penalties collected from the misuse of SSA's emblems and symbols must be deposited into the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. A provision similar to this one was included in the conference report of H.R. 11, the Revenue Act of 1992.

The Social Security bill of rights also addresses another serious problem facing senior citizens. Unscrupulous organizations take advantage of the elderly by the use of deception and scare tactics. I have received many calls and letters from seniors who have received mailings that suggest that the Social Security trust funds are out of money. Just imagine the horror and anxiety that a senior citizen must go through when they hear that Social Security—the sole source of income for many—is bankrupt.

Clearly there is a need to educate beneficiaries about the status of the Social Security trust funds. This legislation would require SSA to provide all beneficiaries of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund with information on its financial status, a description of how it is financed and a description of all services provided to beneficiaries free of charge. This information will be sent to all beneficiaries in the annual cost-of-living adjustment notice. We must let beneficiaries know that they need not worry about the financial status of the trust funds.

THE RIGHT TO UNDERSTANDABLE INFORMATION

Mr. President, according to an American Association of Retired Persons report, illiteracy and reading comprehension problems pose a significant barrier to getting benefits for older persons who do not speak English. Information about benefit programs as well as current outreach efforts are primarily aimed at the English-speaking population. Senior advocates in several States have noted a shortage of bilingual personnel in local Social Security offices despite large non-English-speaking populations in that area. This situation discourages people from getting benefits from which they qualify.

My legislation requires Social Security offices to provide materials in other languages where a significant number of people in the area served by the office do not speak English. The level of bilingual services required in the legislation is the same one that exists under the Food Stamp Program. This legislation would extend this requirement to additional Social Security Act programs. It is my hope that all Social Security offices will have bilingual personnel and applications on the premises to serve those people who do not use English as their first language within 180 days of enactment of this legislation.

THE RIGHT TO WORK

Mr. President, people who receive Social Security disability insurance benefits [SSDI] want to work. One man told me that he actually wants to pay taxes—think about it, someone who yearns to file an IRS 1040 form. But this gentleman, like many disabled people on SSDI, chose not to work because under the SSDI Program he could lose his medical benefits if he earned more than $500 a month.

The Social Security bill of rights creates a right to work by extending the work incentives provisions of the Supplemental Security Income [SSI] Program of the SSDI Program. Experience with this provision of SSI has shown that, for most disabled people, continued access to Medicaid health insurance coverage is the most important factor in their successful return to work. This program gives SSI beneficiaries the confidence that attempting to work will not disqualify them for benefits in the future should that work attempt fail. People on SSDI should have the same protection.

This provision is particularly timely now that the Americans with Disabilities Act [ADA] is in full effect. This landmark legislation guarantees that a person with a disability will not be discriminated against in employment and that they will have access to public places, including the workplace. But without adequate incentives to seek work, the promise and the dream of the ADA will go unfulfilled for millions.

ELIMINATION OF THE ONE-THIRD REDUCTION RULE

The Supplemental Security Income [SSI] Program protects millions of blind, aged, and disabled people from destitution by giving them the means to live independent lives. Last year, SSA completed the SSI modernization project, a comprehensive review of the SSI Program. The project convened a panel of experts to assess the SSI Program and make recommendations for improvements.

One of the key goals identified by the modernization project is included in this legislation—the repeal of the one-third reduction rule. The regular monthly SSI Federal benefit standard for 1993 is $434 for an individual and $652 for a couple—this translates into $5,208 and $7,824 per year, respectively. The Federal poverty level is $6,970 for individuals and $9,430 for couples. SSI recipients are living below the poverty level—and remember, these are low-income blind, aged, and disabled people—this Nation's most vulnerable citizens.

Under current law, SSI recipients face a penalty for living in the home of another person, whether that person is a friend or family member. Their benefits are subject to a one-third reduction—33 percent—for in-kind support and maintenance. In-kind support is not cash income, but is actual food, clothing, or shelter that is given to the recipient. SSA does not determine the actual value of any support received, it simply assumes that the total amount is one-third.

The modernization project's panel of experts identified several problems with the so-called one-third reduction rule. First, it pushes people who are already living below the poverty level even deeper into poverty. Second, the rule is demeaning. When a person applies for SSI, or when their eligibility is redetermined, they have to answer a battery of personal questions about their living arrangements—questions about household operating expenses and any help the household gets to meet expenses. One recipient testified before the experts that she was afraid to accept gifts from caregivers for fear that it would place her in violation of the rule. Statements are also obtained from other household members who are not receiving SSI benefits. This intrusion is unwarranted.

The one-third reduction rule is also a disincentive to families helping each other. Informal caregiving from friends and relatives provides valuable assistance to SSI recipients—particularly for the elderly. The rule only places a greater financial burden on the families of these recipients. What's more, the rule encourages moving the recipient out of the home and away from the people who can give them the greatest support. This occurs because SSI recipients who live in public housing are not subject to the rule, but those whose family members help them with housing costs receive a reduced benefit.

Finally, the one-third reduction rule poses administrative problems for SSA. The modernization panel heard testimony from field office employees who reported that the information gathering and decisionmaking process for determining in-kind support is highly subjective and is one of the most time-consuming and complex tasks they perform. Even the most experienced employees have trouble with it.

Mr. President, my legislation will eliminate the one-third reduction rule in order to ease the burden that the present rule places on the families of beneficiaries and the people who administer the program.

DEMONSTRATIONS PROJECTS TO IMPROVE SERVICE

There are two demonstration projects in this bill that I believe would improve the disability system. The first would eliminate, on an experimental basis, the reconsideration level in the disability determination appeals process for SSI and the Social Security Disability Insurance [SSDI] Programs. The disability determination system is plagued by a huge backlog causing lengthy delays in getting people benefits. Under the current system, State agencies are responsible for determining whether a person can qualify for benefits. If an individual's initial application is denied, they may file for a reconsideration of the ruling. The reconsideration is performed by the same State agency that rendered the initial denial of benefits. Very few of these initial denials are overturned in reconsideration.

Under my demonstration project, the States will no longer have to conduct the reconsideration, freeing up State personnel to conduct initial reviews. Instead of going to reconsideration, denied cases will proceed directly to the hearing level. It is my hope that this will result in a decrease in the backlog of cases at State disability determination services.

The second demonstration project would explore changing the orientation of the current SSDI Program from an early retirement system for people too disabled to continue working to a system designed to meet the needs of disabled workers. Under the current system, an individual applying for disability benefits is only evaluated from the narrow perspective of establishing the existence of a medical disability. An applicant has an incentive to heighten the severity of the disabling conditions while the administrators have an incentive to minimize existing maladies. Under current practice, a very complex determination is made with regard to the severity and duration of the disabling condition, and then a decision is made regarding whether a benefit is either awarded or denied.

The demonstration project I am proposing would alter the incentives contained in the current program by integrating a vocational rehabilitation evaluation into the initial and ongoing determination process. Prospective beneficiaries would be assessed based upon their rehabilitation potential as well as their disability.

Mr. President, the Social Security bill of rights will result in better delivery of services and benefits to millions. People who have low incomes; people with disabilities; the elderly—these people have a right to government services that respect their individual needs. This legislation would make Social Security a program that Americans can be proud of.•

By Mr. RIEGLE:

S. 620. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to overturn the new limitations placed on private enforceability of State plan requirements by Suter versus Artist, M., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

FOSTER CARE LEGISLATION

• Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to overturn the Supreme Court's opinion in the case of Suter versus Artist, M. In this case the Court ruled that individuals—mainly low-income children—did not have recourse through the Federal courts when States fail to implement State plan requirements under the title IV-E Foster Care Program of the Social Security Act. According to the Court, the only clear requirement of title IV-E was that States must have a written plan for implementing the program and that the plan must be approved by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. Under this ruling, individuals could only sue if a State did not have an approved plan.

The Suter ruling dealt a devastating blow to thousands of low-income children who potentially would be denied benefits and services that Congress intended them to receive. Although the underlying case in Suter involved the Foster Care Program, its reasoning could be applied broadly to other State plan programs such as Medicaid, Child Support Enforcement, and AFDC. Indeed, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals dismissed a suit in an AFDC case using the Suter reasoning. Other States have made attempts to use Suter as a basis for dismissing pending lawsuits in some of these other programs as well.

The legislation I am introducing today makes it clear that when the Congress places requirements in a statute, we intend for the States to follow them. If they fail in this, the Federal courts can order them to comply with the congressional mandate. For 25 years, this was the reading that the Supreme Court had given to our actions in Social Security Act State plan programs. The Suter decision represented a departure from this line of reasoning.

Mr. President, this legislation is the same as a provision included in the conference report to H.R. 11, the Revenue Act of 1992 at the end of the 102d Congress. The language in this bill was the product of lengthy negotiations between the two competing interests in the Suter debate; representatives of numerous social service advocacy groups on the one side and representatives of State governments—including the National Governor's Association—on the other. My bill seeks to restore these interests groups to the status they had prior to Suter without expanding the remedies available in Federal court.

Mr. President, I remember when the Federal courts—particularly the Supreme Court—were the last bastion of protection for the disadvantaged. The Suter decision changed that. It is time that we reopen the courthouse doors to these people. The people who need our social welfare programs must be able to protect their rights under the system. This bill presents us with an excellent opportunity to do that.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 11

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 11, a bill to combat violence and crimes against women on the streets and in homes.

S. 185

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the name of the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 185, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to restore to Federal civilian employees their right to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political processes of the Nation, to protect such employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes.

S. 211

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 211, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax credits for Indian investment and employment, and for other purposes.

S. 265

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 265, a bill to increase the amount of credit available to fuel local, regional, and national economic growth by reducing the regulatory burden imposed upon financial institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 268

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 268, a bill to extend the period during which the U.S. Trade Representative is required to identify trade liberalization priorities, and for other purposes.

S. 359

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] were added as cosponsors of S. 359, a bill to require the Secretary of Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, and for other purposes.

S. 377

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 377, a bill to require a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2000 and each year thereafter, to protect Social Security, to provide for zero-based budgeting and decennial sunsetting, to impose spending caps on the growth of entitlements during fiscal years 1994 through 2000, and to enforce those requirements through a budget process involving the President and Congress and sequestration.

S. 384

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 384, a bill to increase the availability of credit to small businesses by eliminating impediments to securitization and facilitating the development of a secondary market in small business loans, and for other purposes.

S. 415

At the request of Mr. BOREN, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 415, a bill to require the Attorney General to establish 10 military-style boot camp prisons.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to permit Governors to limit the disposal of out-of-State solid waste in their States, and for other purposes.

S. 455

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD] were added as cosponsors of S. 455, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to increase Federal payments to units of general local government for entitlement lands, and for other purposes.

S. 474

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the exemption for dependent children under age 18 to $3,500, and for other purposes.

S. 483

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] were added as cosponsors of S. 483, a bill to provide for the minting of coins in commemoration of Americans who have been prisoners of war, and for other purposes.

S. 564

At the request of Mr. FORD, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 564, a bill to establish in the Government Printing Office a means of enhancing electronic public access to a wide range of Federal electronic information.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. SASSER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to protect the free exercise of religion.

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] were added as cosponsors of S. 578, supra.

S. 587

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] were added as cosponsors of S. 587, a bill to establish the Mike Mansfield Fellowship Program for intensive training in the Japanese language, government, politics, and economy.

S. 600

At the request of Mr. BOREN, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] was added as a cosponsor of S. 600, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the targeted jobs credit.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 32

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 32, a joint resolution calling for the United States to support efforts of the United Nations to conclude an international agreement to establish an international criminal court.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 39

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. KRUEGER] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 39, a joint resolution designating the weeks beginning May 23, 1993, and May 15, 1994, as Emergency Medical Services Week.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 47

At the request of Mr. JOHNSTON, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 47, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning on November 21, 1993, and the week beginning on November 20, 1994, each as "National Family Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 51

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 51, a joint resolution designating the week commencing October 3, 1993, as "National Aviation Education Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 53

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 53, a joint resolution designating March 1993 and March 1994 both as "Women's History Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 56

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 56, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning April 12, 1993, as "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week."

SENATE RESOLUTION 35

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 35, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate concerning systematic rape in the conflict in the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

OMNIBUS CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RESOLUTION

HARKIN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 181

Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. WELLSTONE, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. WOFFORD, Mr. BUMPERS, and Mr. PRESSLER) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, as follows:

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

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE BARGE TAX.

It is the sense of the Senate that the revenue figure set forth in this resolution does not assume an increase in inland barge fuel taxes beyond those increases already scheduled in current law and nothing in this resolution should be considered to assume such a tax or fee.

NICKLES (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 182

Mr. NICKLES (for himself, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. WALLOP, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LOTT, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BOND, Mr. BROWN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SMITH, Mr. GREGG, Mr. BURNS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. HELMS, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. COATS, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. DOLE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. ROTH,

Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. DURENBERGER, and Mr. GORTON) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), supra, as follows:

On page 2, line 18, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.
On page 2, line 19, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.
On page 3, line 2, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.
On page 3, line 4, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.
On page 3, line 6, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.
On page 3, line 10, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.
On page 4, line 9, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.
On page 4, line 11, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.
On page 5, line 1, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.
On page 5, line 2, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.
On page 5, line 3, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.
On page 41, line 17, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.
On page 41, line 24, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.
On page 41, line 25, decrease the amount by $9,438,000,000.
On page 42, line 6, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.
On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by $17,007,000,000.
On page 42, line 13, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.
On page 42, line 14, decrease the amount by $22,127,000,000.
On page 42, line 20, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.
On page 42, line 21, decrease the amount by $23,458,000,000.
On page 50, line 9, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.
On page 50, line 10, decrease the amount by $72,982,000,000.
On page 57, line 18, decrease the amount by $952,000,000.
On page 57, line 19, decrease the amount by $72,982,000,000.

KENNEDY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 183

Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. DODD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. RIEGLE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), as follows:

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. . ASSUMPTIONS.

In setting forth the budget authority and outlay amounts in this resolution, Congress assumes that the Head Start program will be funded at the level requested by the President for fiscal year 1998.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, 9:30 a.m., March 18, 1993, to receive testimony on S. 473, the Department of Energy National Competitiveness Technology Partnership Act of 1993.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 18, 1993, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing on the nomination of Lawrence H. Summers to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 18, 1993, at 4:30 p.m., to hold a closed hearing on intelligence matters.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Consumer Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 18, 1993, at 9 a.m., on telemarketing fraud.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL SERVICES, POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Federal Services, Post Office, and Civil Service, Committee on Governmental Affairs, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 18, 1993, to receive the annual report of the Postmaster General of the United States.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINERAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Mineral Resources Development and Production of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, 2 p.m., March 18, 1993, to receive testimony on S. 558, the Northern Mariana Islands Act of 1993.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

BELMONT SCHOOL "AMERICA'S BEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS"

• Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am very proud to recognize and honor the students, parents, faculty, and administrators of the Belmont School in Grand Forks, ND, for their dedication and hard work which has resulted in the school's designation by Redbook magazine as one of "America's Best Elementary Schools."

This outstanding tribute for the Belmont School was announced in the recently released April 1993, issue of Redbook magazine. Redbook recognized Belmont as one of 177 outstanding elementary schools across the Nation. A total of 550 schools among the Nation's 50,000 elementary schools had been nominated by school administrators and educators for this Redbook magazine honor.

In addition, the Belmont School was among 51 elementary schools designated on Redbook's "Best of the States" list. According to Redbook magazine this designation was recommended by 12 national education ex-

perts on the basis of the school's innovative curricula, compassionate faculty, impressive test scores, and an uncompromising commitment to excellence.

Mr. President, North Dakotans are honored that Belmont has been chosen among "America's Best Elementary Schools". This is an honor that, without question, has involved considerable hard work and a commitment to excellence by Belmont School officials, teachers, and parents—all contributing to an exceptional learning environment.

As we consider proposals for education reform and the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 during the 103d Congress, it is most important that we carefully examine the accomplishments and unique programs of these 177 elementary schools—"America's Best Elementary Schools." These schools are clearly on the right track, and we can learn much from their accomplishments as we debate education reform.

I extend my warmest congratulations to the parents, faculty, administrators, and students at the Belmont School for their hard work in achieving this outstanding honor as "America's Best".

Mr. President, I ask that the articles from Redbook magazine of April 1993, entitled "America's Best Elementary Schools" and the Grand Forks Herald of March 14, 1993, entitled "Belmont One of Nation's Top Schools" be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The articles follow:

AMERICA'S BEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

(By Michael J. Weiss)

Three years ago, Craycroft Elementary School in Tucson, Arizona, was an example of everything wrong with public schools. Each day, nearly 15 percent of its 350 students missed class. Home-work was ignored and standardized test scores were among the area's worst.

Then Craycroft, whose student population is about half white and half Hispanic, urged parents to get more involved. The results: Classroom volunteers jumped from 7 to 150. PTO members made house calls to other parents to help tutor their children. With equipment contributed by local businesses, parents helped set up a computer lab and science center.

Today Craycroft is an educational showcase. Some 60 percent of its graduating fifth graders score higher than the national norm on standardized tests. Attendance is 97 percent. Principal Franklin Narducci credits the fact that children learn best when adults show they care about school for the dramatic turnaround.

Success stories like Craycroft's may seem like the exception rather than the rule. But the untold story of American education is that many of the nation's 59,015 elementaries are succeeding.

Indeed, in our annual America's Best Schools project, we found 177 public elementaries worthy of honor, including rich and poor schools, inner city and suburban schools, schools with 200 students and those with more than 1,300. What the winners all have in common is a commitment to finding the best ways to meet the needs of today's young students. They know that a child's first school experiences set the stage for lifelong learning.

But because there's no agreement on how to create the perfect school, the best ones devote an impressive amount of time to experimenting with an array of programs to enhance learning. Such grass roots reforms are steadily changing the way we educate our children:

No more rote learning: Gone is the back-to-basics revival of the eighties with its emphasis on memorization. Educators no longer think kids' heads should just be stuffed full of facts. Instead, the goal is to make pupils independent thinkers. "Kids don't learn much when they're faced with passive activities," says Henry Levin, Ph.D., a Stanford University professor whose Accelerated Schools Project has been adopted by more than 325 schools. Rather than assign fill-in-the-blank work sheets, for instance, teachers at Daniel Webster Accelerated School in San Francisco may ask third-grade students to critique "Charlotte's Web" or fourth graders to analyze "The Cosby Show."

Derailing "tracking:" Although tracking—the practice of grouping children by ability—is still used in about 60 percent of U.S. elementary schools, it's losing favor. Although it may be efficient to move like-minded pupils along in unison, often only the smartest students—who get all the educational goodies—profit. At the low end, classes look more like the Sweathogs from the old sitcom "Welcome Back, Kotter." And a growing number of researchers say that tracking is self-fulfilling: As disadvantaged kids fall years behind their grade levels, they grow to dislike school. Better, they say, to mix children at different levels in the same classroom. They cite studies showing that such classes increase everyone's achievement, including gifted students who help tutor their classmates.

Growing the school year: At 178 days, American kids have one of the shortest school years among industrialized nations. Japanese youngsters, by contrast, go to school for 210 days. The number of year-round schools is rising, albeit slowly: 2,017 public schools have now abolished long summer vacations, substituting shorter breaks throughout the year. (Though many educators know year-round schools could close the performance gap, cost is the major obstacle. An estimated $1 billion is needed for every extra day spent teaching the nation's 42.25 million public-school children.)

Helping the urban poor: A growing number of schools are making an effort to reach disadvantaged students. "Many kids under economic and social stress need special services," says James Comer, M.D., a psychiatrist and director of the Yale University Child Study Center School Development Program. "But most of all, they need an attitude that says, You can succeed." A Dr. Comer-designed program that strives to build an active partnership between parents, teachers, and social workers has been adopted at some 250 schools.

If one lesson is clear, it's that schools must change as our society does. By constantly revitalizing themselves, our 177 winners are leading the way to sparking excellence in all schools.

DOES YOUR SCHOOL MAKE THE GRADE?

Review the following qualities shared by our winners to see if your school measures up.

Involved parents: Winning schools find creative ways to include busy parents in their children's education. At Boston's Mather Elementary, principal M. Kim Marshall sends parents a weekly one-page guide about their kids' schoolwork. At George Washington Carver Elementary School in San Francisco, parents can drop by at their convenience, and take math and reading workshops so they can better tutor their kids. In many top schools, 90 percent of the parents volunteer their time.

A committed principal: Principals of the best schools are determined and caring, and dedicated to children above and beyond the call. At Baltimore's Samuel Coleridge-Taylor Elementary School, principal Deborah Wortham goes door-to-door to introduce herself to parents. R. Karen Craig, the principal at Naches Valley Primary in Yakima, Washington, shares a cafeteria lunch with a different child each day until, by year's end, she's met every pupil.

Nurturing teachers: Outstanding teachers are not only qualified in their craft, they also respect the different ways kids learn, and are dedicated to having all students do their best. At Union Elementary School in Montpelier, Vermont, students who need extra nurturing are often taught by the same teacher for two or three years. At Westridge Elementary in Raytown, Missouri, teams of teachers identify students with academic or emotional problems and then assign a "care teacher" to provide daily encouragement.

An emphasis on the written word: Instead of work sheets and "Dick and Jane" readers, these schools offer a "whole language" approach, meaning kids write at every opportunity and work at developing speaking skills. At Dutch Fork Elementary in Irmo, South Carolina, an in-school mail system encourages younger students to write to their teachers and each other. At the best schools, keeping a journal is as common as carrying a lunchbox.

Hands-on-learning: Experts estimate that 75 percent of all children learn faster and retain more through real-world experiences. Top elementaries feature nature trails, environmental labs, and simulated communities. At E. F. Swinney Applied Learning Magnet in Kansas City, Missouri, students plant gardens and publish their own newspapers. Sixth graders at Mountain Brook Elementary School in Birmingham, Alabama, observe a trial at a county courthouse and then invite a local judge to preside over a mock student trial.

Innovative use of technology: Until recently, high technology at most elementary schools meant an overhead projector and some shared VCRs. But at leading schools such as Floranada Elementary School in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, pupils produce a closed-circuit television program every morning. Many of the nation's best schools fully integrate computers into daily learning by first grade; some even allow students to borrow computers like library books.

Alternative assessments: Progressive elementary schools know that success can't be measured by standardized multiple-choice tests alone. At New Suncook School in Lovell, Maine, teachers evaluate their students through written reports, oral presentations, and group projects. And students contribute a journal entry and a written self-portrait as part of their assessments.

Supportive learning environment: The finest elementaries thrive because they create a climate of high expectations. Dr. Lawrence A. Nixon Elementary in El Paso, Texas, treats all of its 425 students as gifted, providing them with an accelerated curriculum that features laser-disc science equipment.

Exemplary schools reward student success—no matter the arena—with bulletin board displays, awards assemblies, and positive letters home.

Community alliances: Besides the usual visits by local police and fire chiefs, top schools enjoy presentations by business leaders, writers, college professors, and artists. They take students on field trips to see how offices and factories work as well as attend concerts and other cultural events.—M.J.W.

BEST OF THE STATES

Our blue-ribbon panel of education experts judged these 51 schools (one from each state and the District of Columbia) to be among America's top public elementaries. The secret to their success? They combine innovative curricula, compassionate teachers, impressive test scores, and an uncompromising commitment to excellence.

AMERICA'S TOP PUBLIC ELEMENTARIES

State	School and city	Comments
Alabama	Cahaba Heights Community School—Birmingham	This suburban school for 850 prides itself on involved parents (1,520 belong to the PTO) and an innovative curriculum: Students keep journals, correspond with foreign pen pals, and publish a school newspaper.
Alaska	Susitna—Anchorage	To encourage students to become self-directed, Susitna's 600 pupils set their own academic goals, develop plans to achieve them, and lead conferences with their parents and teachers to evaluate their progress.
Arizona	Craycroft—Tucson	This once-troubled school has become a source of state pride by providing its 365 students with unusual learning settings, including a biosphere, desert trail, First Interstate Banking/Math Lab, and Kids' Kitchen; parents can take classes in math, science, computers, and parenting skills.
Arkansas	George Washington Carver Magnet—Little Rock	The state's first elementary math-and-science magnet offers its 603 students a superior curriculum, including a weekly astronomy class. One third of the students are gifted, and 90 percent excel in higher-order thinking skills.
California	Rooftop Alternative School—San Francisco	Rooftop's 339 students achieve impressive results, thanks to award-winning teachers and community consultants who specialize in art, architecture, and science.
Colorado	Nederland—Nederland	This rural school has pioneered a ground breaking space curriculum with hands-on lessons in math, science, and computer technology. To simulate solar-powered space research, students even grow hydroponic plants within a geodesic dome.
Connecticut	Columbus Magnet School—South Norwalk	This exemplary inner-city magnet has overcome numerous urban ills by offering its 328 students high-quality programs in writing and art-appreciation as well as in space exploration and child sexual-abuse awareness.
Delaware	Cedar Lane—Middletown	The 414 students at this rural school are offered myriad extracurricular activities, including French and Spanish courses, music and art clubs, and a calculator team.
District of Columbia	John Eaton—Washington	A novel parent group organizes after-school tutors, funds engaging math courses, and awards faculty grants for special projects.
Florida	Alimacani—Jacksonville	With 475 parents serving as classroom aides, 227 community members involved as mentors and tutors, and 33 business partners providing more than $350,000 in supplies and equipment, this suburban school for 1,301 students thrives.
Georgia	I.N. Ragsdale—Atlanta	A model urban school, Ragsdale offers its 351 students an impressive array of extracurricular activities, such as a mentoring program for at-risk pupils, tutoring for classroom enrichment, rap sessions for girls, and an Honor Court to recognize achievements by all.
Hawaii	Kapunahala—Kaneohe	Many of the 543 students at this suburban school produce a weekly telecast, "Inside Kapunahala," that's earned state recognition for teaching language and video-production skills.
Idaho	Sorensen—Coeur d'Alene	Sorensen's 332 students not only help manage the school as peer mediators and student-council representatives, they also organize clubs—in art, drama, and chess—and recruit teachers and parents to act as adivisers.
Illinois	Prescott—Chicago	Serving a poor inner-city population, Prescott has turned itself into a "community learning laboratory," providing students and parents with access to social workers, physicians, college tutors, and business mentors.
Indiana	IPS Key School No. 97—Indianapolis	Described as a cross between a children's museum and a school, Key develops its 179 students' varied abilities through multiage classes; elective courses; daily instruction in music, art, and computers; and nontraditional grading by video presentations and art and writing portfolios.
Iowa	Fillmore—Davenport	This city school reports high test scores and a daily attendance rate above 96 percent, thanks to innovative teaching techniques such as computer-assisted math instruction, peer tutors, and a writing center that published 750 books last year.
Kansas	Village—Emporia	Nearly half of the 554 students at this school voluntarily enroll in summer school courses that include painting, computer math, aeronautics, and field science.
Kentucky	The Virginia Wheeler—Louisville	This progressive primary mixes pupils by ability, not age; students submit video portfolios and other examples of their work for evaluation by teams of teachers—80 percent of whom hold advanced degrees. parents receive weekly progress reports.
Louisiana	Glendale—Eunice	With its computer lab, after-school tutorials, daily French lessons for fourth grades, and award-winning Four-H Club, Glendale provides its 380 students with an enviable, well-rounded program.
Maine	Narragansett School—Gorham	Reform-minded Narragansett offers its 440 students flexible scheduling, multiage classes, gradeless learning, and teacher teams to design class curricula.
Maryland	Forest Knolls—Silver Spring	A suburban school for 475, Forest Knolls has an interdisciplinary curriculum serving three populations: neighborhood K through sixth graders, students with physical disabilities, and those attending a magnet program in communication arts.
Massachusetts	Alfred J. Gomes Magnet School—New Bedford	This inner city magnet for 744 offers a novel career-oriented curriculum in which students take hands-on classes in carpentry, cooking, and computer skills.
Michigan	Chrysler—Detroit	The 230 students here can boast of their impressive 98 percent attendance rate and their award-winning newspaper, Flash, which they write, edit, and publish all year—even during summer vacation.
Minnesota	Cyrus Math, Science, and Technology—Cyrus	This small rural magnet for 110 students is dedicated to innovation from the top—with its teachers sharing the principal's job—down to kindergarten classrooms that are equipped with a reading loft. The ratio of students to computers is 3 to 1.
Mississippi	The Hayes Cooper Center for Math, Science & Technology—Merigold	With a 99 percent attendance rate, this magnet for 190 begins computer instruction in kindergarten. The 13 to 1 teacher-student ratio and a 280-member PTA helped nearly 10 percent of the students win awards at a recent statewide science fair.
Missouri	Wilkinson Early Childhood Magnet Center—St. Louis	Believing that all children learn through discovery, this urban magnet teaches 287 students all the basic skills through the study of science; 1,000 students applied for this past year's 50 openings.
Montana	Garfield Grade School—Billings	Through 91 percent of its 440 students come from low-income families, Garfield consistently wins state and national awards for academic achievement, thanks to a rigorous program that includes hands-on science projects, nearly two hours a day devoted to communication arts, and good-citizen awards.
Nebraska	Fontenelle—Omaha	Fontenelle has become a community center thanks to an outstanding array of after-school classes, including evening computer courses for parents and students, a study center for practicing classroom skills, and challenging activity clubs.
Nevada	Smithridge—Reno	The 640 students get heavy doses of individual attention from foster grandparents, tutors, and business mentors, and lots of extracurricular activities.
New Hampshire	Harold Martin School—Hopkinton	To promote self-reliance, Harold Martin has its 292 students publish their own books, conduct independent research at its award-winning media center, and participate in a "mini-mentor" program matching K through second- and first- through third-grade students in a number of interactive projects and musical programs.
New Jersey	Harriet Tubman—Newark	At Harriet Tubman, students consistently score above the national average on standardized tests due to a program that includes all-day kindergarten, computer lab for every pupil, and even Suzuki-method violin lessons.
New Mexico	Loma Heights—Las Cruces	A model language-arts program offers this school's 495 students an early-morning reading club, poetry-based murals, science and math journals, and a Young Author's Conference to celebrate student writings.
New York	Public School No. 87M—New York City	The 1,127 students at this ethnically diverse school excel thanks to a literature-based reading program, hands-on math activities—and a family atmosphere preserved by parent volunteers and student teachers from six colleges.
North Carolina	Konnoak—Winston-Salem	A successful restructuring effort has introduced the 393 students to team teaching, multiage classes, enriched arts courses, and increased computer literacy.
North Dakota	Belmont—Grand Forks	At Belmont, many of the 314 students take advantage of the school's long list of enrichment activities, notably the Art Smart program, where parents serve as volunteers to assist in pottery, folk art, and mask making.
Ohio	Duxberry Park Arts IMPACT Alternative—Columbus	This novel magnet school integrates the arts with academic coursework. Students might learn about China by mounting a theatrical production complete with songs, dances, and elaborate sets.
Oklahoma	Polk—Oklahoma City	Closed the previous year because of low performance, this urban school has come back with astonishing 28 percent gains in test scores, thanks to a 16 to 1 student-teacher ratio, extended days, and a community alumni group that provides mentors and academic incentives.
Oregon	Slater/Filmore School—Burns	This school has developed a formula for excellence by combining cross-curriculum activities (a unit on insects involves scientific research, poetry, and art) with recognition program for good grades, perfect attendance, and positive behavior.
Pennsylvania	M. Hall Stanton—Philadelphia	Set in an inner city neighborhood, Stanton succeeds by offering its 715 students an intensive academic program, lots of tutoring, incentives for attendance, and the support of an active PTA where all families are involved.
Rhode Island	Francis J. Varieur—Pawtucket	A pioneer in the use of classroom technology, Varieur has its 419 students use computers to write short stones, solve math problems, and keep track of the academic progress.
South Carolina	Oakbrook—Ladson	Oakbrook's 800 pupils participate in a program that features symphony trips and art contests, an all-day media center, an open-door policy for parents, and a newcomers' club that makes the school's highly transient student population feel at home.
South Dakota	Cleghorn Canyon—Rapid City	This school for 250 students revitalized its curriculum by lengthening the school day, adding arts activities, increasing student-teacher contact, and upping the number of parents who serve on school committees.
Tennessee	Brookmeade—Nashville	Parents of Brookmeade's students dial an electronic voice mailbox to hear their child's teacher report on homework assignments, the day's activities, and schedule changes.
Texas	Dr. Lawrence A. Nixon—El Paso	To present real-world learning experiences to its 425 students, Nixon has created a simulated community, with students operating a post-office, grocery store, and more.
Utah	West—St. George	This year-round school features an arts program that integrates music, dance, drama, and the visual arts into the core curriculum; students can display their art-work in four schoolwide galleries.
Vermont	Union—Montpelier	At this progressive elementary, students choose either a conventional single-grade classroom, a multiage class for up to three consecutive years, or a "looping" single-grade class with the same teacher and students for two straight years.

AMERICA'S TOP PUBLIC ELEMENTARIES—Continued

State	School and city	Comments
Virginia	Strawbridge—Virginia Beach	Despite its large student body (1,167 pupils), Strawbridge succeeds thanks in part to a core of parents who volunteer in the classroom, shelve books in the library, and teach after-school classes in Japanese, Spanish, and sign language.
Washington	Naches Valley Primary School—Yakima	Serving a diverse rural population of 423, Naches Valley organizes Family Science Nights at school, hosts student lunches with the principal, and offers peer teaching.
West Virginia	Elm Grove—Wheeling	Elm Grove's comprehensive program for 353 offers computer instruction at all grade levels, before- and after-school kindergarten care, and varied extracurricular activities such as chorus, strings, and band.
Wisconsin	Milwaukee Spanish Immersion School—Milwaukee	This city school not only trains its 510 English-speaking students to become fluent in Spanish, it also offers peer mediators, senior citizen mentors, and involved parents who log nearly 6,600 hours of volunteer service each year.
Wyoming	Pine Bluffs—Pine Bluffs	A pioneer in the "Schools of the 21st Century" model, Pine Bluffs operates from 6:30 a.m. to 6 p.m., offering child care, parental-involvement activities, and programs where students explore job opportunities and the hazards of drug abuse

CATEGORY WINNERS

Our judging panel selected the following 126 schools as the best in their respective categories. The honored schools are listed alphabetically by state within each category; one school from each category is highlighted to provide a more detailed portrait of its successful formula.

Overall excellence

These 72 well-rounded schools excel in many ways. They offer students a success-oriented mix of a creative curriculum and varied extracurricular activities, nurturing teachers, and supportive parent and community members.

Indian Creek Elementary, Indianapolis, Indiana: Despite only modest financial support from a socio-economically diverse community, Indian Creek Elementary still manages to excel thanks to grants, fund-raisers, and a committed faculty. The school offers its 533 students the latest learning tools—including one computer for every two students. But it's not the high-tech wizardry alone that makes this school exceptional. A six-acre outdoor nature center is a living lesson in botany. A nationally recognized artists-in-residence program teaches weaving, mime, and storytelling. And fourth- and fifth-grade students in the French Back-to-Back program take a three-week trip to France while stateside classmates interact with French exchange students. Indian Creek boasts a 98 percent attendance rate and higher than average test scores. "We thrive because our parents and teachers want to be the best," says principal Karen Gould, Ed.D.

Elementary School, City/State

Jim Pearson, Alexander City, Alabama.
Mountain Brook, Birmingham, Alabama.
Westwood, Springdale, Arkansas.
Ezequiel A. Balderas, Fresno, California.
Glenn E. Murdock, La Mesa, California.
Union House, Sacramento, California.
Daniel Webster Accelerated School, San Francisco, California.
Dr. George Washington Carver, San Francisco, California.
Killingly Central School, Dayville, Connecticut.
Stratfield School, Fairfield, Connecticut.
Union School, Unionville, Connecticut.
Tilford W. Miller School, Wilton, Connecticut.
Clover Street School, Windsor, Connecticut.
Floranada, Fort Lauderdale, Florida.
Oak Hill, Jacksonville, Florida.
Southwest, Lakeland, Florida.
Aikahi, Kailua, Hawaii.
Grove Avenue School, Barrington, Illinois.
Daniel Webster School No. 46, Indianapolis, Indiana.
Indian Creek, Indianapolis, Indiana.
East, Pendleton, Indiana.
Tecumseh-Harrison, Vincennes, Indiana.
Valley Park, Overland Park, Kansas.
Arlington, Lexington, Kentucky.
Mary G. Hogsett, Danville, Kentucky.
Millard, Pikeville, Kentucky.
Audubon Montessori School, New Orleans, Louisiana.
New Suncook School, Lovell, Maine.
Mt. Washington, Baltimore, Maryland.
Sanborn School, Andover, Massachusetts.
Graham & Parks Alternative Public School, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Nantucket, Nantucket, Massachusetts.
Barton, Detroit, Michigan.
Blue Earth, Blue Earth, Minnesota.
New Hope, New Hope, Minnesota.
Susan Lindgren Intermediate Center, St. Louis Park, Minnesota.
D.T. Cox, Pontotoc, Mississippi.
Midway Heights, Columbia, Missouri.
E.F. Swinney Applied Learning Magnet, Kansas City, Missouri.
Cambridge School, Kendall Park, New Jersey.
Sandyston-Walpack School, Layton, New Jersey.
Littleton, Morris Plains, New Jersey.
Dutch Neck School, Princeton Junction, New Jersey.
Hillrise, Las Cruces, New Mexico.
Benjamin Franklin, Binghamton, New York.
West Frankfort, Frankfort, New York.
Tangier Smith P.S. 75, Mastic Beach, New York.
The Emily Dickinson School P.S. 124, New York, New York.
The Yung Wing Elementary School, New York, New York.
Fox Meadow, Scarsdale, New York.
Wantagh, Wantagh, New York.
Barrington Road, Upper Arlington, Ohio.
Caledonia School, East Cleveland, Ohio.
Morgan, Hamilton, Ohio.
Alameda, Portland, Oregon.
Bradford School, Bradford, Rhode Island.
Buist Academy, Charleston, South Carolina.
Satchel Ford, Columbia, South Carolina.
Dutch Fork, Irmo, South Carolina.
Vermillion, Vermillion, South Dakota.
Tulip Grove, Hermitage, Tennessee.
DuPont, Old Hickory, Tennessee.
Ortega, Austin, Texas.
Stonewall Jackson, Dallas, Texas.
Bunker Hill, Houston, Texas.
Christa McAuliffe, Lewisville, Texas.
Huffman, Plano, Texas.
Shepard, Plano, Texas.
W.H.L. Wells, Plano, Texas.
Fidalgo, Anacortes, Washington.
Phantom Lake, Bellevue, Washington.
Milwaukee German Immersion School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Significant Improvement

Despite a lack of resources affluent schools take for granted, these 12 schools have made significant gains in academic achievement, attendance rates, and student behavior. Their strategies are both innovative and inspirational.

Baker's Chapel Elementary, Greenville, South Carolina: For years, Baker's Chapel Elementary had a reputation for mediocrity. But with the 1983 hiring of principal Nancy Farnsworth, everything changed. She insisted that every night the 317 students complete homework in math and reading. Each month, they had to write a book report, finish a science and social studies project, and memorize a poem. Each teacher was required to host three field trips and three outside speakers per year, as well as write one grant application annually. Today the school's curriculum, teachers, and principal have all won awards. Between 1983 and 1990, test scores in reading doubled; in mathematics, they tripled. "If you expect kids to achieve, they're going to," observes Farnsworth.

Elementary School, City/State

Library, Midway, Georgia.
S. Ellen Jones, New Albany, Indiana.
Shady Grove, Monroe, Louisiana.
Samuel Coleridge-Taylor, Baltimore, Maryland.
Mather, Dorchester, Massachusetts.
Dag Hammarskjold School No. 6, Rochester, New York.
Winter Place Primary School, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Pierce, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.
Baker's Chapel, Greenville, South Carolina.
Whiteville, Whiteville, Tennessee.
Montgomery, Farmers Branch, Texas.
Tiskelwah, Charleston, West Virginia.

Classroom Innovation

Recognizing that not everyone works best in traditional learning settings, these six standout schools are honored for implementing creative and successful curriculum projects to better reach their students.

Yonkers Public School No. 29, Yonkers, New York: Nature is at the heart of the learning process at School No. 29. The school boasts a wildlife bird sanctuary, and students learn about local plants and animals at workshops taught by rangers and scientists. While many schools feature recycling programs, School No. 29 has taken its program further, integrating the environment into all subject areas. The school's three wings are divided into geographic regions—like oceans, marshlands, and deserts—so teachers can develop thematic units for math and reading. Recently, students won a national award for a primer about recycling. "We want students to understand that ecology is a way of life," says principal Marilyn Walder, "not something on a bumper sticker."

Elementary School, City/State

Susan Roll Leach School No.± 68, Indianapolis, Indiana.
Stanton, Stanton, Kentucky.
Bach Open Classroom Program, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
Pierre Laclede, St. Louis, Missouri.
Saco Public School, Saco, Montana.
Yonkers Public School No. 29, Yonkers, New York.

Special-Needs Programs

The judges honored these ten schools for their exceptional efforts to meet the needs of those with physical, emotional, or behavioral learning disabilities.

Vilonia Elementary, Vilonia, Arkansas: At rural Vilonia Elementary, one third of the pupils in some classes of the third to fifth grades are "differently abled," as the school calls them. Everyone learns together thanks to teachers who are jointly certified in elementary and special education, and the fact that kids with disciplinary problems are paired with high school students who serve as role models. Physically or mentally limited pupils work with gifted fifth graders during science activities. "Our goal is to get all students to accept that everyone has a problem of some sort," says principal Ed Bradshaw, who reports that improved self-esteem among all students is the result.

Elementary School, City/State

Educational Program for the Individual Child, Birmingham, Alabama.
Vilonia, Vilonia, Arkansas.
Linda Vista, San Diego, California.
John Quincy Adams, District of Columbia.
Ala Wai, Honolulu, Hawaii.
Hartman, Omaha, Nebraska.
Sarah Collins, Greenville, South Carolina.
Beacon Heights, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Gilbert Linkous, Blacksburg, Virginia.
Emily Dickinson, Redmond, Washington.

Extracurricular Activities

Unlike schools that lock their doors after classes, the five winners in this category excel in offering challenging and mind-expanding activities to enrich students' lives.

Vaughn Road Elementary School, Montgomery, Alabama: For many kids in the Montgomery area, the biggest draw in town for sheer fun isn't the local mall or video arcade. It's Vaughn Road Elementary School's activities program. Once a month, the school's 629 students skip their routine in favor of taking courses in everything from bowling and cake decorating to oceanography and jazz dance. Like free universities, the 42 course offerings are taught by parents, teachers, and business leaders (and funded by a $6,000 grant from a local councilman).

Elementary School, City/State

Vaughn Road, Montgomery, Alabama.
Eccleston, Orlando, Florida.
Frederick Funston Elementary, Chicago, Illinois.
Alpine School, Sparta, New Jersey.
John B. Dey Elementary, Virginia Beach, Virginia.

Parent/Community Involvement

At these 21 schools, supportive parents and community members play a crucial role. These elementaries are honored for their success at turning parent/community involvement into school improvement.

Richey Elementary School, Tucson, Arizona: Many elementary schools look to parents to raise money for T-shirts or trees. But at Richey Elementary School, the parents help preserve their local Indian and Mexican culture. Every day, about ten parents and grandparents volunteer in the trilingual classrooms, serving as tutors and translators, to teach indigenous arts to the 200 pupils who are 47 percent Hispanic, 43 percent Yaqui Indian, and 10 percent black, white, or Asian. Richey also hosts bilingual workshops to teach parents health and parenting skills. Such community activism, says principal Betty Brichta Garcia, has increased student confidence and decreased dropouts. "Here, students graduate with one foot in the majority culture and one in their family culture. And that gives them a better chance at success."

Elementary School, City/State

Pepperell Intermediate School, Opelika, Alabama.
Richey, Tucson, Arizona.
San Juan, San Juan Capistrano, California.
Christopher Columbus School, New Haven, Connecticut.
Lulu M. Ross, Milford, Delaware.
Banyan Creek Community, Delray Beach, Florida.
Fourth Street, Athens, Georgia.
Swainsboro Primary School, Swainsboro, Georgia.
Jose Clemente Orozco Community Academy, Chicago, Illinois.
Muessel, South Bend, Indiana.
Carmody Hills, Capitol Heights, Maryland.
Columbia Park, Landover, Maryland.
Snail Lake, Shoreview, Minnesota.
Westridge, Raytown, Missouri.
Tomasita, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
P.S. 146, New York, New York.
Glenwood, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.
East Goshen, West Chester, Pennsylvania.
Oak, Bartlett, Tennessee.
North Summit, Coalville, Utah.
Atenville, Harts, West Virginia.

HOW OUR GREAT SCHOOLS WERE FOUND

Redbook's America's Best Schools project solicited nominations from the experts: state departments of education, national education organizations, members of the U.S. House of Representatives, and education reporters. School principals then filled out nomination forms, providing quantitative data as well as essays, videos, or clippings. All told, 555 schools sent in detailed nomination packets from every state and the District of Columbia. In an initial review, graduate students from Teachers College, Columbia University in New York City, selected 360 finalists. Then the following panel of 12 judges—all leading education experts—named the 177 winning schools.

Michael Casserly, Ph.D., interim executive director of the Council of Great City Schools, a research and advocacy group representing 47 of the nation's largest urban school districts.

Marie Della Bella, Ph.D., education consultant and manager of the school-recognition programs for the Connecticut State Department of Education.

John Fero, president of the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the professional organization serving more than 26,000 elementary- and middle-school principals.

Sharon Field, Ed.D., associate professor (research) at Wayne State University and program director for Transition and Employment at the Developmental Disabilities Institute.

Virginia Horns-Marsh, Ph.D., professor emerita of the University of Alabama at Birmingham and director of the Children's Creative Learning Center.

Martin Koldyke, Chicago businessman and education activist who founded the Golden Apple Foundation, which awards exemplary teachers and teaching students.

Marjorie J. Kostelnik, Ph.D., past director of the Child Development Laboratry and acting chair of the family and child ecology department at Michigan State University.

Walter J. Leonard, J.D., executive director of Cities in Schools, Inc., the nation's largest nonprofit dropout-prevention program, and former president of Fisk University.

Robert M. McClure, Ph.D., director of the site-based restructuring program of the National Education Association's National Center for Innovation.

Jean Narayanan, acting director of the U.S. Department of Education's Recognition Division, which oversees the Blue Ribbon Schools Program.

Allan Shedlin, Jr., executive director of the National Elementary School Center, an advocacy, policy, and resource center concerned with improving the quality of elementary schools.

Jon Snyder, Ed.D., director of teacher education at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and former research director of the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching at Columbia University.

[From the Grand Forks Herald, Mar. 14, 1993]

BELMONT ONE OF NATION'S TOP SCHOOLS

(By Steve Schmidt)

Belmont School of Grand Forks has been named by Redbook magazine as one of "America's Best Elementary Schools."

The April edition of Redbook recognizes Belmont as one of 177 outstanding schools and puts Belmont among 51 on its "Best of the States" list.

Redbook, a monthly magazine for young working mothers, with a circulation of more than 3 million, had a panel of 12 national education experts choose the finalists for "America's Best."

Redbook says the 51 state leaders "combine innovative curricula, compassionate teachers, impressive test scores and an uncompromising commitment to excellence."

Belmont, which had been nominated along with two Fargo schools by the state Department of Public Instruction, was the only North Dakota school to make the Redbook honor roll. A total of 550 had been nominated by administrators, education leaders and congressional members from among the nation's 59,000 elementary schools.

In its "Best of the States" listing, Redbook says: "At Belmont, many of the 314 students take advantage of the school's long list of enrichment activities, notably the Art Smart program, where parents serve as volunteers to assist in pottery, folk art and mask making."

Beth Randkiev is principal at Belmont, which last year was named a state and national Blue Ribbon school.

Redbook said its criteria for ranking the best grade schools included involved parents and principals; nurturing teachers; an emphasis on the written word; innovative use of technology; community alliances; alternative ways of assessing student achievement, such as through journals; and an overall supportive learning environment.

Minnesota's "Best of State" entry was Cyrus Math, Science and Technology, a small rural magnet school, with one computer for every three students, in the city of Cyrus. Also recognized were elementary schools in Blue Earth, New Hope and St. Louis Park, Minn.●

FOREIGN CURRENCY REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following report(s) of standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Howell Heflin:									
Germany	Deutsche mark	1,297.76	895.01			1,750.99	1,207.58	3,048.75	2,102.59
Belgium	Franc	14,529.58	501.02			5,066	166.62	19,595.58	667.64
Total			1,396.03				1,374.20		2,770.23

PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry,
Jan. 12, 1993.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Joseph H. Kimmitt:									
Japan	Yen		290.00						290.00
China	Yuan		1,480.00						1,480.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		416.00						416.00
United States	Dollar				2,482.17				2,482.17
C. Richard D'Amato:									
Belgium	Franc	13,367	434.00					13,367	434.00
Romania	Dollar		348.00						348.00
Czechoslovakia	Crown	6,925	624.00					6,924	624.00
United States	Dollar				3,611.90				3,611.90
Tim Rieser:									
Kenya	Dollar		176.10				37.00		213.10
Somalia	Dollar						27.43		27.43
United States	Dollar				3,622.00				3,622.00
Total			3,768.10		9,716.07		64.43		13,548.60

ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Nov. 12, 1992.

AMENDED CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, FOR TRAVEL FROM APRIL 1 TO JUNE 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Robert M. Walker:									
Bahrain	Dinar	87.825	233.00					87.825	233.00
Saudi Arabia	Ryal	2,940	784.00					2,940	784.00
United States	Dollar				4,658.00				4,658.00
Total			1,017.00		4,658.00				5,675.00

ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Nov. 12, 1992.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John W. Warner:									
Belgium	Franc	20,718	618.00					20,718	618.00
Gary L. Sojka:									
Panama	Dollar		132.00						132.00
Colombia	Peso	225,147.16	314.00			71,894	100.00	297,041.16	414.00
Bolivia	Boliviano	1,518.25	375.92					1,518.75	375.92
Venezuela	Dollar		176.00						176.00
Robert G. Bell:									
Former Soviet Union	Dollar		1,200.00						1,200.00
Richard E. Combs, Jr.:									
Former Soviet Union	Dollar		988.95		2,820.00		189.00		3,997.95
Senator Sam Nunn:									
Former Soviet Union	Dollar		1,008.95		2,838.00		140.00		3,986.95
George K. Johnson, Jr.:									
United Kingdom	Pound	1,032	1,599.66					1,032	1,599.66
John W. Douglass:									
Germany	Deutsche mark	678	432.17		239.63				671.80

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1992—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Switzerland	Franc	303.20	217.19	2	1.43			305.20	218.62
Yugoslavia	Dollar		6.00						6.00
Richard D. DeBobes:									
Germany	Deutsche mark	709.86	452.14					709.86	452.14
Switzerland	Franc	319.20	229.39	2	1.93			321.20	231.32
Yugoslavia	Dollar		6.00						6.00
Senator Carl Levin:									
Russia	Dollar		180.00						180.00
China	Yuan	2,840	498.00					2,840	498.00
India	Rupee	8,007	283.00					8,007	283.00
Israel	Shekel	1,026	380.00					1,026	380.00
Syria	Dollar		127.00						127.00
Kenya	Shilling	8,744	175.00					8,744	175.00
Richard W. Fieldhouse:									
Russia	Dollar		65.00		11.00				76.00
China	Yuan	2,582	453.00					2,582	453.00
India	Rupee	7,510	266.00					7,510	266.00
Pakistan	Rupee	2,707	106.00					2,707	106.00
Israel	Shekel	886	328.00					886	328.00
Syria	Dollar		125.00						125.00
Kenya	Shilling	10,485	210.00					10,485	210.00
Total			10,952.37		5,911.99		429.00		17,293.36

SAM NUNN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Jan. 6, 1993.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John E. Mansfield:									
Norway	Dollar		606.00						606.00
United Kingdom	Pound	129.84	250.85			24.92	48.15	154.76	299.00
John J. Hamre:									
Germany	Dollar		327.00						327.00
Belgium	Franc	30,616	1,048.50					30,616	1,048.50
Senator Richard C. Shelby:									
Belgium	Franc	30,616	1,048.50					30,616	1,048.50
Terence M. Lynch:									
Belgium	Franc	30,616	1,048.50					30,616	1,048.50
Germany	Dollar		163.50						163.50
Senator John W. Warner:									
Germany	Deutsche mark	129.27	93.00					129.27	93.00
United States	Dollar				1,735.00				1,735.00
Total			4,585.85		1,735.00		48.15		6,369.00

SAM NUNN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Oct. 1, 1992.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Roy Phillips:									
Belgium	Franc	14,050	466.00					14,050	466.00
Italy	Lira	966,176	872.00					966,176	872.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	790.97	545.50					790.97	545.50
United States	Dollar				3,444.10				3,444.10
Total			1,883.50		3,444.10				5,327.60

JIM SASSER,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, Nov. 12, 1992.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384–22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James P. Beirne:									
Fiji	Dollar	1,373.12	901.00					1,373.12	901.00
Western Samoa	Tala	352.16	142.00					352.16	142.00
United States	Dollar				2,347.60				2,347.60
Benjamin S. Cooper:									
Fiji	Dollar	1,373.12	901.00					1,373.12	901.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384–22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1992—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Western Samoa	Tala	352.16	142.00					352.16	142.00
United States	Dollar				2,347.60				2,347.60
Allen P. Stayman:									
Fiji	Dollar	948.77	649.84	25	17.12	9	6.16	982.77	673.12
Western Samoa	Tala	295.12	121.00			20	8.06	315.12	129.06
United States	Dollar				2,347.60				2,347.60
Total			2,856.84		7,059.92		14.22		9,930.98

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Jan. 4, 1993.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator J. Bennett Johnston:									
Sweden	Krona	6,189	1,164.00					6,189	1,164.00
Switzerland	Franc	607.95	472.00					607.95	472.00
United States	Dollar				5,470.10				5,470.10
Total			1,636.00		5,470.10				7,106.10

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Jan. 4, 1993.

ADDENDUM TO SECOND QUARTER REPORT OF CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, FOR TRAVEL FROM APRIL 1 TO JUNE 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Daniel Akaka:									
Armenia	Dollar		150.00						150.00
Azerbaijan	Dollar		150.00						150.00
Uzbekistan	Dollar		180.00						180.00
Tajikistan	Dollar		102.00						102.00
Kazakhstan	Dollar		113.00						113.00
Total			695.00						695.00

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Jan. 4, 1993.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS, FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Roy W. Kienitz:									
Israel	Pound		810.00						810.00
Jordan	Dinar		632.00						632.00
United States	Dollar				3,688.45				3,688.45
Steven J. Shimberg:									
Uruguay	Peso	3,238,080	960.00					3,238,080	960.00
United States	Dollar				3,321.00				3,321.00
Claudia Anne McMurray:									
Uruguay	Peso	3,238,080	960.00					3,238,080	960.00
United States	Dollar				3,281.00				3,281.00
Robert C. Conner:									
Sweden	Krona	4,065	600.00					4,065	600.00
Germany	Mark	450	150.00					450	150.00
France	Franc	5,713.80	1,068.00					5,713.80	1,068.00
United States	Dollar				1,214.90				1,214.90
Total			5,180.00		11,505.35				16,685.35

DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works, Jan. 20, 1993.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator David Durenberger:									
Turkey	Lira	1,663,181	241.00			2,034,249	290.33	3,697,430	531.33
Jordan	Dinar	255.74	380.00					255.74	380.00
Israel	Dollar		700.00				829.53		1,529.53
United States	Dollar				1,875.90				1,875.90
Richard Evans:									
Turkey	Lira	1,663,181	241.00			2,034,249	290.33	3,697,430	531.33
Jordan	Dinar	255.74	380.00					255.74	380.00
Israel	Dollar		700.00				829.53		1,529.53
United States	Dollar				1,875.90				1,875.90
Total			2,642.00		3,751.80		2,239.72		8,633.52

DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN
(For Sen. Quentin N. Burdick),
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works, Oct. 1, 1992.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Deborah A. Lamb:									
Chile	Peso		920.00						920.00
United States	Dollar				1,636.00				1,636.00
Total			920.00		1,636.00				2,556.00

LLOYD BENTSEN,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, Jan. 14, 1993.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 31, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Hank Brown:									
Greece	Dollar		1,338.00						1,338.00
United States	Dollar				1,184.00				1,184.00
Senator Alan Cranston:									
Ukraine	Dollar		194.00						194.00
Latvia	Dollar		205.00						205.00
Estonia	Dollar		205.00						205.00
Kyrgystan	Dollar		246.00						246.00
Kazakhstan	Dollar		340.00						340.00
Turkmenistan	Dollar		162.17						162.17
United States	Dollar				4,029.30				4,029.30
Senator Nancy L. Kassebaum:									
United States	Dollar				5,691.00				5,691.00
Senator Larry Pressler:									
Russia	Dollar		300.00						300.00
Kazakhstan	Dollar		285.40						285.40
Uzbekistan	Dollar		330.00						330.00
Turkmenistan	Dollar		354.12						354.12
Moldova	Dollar		218.00						218.00
Ukraine	Dollar		266.50						266.50
Belarus	Dollar		408.00						408.00
Latvia	Dollar		227.98						227.98
United States	Dollar				6,333.00				6,333.00
Thomas J. Callahan:									
Kenya	Shilling	11,517.75	357.00	69.80	2.16	69.80	2.16	11,657.35	361.32
United States	Dollar				3,932.00				3,932.00
Peter W. Galbraith:									
Croatia	Dollar		360.00						360.00
Serbia	Dollar		330.00						330.00
Hungary	Dollar		165.00						165.00
United States	Dollar				3,354.20				3,354.20
Germany	Deutsche mark	153	116.00					153	116.00
Austria	Dollar		267.00						267.00
Ukraine	Dollar		194.00						194.00
Latvia	Dollar		205.00						205.00
Estonia	Dollar		205.00						205.00
Kyrgystan	Dollar		246.00						246.00
Kazakhstan	Dollar		340.00						340.00
Turkmenistan	Dollar		162.17						162.17
United States	Dollar				2,850.60				2,850.60
Garrett Grigsby:									
Nicaragua	Dollar		390.40						390.40
United States	Dollar				1,050.80				1,050.80
Thomas Kleine:									
Nicaragua	Dollar		390.40						390.40
United States	Dollar				1,050.80				1,050.80
Robyn Lieberman:									
Germany	Deutsche mark	153	116.00					153	116.00
Austria	Dollar		267.00						267.00
Ukraine	Dollar		194.00						194.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 31, 1992—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Latvia	Dollar		205.00						205.00
Estonia	Dollar		205.00						205.00
Kyrgystan	Dollar		246.00						246.00
Kazakhstan	Dollar		340.00						340.00
Turkmenistan	Dollar		162.17						162.17
United States	Dollar				2,850.60				2,850.60
Michelle Maynard:									
Croatia	Dollar		360.00						360.00
Serbia	Dollar		330.00						330.00
Hungary	Dollar		165.00						165.00
Richard L. McCall:									
El Salvador	Colon	9,450	1,125.00					9,450	1,125.00
United States	Dollar				1,108.00				1,108.00
Danielle Pletka:									
Israel	Dollar		75.00						75.00
United States	Dollar				1,259.00				1,259.00
John Ritch:									
Hungary	Forint	83,043	1,075.00					83,043	1,075.00
United States	Dollar				2,435.70				2,435.70
Tim Trenkle:									
United States	Dollar				5,691.00				5,691.00
Bruce Rickerson:									
Russia	Dollar		300.00						300.00
Kazakhstan	Dollar		285.40						285.40
Uzbekistan	Dollar		330.00						330.00
Turkmenistan	Dollar		354.12						354.12
Moldova	Dollar		218.00						218.00
Ukraine	Dollar		266.50						266.50
Belarus	Dollar		408.00						408.00
Latvia	Dollar		227.98						227.98
United States	Dollar				3,704.00				3,704.00
Anne Smith:									
Russia	Dollar		300.00						300.00
Kazakhstan	Dollar		285.40						285.40
Uzbekistan	Dollar		330.00						330.00
Turkmenistan	Dollar		354.12						354.12
Moldova	Dollar		218.00						218.00
Ukraine	Dollar		266.50						266.50
Belarus	Dollar		408.00						408.00
Lativa	Dollar		227.98						227.98
United States	Dollar				3,704.00				3,704.00
Total			18,453.31		50,230.16		2.16		68,685.63

CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Nov. 1, 1992.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jerry M. Tinker:									
United States	Dollar				1,409.90				1,409.90
Canada	Dollar	1,519.44	1,271.00					1,519.44	1,271.00
Richard W. Day:									
Canada	Dollar	917.33	767.00					917.33	767.00
United States	Dollar				1,249.03				1,249.03
Mary C. Hawkins;									
United States	Dollar				3,554.90				3,554.90
United Kingdom	Pound sterling	170.72	326.00					170.72	326.00
Finland	Finnmark	1,994.37	485.84					1,994.37	485.84
Total			2,849.84		6,213.83				9,063.67

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Nov. 5, 1992.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael Iskowitz:									
Netherlands	Guilder	2,057.32	1,245.35	371.12	224.65	1,425.00	862.59	3,853.44	2,332.59
United States	Dollar				827.90	697.66	422.31		1,250.21
Total			1,245.35		1,052.55		1,284.90		3,582.80

EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Oct. 23, 1992.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SECTION 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Karen L. Bovard:									
Canada	Dollar		425.00				375.00		800.00
United States	Dollar				441.61				441.61
Total			425.00		441.61		375.00		1,241.61

TERRY SANFORD,
Chairman, Select Committee on Ethics, Dec. 18, 1992.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
L. Britt Snider			1,098.00		3,545.90				4,643.90
Marvin Ott			1,224.00		3,545.90				4,769.90
Christopher Straub			1,647.80		4,147.00				5,794.80
Don Mitchell			1,158.80		4,147.00				5,305.80
David Garman			390.00		810.00				1,200.00
John Despres			3,833.00		4,871.00				8,704.00
Cullum Clark			2,954.74		3,748.55				6,703.29
Timothy Carlsgaard			1,491.92		5,167.00				6,658.92
Sarah Holmes			1,991.00		3,351.00				5,342.00
Jonathan Zittrain			2,361.00		3,351.55				5,712.55
Christopher Straub			175.00		695.00				870.00
Peter Dorn			660.00		907.10				1,567.10
Total			18,985.26		38,287.00				57,272.26

DAVID L. BOREN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Intelligence, Sept. 30, 1992.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Dennis DeConcini:									
United States	Dollar				5,075.00				5,075.00
Ireland	Sterling	115.73	221.00					115.73	221.00
United Kingdom	Sterling	141.39	270.00	19.50	37.23			160.89	307.23
Finland	Mark	1,854.15	451.68					1,854.15	451.68
Jane S. Fisher:									
United States	Dollar				3,554.90				3,554.90
United Kingdom	Sterling	170.72	326.00					170.72	326.00
Finland	Mark	1,994.37	485.84					1,994.37	485.84
Mary Sue Hafner:									
United States	Dollar				3,554.90				3,554.90
United Kingdom	Sterling	170.72	326.00					170.72	326.00
Finland	Mark	1,994.37	485.84					1,994.37	485.84
Delegation expenses: [1]									
United Kingdom							1,869.09		1,869.09
Finland							846.13		846.13
Total			2,566.36		12,222.93		2,715.22		17,503.61

[1] Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursement to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502–B of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384.

DENNIS DeCONCINI,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe,
Oct. 16, 1992.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), SELECT COMMITTEE ON POW/MIA AFFAIRS, FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Frances A. Zwenig:									
Vietnam	Dollar		391.00						391.00
Laos	Dollar		50.00						50.00
Thailand	Baht	22,264	880.00						880.00
United States	Dollar				1,598.00				1,598.00
Total			1,321.00		1,598.00				2,919.00

GEORGE J. MITCHELL, Majority Leader,
ROBERT J. DOLE, Republican Leader,
Sept. 28, 1992.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), SELECT COMMITTEE ON POW/MIA AFFAIRS, FOR TRAVEL FROM APRIL 1 TO JUNE 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Neal Kravitz:									
United States	Dollar				386.00				386.00
Mexico	Peso	3,113.00	288.00					3,113.00	288.00
Barry Valentine:									
United States	Dollar				386.00				386.00
Mexico	Peso	3,113.00	288.00					3,113.00	288.00
Total			576.00		772.00				1,348.00

GEORGE J. MITCHELL, Majority Leader,
ROBERT J. DOLE, Republican Leader,
Sept. 15, 1992.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), U.S. SENATE ARMS CONTROL OBSERVER GROUP, FOR TRAVEL JULY 8–12, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John W. Warner:									
Switzerland	Franc	307	225.00					307	225.00
United States	Dollar				2,303.00				2,303.00
Total			225.00		2,303.00				2,528.00

GEORGE J. MITCHELL, Majority Leader,
ROBERT J. DOLE, Republican Leader,
Sept. 24, 1992.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE REPUBLICAN LEADER FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator William V. Roth, Jr.:									
Greece	Dollar		549.00						549.00
United States	Dollar				1,146.00				1,146.00
Total			549.00		1,146.00				1,695.00

ROBERT J. DOLE, Republican Leader,
Jan. 14, 1993.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE REPUBLICAN LEADER FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 1992

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Alan K. Simpson:									
Germany	Deutsche mark	1,392	960.00			1,750.99	1,207.58	3,142.99	2,167.58
Belgium	Franc	16,414	566.00			5,066.00	166.62	21,480	732.62
Total			1,526.00				1,374.20		2,900.20

ROBERT J. DOLE, Republican Leader,
Dec. 30, 1992.

SALUTE TO WILLAMETTE BEARCATS

• Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, as many of my colleagues know, I am a one-man fan club for Willamette University in Salem, OR. Not only did I receive my undergraduate degree from Willamette, but I also taught there for many years and served on the board of trustees, and I am honored to have the university's new library named for me.

Like a proud grandfather, I come to the Senate floor to brag about Willamette once again.

This past Tuesday, the Willamette University Bearcats men's basketball team became the first team from Oregon ever to win an NAIA National Basketball Championship.

The Bearcats defeated South Dakota's Northern State University by a score of 63–56 to win the NAIA Division II title.

Congratulations go to Willamette President Jerry Hudson, basketball coach Gordie James, and the entire Bearcats team.

I am especially pleased to note that along with its athletic prowess, Willamette has also maintained its academic reputation as one of the finest small universities in America.•

PRAISE FOR AMBASSADOR JOSEPH VERNER REED

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to bring to my colleagues' attention some words of well-deserved praise for Joseph Verner Reed. Ambassador Reed has served our country in a number of diplomatic capacities which are remarkable in their diversity. Serving most recently as Under Secretary General Special Representative of the Secretary General for Public Affairs, Ambassador Reed has at one time claimed the titles of Chief of Protocol of the United States, United States Representative to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and Ambassador to Morocco—just to name a few. I have no doubt that my colleagues here in the Senate will find of great interest the remarks made by Famara Ibrahima Sagna, Minister of Finance of Senegal, on the occasion of Ambassador Reed's acceptance of the promotion in grade as Grand Officer in the National Order of the Lion as well as Reed's ensuing remarks.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS BY HIS EXCELLENCY FAMARA IBRAHIMA SAGNA, MINISTER OF ECONOMY, FINANCE AND PLAN OF THE REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL, APRIL 6, 1992

Excellencies, ladies and gentleman:

This afternoon, I would like to say how pleased I am for having this opportunity to see that my visit to Washington, D.C., coincides with the occasion which Ambassador Reed and Ambassador Ka have agreed to organize this wonderful gathering. We are gathered here with many of our dear friends to bestow, on behalf of the President of Senegal, His Excellency Abdou Diouf, one of the highest distinctions of Senegal to His Excellency Joseph Verner Reed.

As I recall, little over a year ago, on December 17, 1990, Ambassador Ka had the unique privilege in organizing a gathering to honor Ambassador Reed with the distinction of the Commander of the National Order of the Lion of Senegal, at Blair House. A day that is special to Ambassador Reed, as it was his birthday.

Today Ambassador Ka has organized this gathering which coincides with me present here in Washington, D.C., and I feel it is a great privilege to be a part of this ceremony.

By bestowing on Ambassador Reed the title of the National Order of the Lion of Senegal this year, President Diouf, specifically wanted to thank him on behalf of all his African colleagues for the remarkable achievements which he accomplished at the satisfaction of the entire continent of Africa, during the special United Nations Session of 1986; "On the Critical Economic Situation of Africa".

This afternoon, in just 14 months later, the President of Senegal, His Excellency Abdou Diouf would like to, once again, honor, Ambassador Reed with one of the Highest Distinctions of Senegal: The title of Grand Officer of the National Order of the Lion of Senegal.

President Abdou Diouf wishes to thank you again for all your wonderful achievements while serving at the Chief of Protocol of the United States of America. In bringing Africa more into the inner circles of Washington, D.C.

Mr. President, once again, would like to thank you on behalf of his wife and the Government of Senegal for their successful state visit which you had organized with quality and professionalism here in Washington, D.C. last September.

Today, by bestowing on your this honor, President Diouf, hopes that you, with your new position as the Under Secretary General to the United Nations will continue to strengthen the relations between Africa and the United Nations.

Ambassador Reed, I want to take this opportunity to personally thank you as an old friend, for all that you have done for Senegal and would like to wish you great success in your new important position.

Ambassador Joseph Verner Reed in the name of His Excellency President Abdou Diouf, and by the virtue of the powers confined on me, I now bestow on you the title of Grand Officer of the National Order of the Lion of Senegal.

Thank You.

REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR JOSEPH VERNER REED

Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, Minister of Finance and Economy Sagna and Ambassador of the Republic of Senegal, Ibra Deguene Ka: I am deeply honored by the extraordinary gesture of President Abdou Diouf to take the initiative to promote my grade in the National Order of the Lion to that of Grand Officer.

Mr. Minister and special friend, I thank you for your presence and for your words. It is indeed a signal pleasure to have someone of your senior rank from Senegal to present me the award. Ambassador Ka—to you, who is one of the great diplomats in the diplomatic corps of Washington, I thank you for organizing this elegant ceremony and for gathering family, friends, and colleagues.

Senegal and the Senegalese have been close to my heart for two decades. I have visited Senegal often and consider myself privileged to count as friends, President and Mrs. Diouf and members of their family. I made my first visit to Dakar in 1971—Senegal's first president, the distinguished Leopold Senghor received me. I visited the island of Gorê which made a lasting impression on me. That gateway island had brought so many African-Americans to the New World that it is now a shrine. Subsequently, I have crisscrossed Senegal by foot, rail, air, motor—even by canoe. I have a dazzling memory of crossing the river Senegal at high noon, and my memories of visiting Dakar and Saint Louis are rich. I have been privileged to know many Senegalese, in both the public and private sectors, and consider these friendships timeless.

Senegalese diplomats are among the best of the best—and thanks to Senegal's leadership, the historic conclave of the General Assembly in 1986 on the critical economic situation in Africa changed forever the course of economic affairs on the continent. That special session brought the winds of political change from one end of the continent to the other.

Africa is a huge continent with varied parts and people; 51 countries and 800 groups of people with their own art and customs. Africa: a population of 600 million. Morocco lies 9 miles across the Straights of Gibraltar (The Pillars of Hercules) to Africa's sister continent, Europe; the largest desert in the world, the Sahara; the world's longest river, the Nile; Victoria Falls, one of the Seven Natural Wonders of the World; the Atlas Mountains, higher than the Alps. Mount Kilimanjaro at 19,340 feet, and the continent's largest lake, Lake Victoria. But, most important are her people—intelligent, hospitable, warm, and eager for friendships.

Tradition is an honor in societies in Africa—I recall being in Saint Louis and hearing a story that has been handed down for centuries. In Africa story telling is an art; often story tellers use animal characters to teach right from wrong. The stories are gentle, informative, and a critical part of the love of the land.

"THE LEOPARD AND HIS SPOTS

"Once upon a time, all the animals lived in clusters of villages in the forest. If one of them lost a family member, they all joined him to mourn the death of the beloved one.

"One day the ant's mother died, and all the animals decided to form a procession and help the ant mourn his mother's death.

"They walked on the footpath, one after the other, and came by an eggplant farm. Everything was ripe and beautiful.

"Now the leopard's favorite food was eggplant or, as we Senegalese call them, gardeneggs. He waited for all the animals to pass the farm so that he could go and eat some of it.

"He was so greedy that he furiously ate almost everything that was ripe on the farm. Then he could eat no more and went slowly off along the path to join the other animals.

"As soon as he left, the farmer came and saw that all the vegetables he was to collect and take to the market were gone.

"He knew all the animals had passed by, so he ran after them and stopped the one leading the procession. He asked whether they knew which of them had taken his vegetables.

"Each animal said, 'Not me'. Each one denied that they went to the farm. Except the leopard, who did not talk. So the farmer came up with the idea of building a bonfire. He dug a hole and built a fire, than asked each animal to jump over it. He knew that the guilty one would be too heavy or too nervous and would jump into the fire.

"All the animals started singing their songs to show they were not afraid. They jumped one after the other.

"The last one was the leopard. He was reluctant to do it. But he knew if he didn't they all would suspect he was the guilty one.

"Finally he started his song and got ready to jump. But as he jumped, he fell right into the fire. The other animals stood there amazed. They knew he was guilty.

"Now he started yelling, howling and confessing that he did it. He rolled on the ground to put the fire out, and the animals tried to help him. But the fire had burnt patches in his fur, some black, some brown.

"That's why the leopard has all those spots."

President Diouf has been a great and noble leader of Senegal. His leadership was recognized by his friend, President George Bush, when the invitation for a state visit to Washington was issued in the autumn of 1991. That visit was indeed a brilliant one. I counted myself privileged to have been at the President's side when America saluted on the south lawn of the White House the arrival of President Abdou Diouf. A footnote to the history of our two Nations and their bilateral relationship will be the historic farewell ceremony at the Monument Grounds at the Ellipse when President Diouf was given a specially designed farewell ceremony of grand proportions.

Under President Diouf's leadership and with his able men and women in his administration, Senegal has made a valiant and successful effort to overcome hardships. I salute President Diouf for his leadership. The cold

war was a debilitating and destructive experience for much of Africa. President Diouf was, and is, a leader in moving Senegal's political and economic forces with the tide of the times. I wish President Diouf and the people of Senegal every success and I look proudly to my promotion in grade of Senegal's highest honor, the National Order of the Lion.•

THE THIRD "SEAWOLF"

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, the submarine community just received its wake-up call. "Clinton: No Third Seawolf in Budget" was the headline of a story that appeared in the Hartford Courant on March 14, 1993. It's over. The *Seawolf* is dead.

Now what are we going to do? Most submarine supporters had pinned all of their hopes on a third *Seawolf*. In anticipation, the Navy has been a study in obstructionism since termination, objecting to every submarine initiative proposed to provide submarine work. The resultant paralysis continues to this day.

It's time to get off the dime. The House Armed Services Committee markup is 2 months away. We need ideas, good ones, now. It is essential that a submarine be included in the fiscal year 1994 Defense authorization and appropriations conference bills. The ability of this country to produce nuclear-powered submarines is in peril. Once lost, it is unrecoverable. No further President, Congress, or Pentagon, will see the day when new nuclear vendors or shipyards are certified. NIMBYitis will take care of that.

A coalition needs to form quickly around a submarine initiative that will be acceptable to the majority of our colleagues, fit within the budget, and provide relief to nuclear vendors, nonnuclear vendors, and shipyards alike. Otherwise, we will trade away a naval trump card forever.

I ask that the aforementioned Hartford Courant article be included in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Hartford Courant, Mar. 14, 1993]

CLINTON: NO THIRD SEAWOLF IN BUDGET

(By Miranda S. Spivack)

WASHINGTON.—President Clinton's defense budget probably will not include funds for a third Groton-built Seawolf submarine, but high-tech products such as Sikorsky Aircraft's proposed Comanche light helicopter, now on the drawing board, will be funded in this budget plan due next month.

"I thought that at least one more ship should be completed than the [Bush] administration, and then we should in effect transform the operation to produce a smaller follow-on ship." Clinton said Saturday of the Seawolf, now under construction at General Dynamics' Electric Boat division in Groton, Conn.

The president made his remarks in a 20-minute meeting in the Cabinet room with about a dozen Connecticut reporters as he sought to sell his defense cutback and military conversion plan through a series of public appearances and interviews.

He voiced no explicit worries that the deteriorating situation with Russian President Boris Yeltsin might cause him to rethink his defense cuts.

"We are obviously concerned about him." Clinton said. "He represents a passionate commitment to democracy and economic reform. . . . I think we should support that." He said he hoped other democratic nations would step up their backing of Yeltsin, too.

On the Seawolf, Clinton left the door slightly open, but suggested that the nation's submarine builders should look ahead to the next, smaller generation of boats.

"I think it is an open question but I haven't changed my position on it," he said. "The last time I had a conversation about this, there was a general consensus that the design of the Seawolf was not necessary in terms of size, given a declining Soviet threat . . . but that we still need and are quite dependent on submarine technology to maintain our overall military superiority," he said.

During last year's presidential campaign, Clinton voiced support for the Seawolf, though he never said how many he thought should be built. He spoke of the need to protect submarine construction expertise, though he never specifically endorsed Electric Boat as the anointed site. Subs also are built at Newport News Shipbuilding in Virginia, and talks are under way between Newport News and Electric Boat on possible sale or consolidation of the two companies.

A third Seawolf would cost at least another $2 billion, a large sum at a time Clinton is proposing to trim the defense budget by more than $100 billion in the next five years.

Clinton's endorsement of the Comanche, the army's top modernization project, stopped short of support for a particular production plan or schedule. When Clinton was asked about the Comanche at the end of the session, he said he was short on specifics and would provide an answer soon. The White House press office, after conferring with officials at the Defense Department, said Clinton supported "initial production" of the Comanche, which is still several years from coming off the assembly line.

Clinton also spent Saturday morning meeting with reporters from California and Florida, states hit much harder than Connecticut in the administration's proposal, unveiled Friday, to shutter 31 military bases and scale back 134 others, including the Navy's submarine base in Groton.

The morning sessions, which followed Clinton's weekly radio address, excluded most members of the national press corps, who complain that Clinton has offered few opportunities to question him directly since he took office Jan. 20.

Clinton was tieless and clad in a beige sweater and dark sports jacket. He drank from a white mug and answered questions—sometimes talking for several minutes on a single issue—as he sat at a leather oval table in the White House Cabinet room, surrounded by about a dozen reporters from Connecticut news media.

The president stressed his recently unveiled $20 billion plan for defense diversification and tax credits, and he said that Connecticut would receive about $118 million from his separate stimulus package that is designed to provide new jobs for highway, environmental cleanup and community development projects. Each program is subject to congressional approval.

"Obviously those will create a lot of jobs, and some of those will be in the same areas where defense jobs have been lost," he said.

Although Clinton acknowledged that some defense contractors are cool to using military technologies in civilian manufacturing, he said he helped to bring them around. He plans meetings with his administration and defense contractors around the country, saying he wants to get them involved long before contracts with the military expire.

"The thing that has bothered me about this all along is that these contracts have been canceled and then someone comes along and says, "Why don't you think of something else to do?"

"This whole thing has to be coordinated," he said.

He pointed to Sikorsky, a division of United Technologies Corp., for its sales in the civilian and overseas markets, and he cited another, unnamed Connecticut helicopter maker, presumably Kaman Corp. of Bloomfield, for similar diversification.

As for submarine conversion, he said, "I don't know that General Dynamics' options are to know whether that is the right or wrong suit. All I can say is that we are prepared to assist . . . companies that are serious about conversion." But he noted that "submarines have few uses other than military. It's hard to imagine."

He suggested that closing military bases, no matter how painful to communities affected, was the right course for states such as Connecticut because it might save some jobs with defense contractors that have a brighter future if they diversify.

"If you don't close any of them and you have the defense budget going down, it means more reductions for contractors." He said he was committed to maintaining a "very, very high level of technological superiority and military readiness."

Sen. Joseph I. Lieberman, D-Conn., said Saturday he believes Pentagon cuts are moving too swiftly, and he said that building a third Seawolf would be the most "cost-effective way to maintain the submarine industrial base."

But he also acknowledged that if the president does not include the third sub in his budget plan, it will be hard to persuade Congress to fund it anyway.

Rep. Sam Gejdenson, D-2nd District, said that he was not surprised Clinton did not endorse a third Seawolf.

"There is some money already available. . . . It is not impossible but it is a very tough fight," he said.

"it's a long stretch, to get to the next class of boats," Gejdeson said.

Clinton also was asked whether he thought Connecticut should endorse casino gambling beyond the Mashantucket Pequots' complex in Ledyard. He said he was not necessarily the right person to ask because he had grown up in a town that had extensive and illicit gaming parlors until the mid-1960s.

Although he stressed that legalized gambling should be decided State by State, he offered this: "analyze very carefully what the costs and benefits are. It is not a free ride, that's the only thing I will say. . . . It is not an unmixed blessing."•

A TRIBUTE TO LOUISA

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the town of Louisa in Lawrence County, a small town located in the rolling hills of eastern Kentucky on the West Virginia border.

Louisa is the county seat of Lawrence County and sits at the junction

of the Levisa and Tug forks of the Big Sandy River. This location brought early success to the town, with the rivers serving as transportation outlets for Kentucky's timber, coal, oil, and gas industries.

Louisa was first settled around 1789 by Charles Vancouver. On the 15,000-acre land grant he received, Vancouver built a fort and farm. He and his men were driven out a year later by native American tribes. Eventually, however, the land was reclaimed by settlers, and Louisa began to grow.

Today, Louisa is a quiet town, void of most of the hustle and bustle found in neighboring cities. Instead, Louisa is filled with charming houses, wide streets, carefully manicured lawns, and historic buildings. Residents are interested in adding to the charm of the town by honoring a local hero. Plans are now underway for the construction of a museum to honor Fred M. Vinson, a Louisa native who was appointed to the Supreme Court by President Harry Truman and later became Chief Justice.

Mr. President, today I honor the people of Louisa for upholding the traditions and values of small-town life, and for their dedication to the town's history. These efforts confirm my belief that Louisa truly is one of Kentucky's finest towns.

Mr. President, I ask that an accompanying article from the Courier Journal be submitted in today's RECORD.

The article follows:

LOUISA

(By John Voskuhl)

U.S. 23 used to go right through Louisa.

And so did a sizable chunk of America's population, it seemed. According to local recollection, it was a hungry chunk.

"There used to be restaurant after restaurant and grocery store after grocery store," said Paul Chandler, whose video store and tanning-bed emporium occupies a 100-year-old building on Louisa's Ricky Skaggs Boulevard.

But Louisa now has a bypass, taking U.S. 23 just west of town. It wasn't long before traffic became too heavy for that two-lane bypass. So a second bypass was built, taking U.S. 23 even farther west and making it four-lane.

And so the inevitable happened. Fewer and fewer travelers found their way off the four-lane and into town. Local shoppers began using the new road to drive a half-hour north to Ashland or south to Paintsville. Louisa lost a few businesses and gained a few vacant storefronts.

As any cardiac patient cay testify, a double bypass tends to slow life down.

"If you wanted to buy a men's suit, you couldn't do it in Louisa," said Nelson Sparks, the Lawrence County attorney, whose family settled in the county in 1821, the same year it was created.

In the many generations since, the Sparkses have watched the county and its town change from a farming community to an early seat of Kentucky's timber, coal and oil and gas industries to a bustling transportation center at the junction of the Levisa and Tug forks of the Big Sandy River.

They've watched the river traffic dry up. They've watched rail transportation dwindle. And for the past few years, they've watched as nearby towns grew while Louisa didn't.

And at least one of them didn't have a big problem with it.

"People always think that if you have a lot of growth and a lot of new businesses and a lot more people coming in, you have a good thing. I don't think that's necessarily true," Sparks said. "I think there is a place in the world for little towns."

Louisa has plenty of pleasant houses, lovely wide streets, fine old buildings and acres of lawns that can only be described as "manicured." Unfortunately, many of the town's trees have also been manicured—trimmed to the point where they sport no greenery. Some have been removed entirely.

Frances Cain, who owns several of downtown's fine old buildings, laments the loss of the trees. She remembers when trees stood on each side of Ricky Skaggs Boulevard—back then it was Main Cross Street—and their leaves formed a canopy over the town's center.

"It was the prettiest town on the river" said Cain, who worked in those days managing the old Garden Theater.

The theater is closed—its lobby houses a baseball-card shop—and the trees have been plucked out or pruned. Cain acknowledged that many needed to be cleared or cut, but she said she thinks city officials went a little too far.

"I think our City Council went tree-happy," she said.

Still, Louisa residents take a measure of pride in the appearance of their town, their homes and their businesses.

For example, on Louisa's outskirts, at Hardin's Used Cars, Helen B. Hardin has established what may be the larger inventory of lawn ornaments in all of Kentucky. She has geese, pelicans, reindeer, cardinals, lions, bears, eagles, turtles, poodles, Saint Bernards, raccoons, pigs, lambs, rams and frogs sitting on settees beneath umbrellas.

She has fake fire hydrants, Roman centurions, Spanish conquistadors and a bust of JFK.

She has a vast assortment of those big, metallic balls that sit on ceramic pedestals; she has gold, silver, green, blue and red balls.

She has an assortment of Madonnas and an array of Jesuses. She has miniatures of Michelangelo's David.

She has Mexican peasants leading burros. She has cigar-store Indians. She has lawn jockeys, both in neutral Caucasian and inflammatory black.

But Hardin declined to discuss her inventory. She had been displeased by a previous newspaper story.

"Called my stuff tacky," she said.

Her husband, J. D. Hardin, who runs the used-car lot, was a bit more forthcoming. He said the lawn-ornament business began about 45 years ago, when his wife dreamed of selling dishware as a way to make extra money. The couple bought about $300 worth of dishes to start and "my wife just went on from there" he said.

Such economic success stories are all too rare in Louisa, according to Howard See an insurance agent who has headed up industrial-development efforts in Lawrence County for nearly 40 years.

The county's industrial park had housed a large carpet mill that went out of business in the late '70s. It's now home to a blue-jeans manufacturer and a produce wholesaler. Yatesville Lake, a man-made lake recently completed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, is expected to draw more visitors to the area.

But See said the community has been slow to foster growth.

"The people of Louisa, as a whole are satisfied to let change come about," See said. "They don't attend meetings very well."

But residents can get stirred up.

Citizens groups rallied against developers who tried to install a hazardous-waste incinerator and against developers who operated a landfill in Lawrence County. After lengthy debates, the incinerator was stalled and the landfill closed.

"You don't think about environmental movements in places like Louisa," said Sparks, the lawyer. "But people here are very committed to those kinds of issues."

Laying contentious issues aside, there's a different reason that keeps Louisa's coffee drinkers from sharing common grounds. The town has two hangouts. Betty's Home Cookin' restaurant, located on old U.S. 23, serves as the hangout for many of Louisa's older residents. Up on the second bypass, a younger group of coffee drinkers has begun congregating at the McDonald's restaurant.

For people like Mike Armstrong, a former Louisa mayor, there's a metaphor in the coffee gatherings. To Armstrong, they symbolize a town in transition, a place where people are torn between old and new, fast and slow, home and away.

More and more Louisa residents are being drawn to the road, to that rolling culture that used to roll through downtown on U.S. 23.

"Sitting in a car and driving 30 minutes is becoming the norm," Armstrong said.

Many folks drive to Boyd or Johnson counties to work, shop, see a movie or eat dinner. A sizable portion of Lawrence Countians travel to neighboring Martin County to work in coal mines.

Cain, the downtown landlord, offered another metaphor. Louisa's downtown, with its fine old buildings, is built over quicksand, she said, because its' so near the rivers. The land at the second bypass, which already has a Pizza Hut and a Sunoco station in addition to McDonald's, is much more solid.

It begs the quesiton: Must the past be lost?

"We used to play on the courthouse lawn—be it football or whiffle ball or whatever," Armstrong recalled. "It was a beautiful, green expanse. Now it's the courthouse annex."

In his office behind the annex, See, the insurance agent, declared that the past never abides for long unless people work at preserving it.

See is one of several Louisa residents who have formed the Fred M. Vinson Memorial Foundation, a non-profit group that's trying to raise money to build a museum to honor the Louisa native who became chief justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Vinson served as a congressman and a federal appeals judge. President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed him director of economic stabilization in 1943, a job that entailed setting prices "from toothpicks to airplanes" to prevent wartime inflation, See said.

Vinson held other posts under FDR, and was appointed secretary of the treasury by President Harry Truman, who eventually put him on the Supreme Court. Vinson's appointment to the Supreme Court made him one of Kentucky's most illustrious statemen, See said.

"Kentucky as a whole should be proud of this man," See said. "He's been dead now 40 years and people have forgotten his contributions because we've let his name die. We shouldn't have."

The history behind Louisa's name has already died.

Some say the town is named after the first white child born at the Tug and Levisa forks. Others contend that it's named for Lousa County, Virginia, the supposed home of some early Louisa settlers. And still other say the name is simply a corruption of Levisa—a theory that's bolstered by the fact that some older residents call their town "Loo-EYES-uh". Instead of the generally accepted "Loo-EASE-uh."

It's clear, however, that Louisa's county was named after Capt. James Lawrence, a hero of the War of 1812, who was fatally wounded in a naval battle.

Lawrence is remembered for his dying order: "Don't give up the ship."

Good advice for a town built on quicksand.

FAMOUS FACTS AND FIGURES

The first lock-and-needle dam in the United States was built across the Big Sandy River at Louisa. Such dams use vertical rods, called needles, that can be raised or lowered to act as valves for controlling the flow of water. Though it's no longer used, the dam is still visible.

The bridge between Louisa and Fort Gay, W. Va., was mentioned in "Ripley's Believe It or Not," a syndicated newspaper feature about odd people, places and things; Ripley's noted that the bridge linked three communities, spanned two rivers, connected two states and had entrances from each of three directions; west, east and south. Believe it or not.

Ricky Skaggs Boulevard, which crosses through the heart of downtown, honors the famous guitar, mandolin, banjo and fiddle player, who was born at Cordell, southwest of Louisa.

Lawrence County settlers kept their towns on a first-name basis in Ulysses, Martha, Wilbur, Clifford, Mattle, Jean, Zelda, Hannah and Ellen. Other nice town names include Overdo, Jettle, Irad, Torchlight and Mazie.

The first white settlement near what is now Louisa was built in 1789 on "the Point," the land between the junction of the Tug and Levisa forks of the Big Sandy River. Charles Vancouver, who had received a 15,000-acre land grant, built a fort and tried to farm. But he and his men were driven out by Native American tribes the next year.•

HANDGUN SHOOTINGS

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, once again, I would like to address the issue of handgun violence in our cities. The Chicago Tribune recently ran an article stating that 938 people were murdered in Chicago in 1992. In addition, in the first 11 months of 1992, there were 13,751 nonfatal shootings. Similar statistics exist for our Nation's other major cities.

And while the statistics are astonishing, they do not tell the whole story. The individual victims of the violence present the human side of this ongoing problem. The recent Chicago Tribune article tells the stories of eight of Chicago's shooting victims. Willie Nelson, a retiree, was shot in her home, as she lay in bed. Tina Jones, an 11-year-old student, was shot in her CHA home as she watched TV with her mother. She later said, "I feel bad about it now because we were in our house and I was just shot through the door. If I can't be safe at home, there's nowhere I can be safe."

Mr. President, it is obvious that we can do better in our nation's fight against violent crime. I was recently pleased, during our confirmation hearings of Attorney General Janet Reno, to hear her ideas on integrated approach to fight crime which includes early intervention, drug treatment, and attention to domestic violence. With these initiatives, coupled with tough firearm measures, we can begin to address the violence in our society and finally make strides toward successfully dealing with this enormous problem.

I ask to insert into the RECORD at this point the full text of the January 17 Chicago Tribune article.

The article follows:

WRONG TIME, WRONG PLACE—WHAT IT'S LIKE TO BE SHOT ON CHICAGO'S MEAN STREETS

(By Jeff Lyon)

It is a city awash in blood.

The crackle of gunfire, as much a part of the urban symphony as traffic noise, jackhammers and barking dogs, punctuates the days and nights in certain sections of town. Innocent people are trapped in the crossfire as rival warlords, their henchmen armed to the teeth, battle it out in the streets.

Children are slain on the way to school, some inside the very school buildings themselves. Pregnant women, the elderly, infants, the disabled—it makes no difference to the gunmen, who pursue the slaughter with the recklessness that comes with the suspicion that they are very nearly beyond the law.

The city is not Mogadishu. It is not Sarajevo. It is not Beirut. It is Chicago.

There were 938 people murdered in Chicago during the past year, assuring that 1992 would be the second bloodiest year in the city's history, exceeded only by 1974, when 970 homicides were recorded. The total was already higher than that of 1991, formerly the runner-up for gore.

More than 70 percent of these homicides were committed with guns, according to police. But that statistic does not do justice to the real extent of firearms violence. In the first 11 months of 1992, the number of people shot nonfatally was 13,751, an all-time record.

For a frame of reference consider this: In the first 11 months of 1992, an estimated 2,800 people were killed in Sarajevo, the besieged capital of war-torn Bosnia-Herzegovina. Some 48,000 are said to have been injured, most of them by guns.

Chicago is on a killing and shooting pace somewhere between a third and a fourth that of a city in the midst of a murderous war. It would seem that we need no further proof that parts of Chicago resemble a war zone.

The sheer prevalence of guns is frequently cited as a major cause of urban violence in America. Some experts estimate that there are from 200 to 300 million firearms distributed among the general population of the United States, with some 4 million additional firearms sold annually. Whether this staggering figure is the sole or central reason behind this country's annual toll of more then 26,000 firearm-related fatalities—14,000 homicides, 10,000 suicides and 2,000 accidental deaths—is anybody's guess. But if one lumps together the annual gun fatalities in Japan, Great Britain, Switzerland, Canada, Israel and Sweden, all of which have much more severe restrictions on handgun ownership than ours, they total only a few hundred at best.

Toronto, which like Chicago, has 3 million people and tough handgun laws, notched only 17 firearms deaths in all of 1991. That is because Chicagoans can simply drive to the suburbs or surrounding states to get the guns they desire, but Toronto's citizens cannot.

Firearm injuries cost us $14 billion a year, with more than 80 percent of the burden picked up by taxpayers. Firearms are the seventh leading cause of death nationally and the leading cause of death among black and white teenage boys.

But statistics come without a face, a fact that bothered free-lance writer Stephanie Arena and her husband, photographer Robert Drea. Several years ago, they began chronicling the experiences of Chicago's shooting victims in both word and image for a project entitled "Wrong Time, Wrong Place."

On these pages, eight of these people give their own private account of what it is like to be shot on the mean streets of Chicago.

WENCE EDWARDS

(Dock Worker, Shot Aug. 4, 1991, near the Cabrini-Green building at 1017 N. Larrabee St.)

Walking down Larrabee Street with two friends, on my way to my mother's apartment in Cabrini-Green, I noticed two guys I didn't know, both about 18 or 19 years old, walking toward us. Something about the two didn't feel right. I passed them on the sidewalk, turned around to look back, then faced forward and kept walking. When I turned around again, I saw that one had a gun pointed at my face. I started running, and within seconds the two guys started shooting. I panicked. I was afraid I was going to die. I didn't know I'd been shot. I just ran, and they kept firing. Once I realized I'd been hit in the arm and cheek, I tried to stay conscious. I managed to keep moving until I got behind my mother's building, where I fell to my knees and tried to hole my arm, but my arm hurt too much. I stayed on my knees till the ambulance came. The only thought I had was the pain and whether I was dying.

After the shooting, I identified one guy from police photos. He was probably a member of some gang. They shot me for some kind of gang retaliation—some kind of gang business. The guys with me wore their hats to the right, a sign of being members of being members of a certain gang. I gave up being in this gang, I had a full-time job, then I got arrested and sent to Cook County Jail for robbery, and when I got back to my neighborhood, I got in with the wrong guys. The gang really doesn't have anything to do with getting shot. I just happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time.

MEEKA JOHNSON

(17-year-old mother of Montanique Jackson, Shot Oct. 22, 1991, at 79th Street and Vincennes Avenue)

Me and my son and my best friend, Julie, and this boy, Leon—we were walking down the street and I was smoking a cigarette, and Leon took the cigarette. Then he put it out, and that made us stop. So I turned around. As soon as I took one step, I got shot, and the bullet hit me so hard I feel to the ground. The first bullet hit me—that's what I think—in the stomach, on the left. It was just darkness. All I thought about was my son because I knew I had him with me. That's why I grabbed him and snatched him down. I had him on my right side, and he just

wanted to run because the gunshot scared him so bad. He didn't know what to do. He was going to run toward them because he didn't know where it was coming from. I snatched him down and grabbed him, right alongside of me so he wouldn't get hit. That the only thing that was on my mind—my baby. I got Montanique.

The boys kept going. My friend who was with me, Julie, she said: "Meeka, get up, get up. You aren't hit. Maybe that was a rock or something that hit you." I was like, "No, I'm hit, I'm hit." She was like, "No, you ain't—I don't see no blood or nothing." I'm like, "Unbutton my pants, pull my shirt up." And there was a bullet hole, the bullet hole was right there. And my baby was crying, telling me to get up, "Mamma, get up," and I said, "I'm sorry, baby, I'm shot," and I just lay down and closed my eyes. I thought I was going to die. It was a .45 bullet, and it's still in me. They can't even get it out. It's two inches from my spinal cord. They say it will never move.

RAUL MONT, JR.

(10-year-old student, Shot Sept. 6, 1992, in Eckhart Park, Chicago Avenue and Noble Street)

I asked my father for an ice cream. He said yes, and he bought it for me. I was holding it, and I got it all over my hands. I washed my hands at the drinking fountain and was walking back. I was walking more toward the baseball players in the park, so my dad told me to move over because I might get hit by the ball.

So he moved me over, and he thought it was firecrackers, so he walked closer to me. But it was a gunshot. I thought it was a rocket; I thought it was firecrackers too. I felt like a rock hit me. I said, "Daddy, I'm bleeding." Then my father was saying, "Call the ambulance." But there's no phone around there, so one of the coaches took me to the hospital. They thought that I was not serious because I walked into the hospital. I was a lucky little boy.

(According to Raul's father, Raul Mont Sr., the bullet lodged within one-sixteenth of an inch of the boy's spine and was later removed.)

When I hear a noise, like a car when it explodes [backfires], I go into something. I was out by Irving Park, and I almost ran into a lady because I heard a noise. By my mother's work, by Humboldt Park, I was walking to the store when I heard a noise, and I ran into the store, thinking it was a gunshot.

Before I go to bed, I think that I'm still alive. I don't want to go to that neighborhood again. I talked to Mom about it. My teacher was saying that I'm going to see someone, psychologist, to talk about it.

PATRICK COLVIN

(Police officer, Shot July 13, 1989, at Loomis and 95th Streets)

The day I was shot I was driving home westbound on 95th Street, approaching the intersection of Loomis and 95th. I looked over at a car on 95th also going westbound, waiting to make a left-hand turn onto Loomis. They had their hats turned over to the right side—gangbangers.

Gangbangers play a game with straight people; it's called a "hate stare." If you happen to look over at them, they'll stare at you with this intense look of hate until you look away.

The guy sitting in the back seat gave me the hate stare, so I just gave it right back to him. The loser of the game is the one who looks away first. So I just stared at them for about 10 or 15 seconds. They finally looked away. I didn't pay any more attention.

The light turned green, their car was in the left-turn lane on 95th at Loomis, I was in the center lane. They pulled up and started to make the turn and stopped. I looked over again, and the guy in the back seat was now leaning up against the front seat with a .22-caliber pistol pointed out the side window. I was even with the rear quarter panel, I wasn't next to him, he shot back at an angle.

All I thought about was, this is how I'm going to die, at the hands of some 16-year-old punk. And when the shot went off and hit me in the chest near my shoulder—because I had thought I was going to get it square in the face, since I was staring right down the barrel of the gun—it hurt like hell, but I knew I wasn't going to die. I knew that right away.

TINA JONES

11-year old student, Shot Oct. 2, 1991, at the CHA's ABLA Homes, 1440 W. 13th St.)

I was lying on the floor in front of the door watching TV. I was watching "Blossom," the show that comes on after "Fresh Prince." I was right there on the floor, and then it just sounded like a big noise out there in the hallway. We got out of the way, and that's when I looked—right here—on my side, and I was bleeding bad. I just looked down and saw the blood.

Then my mama opened the door and said: "Who shot my daughter? Anybody who tries to come in here. . . ." and then she slammed the door. I was thinking, "How bad am I hurt?" I was afraid. I was terrified. Afraid I might be dying. Afraid somebody might come in here and hurt me more. I feel bad about it now because we were in our house and I was just shot through the door. If I can't be safe at home, there's nowhere I can be safe. I was in Cook County Hospital for 10 days. It was painful. It's sore now.

Tina Jones' mother, Fredia Cumberlander: There were a lot of people out there, just in front of the door. Men and women, mostly men though, about 30 people or more. I went out there and said, "Somebody shot my daughter, somebody shot my baby," and everybody started breaking toward my door. That's when I said: "I don't want anybody in here. Somebody just shot my daughter, shot my baby." Somebody said, "Your baby's been shot?" I said, "Yeah, my baby's been shot!" I closed the door, then I opened it and said, "Will somebody please call the ambulance for me?" I thought my baby was going to die because she was shot. We're not safe in our own apartment now.

JAMES CARTER

(Shipping and receiving worker, Shot Aug. 25, 1991, on south Commercial Avenue)

I was on the passenger side in the front seat of a car with my brother, and they just ran up to the car and started shooting. We were at a stop sign at Escanaba or Exchange—I don't remember which—and about 25 people surrounded the car. There were three of us; my brother was driving, and a guy named Carmelo was in the car too. When they started shooting, I just saw my son and my brother in my mind. The guys shooting at us threw up gang signs to indicate that they were members of a certain gang, a gang from the West Side. It was too dark to see if they were wearing hats.

When the shooting stopped, they started throwing bottles and stuff at the car. We'd just come back from a liquor store on 87th Street, and it's a shortcut to pass up Commercial so we can hit South Chicago Avenue. There was already a fight going on, but I didn't see the guys till we came to a complete stop. They thought we were gangbangers. I identified who shot me from pictures, and they've been picked up. I was hit in the neck, and the bullet came out of my chest, but there are two other bullets still in my chest. I have to see a neurologist to see if the bullets are going to stay in or be taken out. I was shot with .25-caliber bullets.

I had an 18-year-old brother who was shot and killed almost instantly. He left an infant son. I have feelings of revenge, but there's really nothing I can do about it; it'd just get worse. In the past I was a member of a gang. I regret it; they weren't doing anything for me. I left that gang about three years ago.

WILLIE B. WILSON

(Retiree, Shot Aug. 19, 1991, at 5817 S. Union Ave.)

I was lying in bed, and I couldn't sleep because a van had pulled up out front and they had loud rap music on. And I was lying in the bed praying that they would leave soon or stop the music. I wanted to be at church on time in the morning. They finally got in the van and closed the door and started the motor. I was in bed with my face to the window, at the foot of the bed, and all of a sudden I heard a lot of gunfire.

At first I thought somebody had lit a package of firecrackers, because that's what it sounded like. I discovered it was a gun, and it went on and on. I was afraid to raise my head because I might get hit with a bullet. Then I felt something that stung my face, and I put my hand up to my face and felt something wet. I got up and turned the light on, and then I saw all the blood on my hands. I called to my husband and told him I'd been shot. My husband called 911. I tried to get some clothes on because I had my night clothes on, but before I could, the ambulance was here and I had to go the way I was. What went through my mind was how bad it was, how bad the wound was.

They opened up with Uzis and 9 millimeters. The policeman said they were stationed on the railroad track, over the viaduct. There must have been someone in two different places because there were two different guns. The doctor at the eye clinic said there were no injuries to my eyeball or to the nerve in my eye. The bullet, a 9 millimeter, is still behind my left ear. When I yawn, it feels funny.

JAMES COOPER

(Cab driver, Shot Aug. 15, 1992, at Rockwell Gardens, 2401 W. Monroe St.)

I had a call on my cab radio to pick up a pregnant lady. As I circled the block, a blue car pulled out in front of me and my car hit its rear right tire. There were three guys in the car. They got out and started talking. They said, "Hey man, you messed up my car, you got to pay." I said, "I didn't mess up your car, you pulled out on me." Then one of the guys grabbed a gun. When I saw the pistol, I got back in my car. I'm saying, "How much you want?" He said, "Give me $200." I said, "I'll give you $50." He said, "Nah, you got to do better." So I say, "I'll give you $75, that's all I got." He says, "OK, I'll take that." I said: "Not so fast. Take this card, sign your name saying that you're OK and we settled."

He's got the gun. He was holding it up, moving it around. At this time he didn't put it in my face. He wrote down, "Solid T." I said, "Hey, you've got to put a name down and say you're satisfied." So he wrote his name down and "OK." I was counting the money out. There was more than 75 bucks; I had about 95 bucks. Then a guy came up and said, "I'll take all of that." I said, "Who's this dude?" This new guy said, "This guy is bull _ _ _ _, start shooting his tires out."

So the guy that he told to start shooting, shot my tires out. He shot out the left tire, BOOM, then he shot the rear tire, BOOM. I'm thinking, "It's out of here, now or never." I threw the car in reverse. I stepped on the gas, and it didn't go anywhere; it shut off. I thought, "I'm out of it now." The second guy with the gun came around the car and opened the door from the passenger side and reached in and grabbed the keys to the car. I tried to stop him because if I'm stranded here, I'm lost, it's over. I stopped him, and then he pointed the gun at me. I grabbed the gun barrel and tried to push it down, and he shot me in the leg once. I didn't really feel it. I saw the blood. I still had a good grip on the gun barrel. I saw the blood sprinkling. Then he shot me again. I felt a serious shock wave go down my leg. So I kind of just steered him back out of the car away from me. Everybody's scattering now. There was a big crowd. We're talking 1:40 p.m., right in there. This guy seemed to be definitely the leader, who shot me. He controlled the situation; by the way he came in, he was in charge. I'd never been shot in my life, and I just couldn't believe it.•

IN HONOR OF NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

• Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the men and women who work every single day of the year to produce our Nation's agricultural products. The farmers and farm families of Minnesota, like all American farmers, are the backbone of the United States. Our Nation has the largest source of cheap, safe, and plentiful food in the whole world. For this reason, we must honor our farmers throughout the year, not just on National Agriculture Day.

Minnesota's 88,000 farmers farm a tapestry of rolling hill country, great stretches of prairie land, and rich valleys that provide a marvelous mix of soils for a variety of agricultural products—wheat, corn, soybeans, barley, sugarbeets, dairy, beef cattle, hogs, sheep, chickens, turkeys, sunflowers, hay, potatoes, flax, rye, red clover seed, timothy seed, mink, wild rice, dry beans, lamb, eggs, sweet corn, green peas, and honey.

Minnesota is the sixth largest agricultural State. The hard work and effort of just one Minnesota farmer provides enough food to feed 101 people—74 Americans and 27 people overseas. Every Minnesota farmer generates four off-farm private enterprises in the State. Over $70,000 per year in cash receipts are generated from one Minnesota farm. And most of that is spent right in town to cover expenses, thus supporting rural small businesses.

American agriculture and food processing provides 21 million jobs, or 1 out of every 6 jobs in the country. Agriculture is the Nation's single largest industry. Farming alone employs 2.1 million people—as many as the combined work forces of the transportation, steel, and automobile industries.

Furthermore, agriculture accounts for 17 percent of America's gross national product. For every $1 billion in agriculture exports, 25 thousand American jobs are created.

Mr. President, the importance of agriculture to Minnesota and to the United States cannot be disputed. On this day, National Agriculture Day, I submit that our Government ought to do more for farmers and rural America.

The median age of a farmer in Minnesota is 48; across the Nation, it is 53. This Government can and should do more to give incentives for beginning farmers. Where will this Nation be in 15 years when so many of today's farmers will retire? Senator GRASSLEY and I recently introduced legislation to provide tax-exempt private agricultural activity bonds for beginning farmers.

This bill should be approved by the Senate early in this session. Aggie bonds are essential if farm loans are to be made for the next generation of farmers. As America sees record numbers of farmers leaving the land and younger generations moving to the cities, the need for tax-exempt aggie bonds is clear. Federal law constricts the use of the bonds for loans to first-time farm purchases and restricts them to a maximum of $250,000 per family per lifetime.

Local lenders are the primary purchasers of aggie bonds, and it is the local community that benefits from the beginning farmers that are funded by them. As farmers are established by this financing, the benefits of this program ripple out to the implement dealers, seed suppliers, and other services in the rural economy. Tax exemption for aggie bonds is good public policy.

This week Minnesota corn, wheat, and barley growers, cattlemen, and input dealers came to my office and impressed upon me the need for their Government to listen to their concerns. Last weekend I held a rural issues meeting in St. Peter, MN, where rural Minnesotans asked me why their Government took their taxes and then invested them in the cities.

Soon the Senate will be debating Btu taxes on energy and an increase in barge fees from 19 cents a gallon to $1.19 a gallon. Between gasoline and diesel to fuel their tractors, propane to dry their grain, fertilizer for their soil, electricity to run their machinery, and barges to ship their harvest, Minnesota farmers will be paying a huge sum into the Treasury. In fuel costs alone, the average Minnesota wheat grower will have increased costs of $2,000 annually. But what will he get in return?

So, Mr. President, on this National Agriculture Day I do not wish merely to devote my time to honoring the hardworking men and women who provide this Nation's bountiful harvest. I also charge the Senate, and the Federal Government generally, to respect the interests of America's farmers as we craft national policies.

What helps America's farmers is helpful to each and every one of us, from country crossroads communities to our greatest metropolitan areas.•

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all but 15 minutes of the statutory 2 hours of time on amendment No. 183 be deemed to have been used in debate; that the remaining 15 minutes be divided, 5 minutes under the control of Senator KENNEDY and 10 minutes under the control of Senator DOMENICI; that the vote on the Kennedy amendment now scheduled for 9:10 a.m. tomorrow morning occur instead at 9:15 a.m. tomorrow morning, and that the vote on the Grassley amendment now scheduled for 11:30 a.m. tomorrow morning occur instead at 11:35 a.m. tomorrow morning.

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

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 9 A.M.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 10:27 p.m., recessed until tomorrow, Friday, March 19, 1993, at 9 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, March 18, 1993*

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Reverend James Healy, pastor, Our Lady Queen of Peace Catholic Church, Arlington, VA, offered the following prayer:

Creator God, You are truth, Your law is love. Make these, Your servants, called by Your people, unrelenting in their search for truth, unmatched in their witness to Your love.

Let Your Spirit hover over their daily deliberations. Give them patience and persistence in the face of frustration, conviction and courage in the art of compromise.

Make them passionate and persuasive in defense of the poor, discreet and discerning in demands of the rich. Let the Constitution be their charter and conscience their guide.

In matters of principle, make them intensely serious, in matters of privilege, a little less so.

Make them bold and courageous in leadership, humble and attentive in service for the good of Your people and Your glory, Eternal God.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. 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. 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 253, nays 155, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—253

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—155

Allard
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Gilchrest
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—22

Clay
DeFazio
Dornan
Fields (TX)
Ford (TN)
Gallo
Gingrich
Hastings
Henry
Johnston
Laughlin
Mineta
Murphy
Peterson (MN)
Quillen
Spratt
Torres
Tucker
Unsoeld
Washington
Williams
Wilson

□ 1126

Mr. COBLE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. MCKEON 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 with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 904. An act to amend the Airport and Airway Safety, Capacity, Noise Improvement, and Intermodal Transportation Act of 1992 with respect to the establishment of the National Commission to Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry.

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

S. 80. An act to increase the size of the Big Thicket National Preserve in the State of Texas by adding the Village Creek corridor unit, the Big Sandy corridor unit, and the Canyonlands unit;

S. 164. An act to authorize the adjustment of the boundaries of the South Dakota portion of the Sioux Ranger District of Custer National Forest, and for other purposes;

S. 214. An act to authorize the construction of a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II and to commemorate U.S. participation in that conflict;

S. 252. An act to provide for certain land exchanges in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes;

S. 275. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the town of Taos, NM, and for other purposes;

S. 326. An act to revise the boundaries of the George Washington Birthplace National Monument, and for other purposes;

S. 328. An act to provide for the rehabilitation of historic structures within the Sandy Hook Unit of Gateway National Recreation Area in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes;

S. 344. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Fox and Lower Wisconsin River corridors in the State of Wisconsin as a National Heritage Corridor, and for other purposes; and

S. 375. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating a segment of the Rio Grande in New Mexico as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 102-240, the Chair, announced on behalf of the majority leader his appointment of Dana Connors of Maine, as a member of the National Council on Surface Transportation Research.

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276d-276g, of title 22, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. METZENBAUM, as chairman of the Senate delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group during the 103d Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 403(a)(2) of Public Law 100-533, as amended, the Chair, announced on behalf of the majority leader his reappointment of Mary Ann Campbell of Arkansas and his appointment of Barbara Aiello of Maine, as members of the National Women's Business Council.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not recognize Members for 1-minute requests at this time.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 69, noes 343, answered "present" 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

AYES—69

Allard
Armey
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Bartlett
Bentley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Collins (GA)
Crane
Crapo
DeLay
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Everett
Fawell
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gekas
Gillmor
Goodling
Greenwood
Hancock
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Houghton
Hunter
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
King
Kingston
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Livingston
McCandless
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Myers
Paxon
Pombo
Pryce (OH)
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Shaw
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stump
Sundquist
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Vucanovich
Walsh
Young (AK)

NOES—343

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dreier
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Levin
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walker
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Taylor (NC)

NOT VOTING—17

Clay	Gallo	Tauzin
Dellums	Gingrich	Tucker
Dornan	Henry	Washington
Fields (TX)	Lehman	Williams
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Wilson
Ford (TN)	Quillen	

□ 1145

Ms. SCHENK, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. HUTCHINSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 133 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 133

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read for amendment under the five-minute rule. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed and by the named proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in this resolution. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. If more than one amendment in the nature of a substitute is adopted, only the last to be adopted shall be considered as finally adopted and reported to the House. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been finally adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

□ 1150

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT). The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary one-half hour of debate time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 133 is the rule providing for the further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 64, the concurrent resolution on the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998.

The rule makes in order the four substitutes printed in the Rules Committee report:

First, the Kasich substitute, debatable for 2 hours;

Second, the Solomon substitute, debatable for 1 hour;

Third, the Mfume substitute, for the Black Caucus, debatable for 1 hour;

And finally, the Sabo substitute, consisting of the text of House Concurrent Resolution 64 as reported by the House Budget Committee, debatable for 2 hours.

Should more than one of these substitutes be adopted, the rule provides that only the last to be adopted shall be reported to the House.

The rule waives all points of order against the four substitutes. It also provides a period of 20 minutes of concluding debate, after disposition of all the substitutes.

Finally, as provided for in the Congressional Budget Act, amendments needed to achieve mathematical consistency are also made in order.

Mr. Speaker, as Members are aware, the role of the Budget Committee is, and has always been, to develop a blueprint, a general plan, for the Federal budget.

The budget resolution is the mechanism through which Congress determines appropriate, overall Federal spending and revenue levels, and directs the Appropriations Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and the various authorizing committees, to report legislation which will achieve the goals outlined in the resolution.

Specific measures to implement the budget resolution—appropriations bills, and reconciliation legislation—will, of course, be considered later. It is through those bills that actual deficit-reduction measures will be debated and, eventually, enacted into law. Right now, today, our purpose is to consider total levels of spending and of revenues.

The Committee on Rules adopted a policy over a decade ago, I remind members, of making in order only comprehensive substitutes to the Budget Committee-reported budget resolution and, in most years, members of both parties have agreed on that approach, on that framework. We adopted that policy for a number of reasons:

Primary among them, first, that we believe that program-level, or line-item amendments to a budget-resolution are inappropriate. Such amendments are the province of the authorizing, appropriating, and tax committees—not the Budget Committee—and are only appropriate for consideration when legislation from those committees is later considered by the House.

Second, program-level amendments unnecessarily prolong debate on the budget resolution. Years ago, when the Rules Committee allowed line-item amendments to the budget resolution, floor consideration of the resolution could often take several weeks—that is, weeks, not days but weeks. The amendments offered were often duplicative amendments, which were also offered to the authorizing and appropriating bills. It was not a constructive use of floor time.

As the minority members of the Rules Committee know, we are quite sympathetic to providing more open rules in many cases. But this is a case where it is completely inappropriate to allow anything more than the comprehensive alternatives that the committee has made, in fact, in order under this rule. The three substitutes made in order do, each of them, offer a comprehensive alternative to the budget as reported by the Budget Committee.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to commend, on behalf of all the members of the Committee on Rules, each of the three authors—the ranking minority member of the House Budget Committee, Mr. KASICH; the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]; and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME], and his colleagues on the Congressional Black Caucus—for the work they have done in putting together alternative fiscal plans, which do, in fact, give the Members of this House several different options for determining fiscal policy for the years ahead of us.

In all, Members will have four comprehensive budget blueprints, two Republican and two Democratic, from which to choose the best course for the Federal budget for the next 5 years.

I also wish to commend once again, as I did yesterday, and I am sure Members will join me in these remarks, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] for his diligent and effective work in developing a budget resolution in a very difficult time, one of great time constraints, a budget resolution that cuts an additional $63 billion from Mr. Clinton's budget plan over the 5-year period from fiscal year 1994 through fiscal year 1998.

In all, the resolution, as reported by the Committee on the Budget, would reduce the Federal deficit by $42 billion in fiscal year 1994 and by $510 billion over the next 5 years.

These savings, may I again remind our colleagues, represent real, substantive cuts. Under the Committee on the Budget's plan, we will be spending less in actual dollars on discretionary programs in every year, from 1994 through 1998, then we spend in 1993. Thus, discretionary spending will be frozen, with no increase for inflation, for the next 5 years.

The remainder of the $510 billion in deficit reduction is achieved through reconciliation instructions to 13 authorizing committees. Those savings will be enacted this year in a single, omnibus reconciliation bill through permanent changes in the law.

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

Mr. Speaker, our friends on the other side of the aisle have touted the change that has taken place in the Federal Government—the new beginning—the death knoll for gridlock. True, what we see on the floor today—and in fact almost every day of this fledgling 103d Congress—is an evolution out of gridlock. But gridlock to grief is not exactly what Americans had in mind, and this budget resolution brings us grief.

On the agenda today is a budget resolution that calls for more than $300 billion in new taxes—for those who find billions hard to compute that translates into an average of $500 a year in higher taxes for a typical family with an after-tax income of $34,000. It's a budget for tens of billions of dollars of new spending with minimal and mostly vague spending constraints.

It's a budget that seems to ignore pleas from the American people to cut spending first and a budget that has disregarded collective proposals, including one of mine, to make specific and real budget cuts of hundreds of billions of dollars. It is a budget that leaves us with a rising deficit in 1998—even after enormous tax hikes and tremendous sacrifice.

And it is a budget resolution that will likely pass without the benefit of full scrutiny by all Members because the Democratic majority—even with its 80-vote advantage—has once again engineered a restrictive rule that shuts out many legitimate and relevant amendments. At the end of my remarks, I will submit the open rule substitute and the amendments and votes cast in the Rules Committee on this subject.

The distinguished minority whip asked the question most succinctly yesterday—just what is the Democratic leadership afraid of? What have we got to lose by debating the merits of Mr. WALKER's proposal? He suggested setting up a 10-percent checkoff so taxpayers can ensure that at least some of their money is being channeled to debt reduction.

And what is there to lose from discussing the distinguished minority leader's very responsible proposal to guarantee that no extraneous provisions end up in this budget resolution as it moves through the process? And I cannot understand what we could possibly lose by considering substitutes offered by Mr. BURTON and others to simply limit the growth of all Government spending over 5 years?

In my view, we have absolutely nothing to lose and everything to gain by opening up this process. So I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle—what are you afraid of? And I implore my colleagues in this House to remember that our actions on the budget—our progress in reducing the deficit, creating jobs, and encouraging economic growth—will be the yardstick by which we will be judged.

Voting for a restrictive rule and more taxes, higher spending and minimal budget cuts will be remembered. Members who are unquestioningly following mandates of their leadership will have some explaining to do. I urge a "No" vote on the previous question so we can consider the merits of all the amendments. Failing that, I urge a "No" vote on this rule.

ROLLCALL VOTES IN THE RULES COMMITTEE ON THE PROPOSED RULE FOR THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

1. Dreier motion—for an open rule. Rejected, 3–7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, and Slaughter.

2. Solomon motion—to make in order Walker amendment No. 2 (see attached summary of amendments). Rejected, 3–7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, and Slaughter.

3. Solomon motion—to make in order Walker amendment No. 8. Rejected, 3–7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, and Slaughter.

4. Dreier motion—to make in order Barton amendment No. 3. Rejected, 3–7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, and Slaughter.

5. Goss motion—to make in order Herger amendment No. 4. Rejected, 3–7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, and Slaughter.

6. Goss motion—to make in order Allard amendment No. 12, Rejected, 3–7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, and Slaughter.

7. Dreier en bloc motion—to make in order the following amendments: Everett No. 5, Burton No. 7, Bentley No. 9, Allard No. 11, and Smith (MI) No. 13. Rejected, 3–7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, and Slaughter.

8. Derrick motion—to report rule. Adopted, 7–3. Yeas: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, and Slaughter. Nays: Solomon, Dreier, and Goss.

AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64

1. Sanders: Reduces defense (function 050) budget authority and outlays by $15 billion in each of fiscal years 1994–1998. Transfers $9 billion of that to Income Security (function 600) and $6 billion to Education, Training (function 500) in each of fiscal years 1994–1998.

2. Walker: Directs Ways and Means and Government Operations Committees to report, by August 1, 1993. Ways and Means must recommend changes in law to allow taxpayers to designate up to 10 percent of their tax liability to reture the public debt Government Operations must recommend changes in law to sequester each year (make automatic, across-the-board cuts in all spending except social security, debt payments and deposit insurance) an amount equal to the amount taxpayers designate for reducing the public debt.

3. Barton: Directs engrossing clerk to send to the Senate a joint resolution proposing a tax limitation/balanced budget constitutional amendment but only if the House adopts the conference report on the budget resolution by a vote of two-thirds of the total membership.

4. Herger: Reduces amount of total tax increases in each fiscal year by the amount assumed for increased taxes on Social Security benefits. Reduces spending in 5 functions (general science, energy, commerce and housing, transportation, and general government). The deficit amount would be correspondingly lowered in fiscal years 1994, 1996, and 1997 and would be increased in fiscal years 1995 and 1998.

5. Everett: Expresses sense of House that Members may not increase pay if budget deficit has occurred in previous Congress; Members should have pay reduced in deficit was not reduced by previous Congress.

6. Kasich: Reduces the budget deficit by $38 billion in fiscal year 1994 and $450 billion over 5 years. Achieves all savings through spending cuts, but includes some changes in user fees. Contains no spending or tax increases. Reforms, reduces or eliminates more than 160 programs. Reduces defense spending more than $60 billion (half of the President's recommendation); increases retirement age of federal workers; creates block grant for food and nutrition programs; expands use of managed care in the Medicaid program; provides means testing for Medicare benefits for those with incomes over $100,000; includes malpractice reform; cuts $5.5 billion from energy programs; places moratorium on federal land purchases; funds highway programs at baseline levels; cuts federal government by $48 billion over 5 years; cuts federal employees by 50,000 more than the President; freezes COLA's for federal employees, including Members of Congress.

7. Burton: Reduces the deficit by $850 billion over 5 years by limiting the annual growth in overall federal spending to no more than 2 percent.

8. Michel: Establishes a point of order against extraneous matter in any reconciliation legislation considered at the direction of the fiscal year 1994 Budget Resolution. Permits Members to strike provisions that (1) have no budgetary impact, (2) increase outlays or decrease revenues where a committee has not met its reconciliation target, (3) increase outlays or decrease revenues in years beyond those covered by the reconciliation bill, and (4) provisions not in the jurisdiction of the Committee reporting the provisions.

9. Bentley: Caps the fiscal year 1994 budget aggregates and the allocations for each function at the fiscal year 1993 level, plus two percentage points. For fiscal years 1995–1998, caps aggregates and allocations at preceding year's amounts, plus two percentage points.

Directs the Committee of the Whole to report, by May 14, 1993, a reconciliation bill to reduce expenditures by not less than $17.1 billion.

10. Solomon: Lowers total revenues by (1) eliminating several tax increases (including Btu tax, increase in tax on Social Security benefits, and corporate tax hike), (2) raising the income level at which the 36 percent individual tax rate begins (from $140,000 to $200,000 on joint returns), and (3) retaining 10 percent surtax on millionaires. To offset the revenue lost, includes all spending cuts from the Kasich substitute and includes $30 billion in additional cuts (including elimination of Supercollider, stretchout of space station funding, further cuts in legislative branch funding—from 15 to 25 percent, and reduction by 50 percent for highway demonstration projects. Also directs appropriate committees to report, by May 1, 1993, (1) a balanced budget constitutional amendment, (2) legislation providing the President enhanced rescission authority, and (3) legislation modifying maximum deficit amounts (MDAs) to reflect amounts in the resolution and to trigger sequestration if actual deficits exceed MDAs.

11. Allard: Decreases total new budget authority for fiscal year 1994 by $1.673 billion. Decreases outlays as follows: $650 million in fiscal year 1994, $540 million in fiscal year 1995, $291 million in fiscal year 1996, $131 million in fiscal year 1997, and $61 million in fiscal year 1998. Decreases deficit levels in corresponding amounts for each fiscal year. Specifies reductions by budget function, targeting those areas which traditionally have had earmarking or individual projects.

12. Allard: Decreases revenue levels in an amount equal to that which is estimated to result from a Btu tax. Reduces new spending in slightly larger amounts than what would be necessary to offset the lost revenues.

13. Smith (MI): Limits outlay expenditures in fiscal year 1994 to either (1) the outlay level of the Kasich substitute or (2) a limited freeze for fiscal year 1994. The freeze would limit the increase in Medicare and Medicaid expenditures to one-half the CBO estimate (approximately 6.5 percent above the fiscal year 1993 outlays) and permit an increase in Social Security to reflect the additional number of retirees projected. After 1994, the amendment would limit outlay expenditures to either (1) the outlay level of the Kasich substitute or (2) a 1 percent increase in each budget function, including Social Security (which would be adjusted to reflect the increased number of retirees). The amendment assumes the social Security retirement age would be extended by one month per year for 36 years.

14. Mfume: Redistributes among domestic discretionary functions to provide increases for education, competitiveness in new technologies, attacking homelessness and war on drugs. Rejects Btu tax; imposes new corporate and individual equity tax measures.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 95TH–103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted [1]	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [3]
95th (1977–78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979–80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981–82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983–84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985–86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987–88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989–90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991–92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993–94)	8	0	0	8	100

[1] Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

[2] Open rules are those which permit any member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

[3] Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rules, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Source: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th–102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103rd Congress, through Mar. 17, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONG.

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D–5; R–25)	3 (D–0 R–3)	PQ: (264–176. A: 259–164. Feb. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: Motor voter	9 (D–1; R–8)	1 (D–0; R–1)	PQ: (248–171. A: 249–170. Feb. 4, 1993).
H. Res. 81, Feb. 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 6: Family planning	8 (D–0; R–8)	1 (D–0; R–1)	
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D–2; R–5)	0	PQ: (243–172. A: 237–178. Feb. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D–1; R–8)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: (248–166. A: 249–163. Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (D–4; R–9)	8 (D–3; R–5)	PQ: (247–170. A: 248–170. Mar. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental appropriations	37 (D–8; R–29)	1 (not submitted) (D–1; R–0).	
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D–2; R–12)	4 (1–D not submitted) (D–2; R–2).	

Note.—Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

H. RES. 133

An amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. GOSS:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States for the fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998. Following any general debate time remaining as provided for in H. Res. 131, the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion.".

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the President has presented his economic plan to the country, the Congress has gone out into the country to discuss and listen and debate that plan. Over and over again we hear that what the majority of the Americans want is more spending cuts first before we look at tax increases.

In order to do that, regardless of which budget resolution we adopt today, we have to have process reform. The single most important process reform that we must have is a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

I went to the Rules Committee yesterday to present as an amendment to any budget resolution that would be adopted the Barton-Tauzin balanced budget tax limitation amendment. The amendment was voted on in the House last summer and got 200 votes. It has bipartisan support. It has been endorsed yesterday by the entire Republican conference, all 175 members. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN], is my chief Democratic cosponsor, and we have over 25 Democratic cosponsors.

The Rules Committee waived all points of order on all amendments and all alternatives today, but they refused to let the Barton-Tauzin balanced budget amendment come to the floor to be adopted as an amendment to any of these budget resolutions. It does not matter what budget resolution we pass today, until we have process reform with real discipline, the resolutions are not worth the paper they are printed on.

I urge a "no" vote so that we can go back to the Rules Committee and make the Barton-Tauzin amendment in order. We have to have a balanced budget amendment. We have to have it in this Congress. We need a chance to do it today. The Rules Committee said no. We should reject this rule to give us another opportunity.

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

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats' tax increases are going to hurt American families. The Democrats' tax increases are going to hurt American employers. But tragically these tax increases will not reduce the deficit. Tax increases never reduce the deficit, and there are a lot of reasons for that.

One important reason is that people actually do behave differently when they are taxed more. This is something

that the economic models that are used by the Budget Committee completely disregard. But the fact is when people's maximum marginal tax rates go up by 37 percent, as is the case in this proposal, they are going to get into tax shelters, they are going to get into municipal bonds, and the Federal Government will not get a nickel from those investments. They are going to defer the realization of their income, and yes, they may even do less work, earn less money, and some may even retire from the work force altogether.

Another reason why raising taxes will not decrease the deficit is that increased taxes hurt the economy so badly that they cost jobs loss and they reduce the income that working people make, so that even when the tax rates go up the tax revenues do not.

The fact is that the rich, whom many of these taxes are aimed at, and the corporations, whom many of these taxes are aimed at, are also known as investors and employers, and the constriction of the economy that is going to be caused by these tax increases will reduce revenues.

Finally, even if every nickel of projected tax revenues came into the Federal Treasury, we still would not use them to reduce the deficit, because as we know too well, whenever Congress has gotten extra revenues from tax increases it has spent every nickel and then some. This is the history of 1982, of 1986, of Gramm-Rudman I, of Gramm-Rudman II. There is no reason to believe that will be different this time.

Vote for the Kasich substitute and against the Democrats' proposal.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. President, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD].

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and this budget resolution. I just concluded over 20 town meetings in my district, 6 meetings on the budget alone, trying to help our people understand the problems associated with the hard choices we must make on this issue. People would stand up in those meetings and voice their concerns about some part of the budget. Program services cuts, tax increases, sometimes expressing anger over their Government letting this country get to $4 trillion in debt. But inevitably those same people would come up to me at the end of the meeting and say:

Congressman, we know the choices are tough, but we can tolerate this debt no longer. Change the direction and turn this country around from the accumulation of more deficits. We know that when the executive branch has told us we never have to pay for anything, that is wrong. And when the legislative branch tells us we never have to do without anything, that's equally wrong. Stop the blaming. Yes, we know that President Reagan doubled the defense budget and cut the taxes of the wealthiest people in this country. We also know that Democrats have opposed the line-item veto to find a mechanism to get the unnecessary and nonpriority spending out of the budget. And we know that all of you let the special interests too greatly affect your decisions. We know that it's not always possible to anticipate an S&L bailout, or a Persian Gulf war, or a flat economy, all of which contribute to the deficit, but Congressman, we also know that if you people choose to work together, you can change the direction of this country and this deficit. Do it.

Mr. Speaker, I support the President's budget because it is the most realistic approach to resolving the deficit crisis facing our country. It recognizes that almost every American will be called upon to help his country. It does not offer an easy course promising no pain, or only pain for those who are in a different economic class than we are. It challenges the wealthiest to pay a fairer share in support of the plight of the middle class in this country and it challenges the middle class to think of the poorest among us.

This debate, sir, is not about Bill Clinton. It is about our children, their nutrition, their health care, their education, their future. This debate is not about Congress, it is about our country. Its future. Our future. This debate is about establishing accountability again by being honest with the people, admitting that some things have to be paid for now and that some nonpriority things have to go now. Years from this moment the history books will look us squarely in the eye and they will record this decision for posterity. Will they say that we found the courage to make the hardest choice in the most difficult of times or will they say that we had not the courage. That we settled for the easy course once again, because we cared more about winning the political battle than we cared about winning the future for our children. In my judgment, the President's budget gives us the best opportunity to win that future.

□ 1210

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the author of the freeze amendment. We cannot hold him responsible for the weather in Washington; this is the budget freeze.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I love these impassioned speeches that we just hear from the other side about how we have got to sacrifice and we have to be honest with the American people and that we have to help their country.

We brought a budget alternative to the Committee on Rules yesterday that would not raise America's taxes but would cut Government spending. It would pinch some toes, but it would not cause economic chaos, and they say, "You cannot get there without tax increases."

Well, America, there is a list of $1.1 trillion in spending cuts that could be made that will get us to a balanced budget in 5 to 6 years without any tax increase.

We had the largest tax increase, or one of them, 2 years ago, and they said that would get us to a balanced budget. What did it do? It led to a major recession, and they said it was going to be used for deficit reduction, and for every $1 in new taxes, they spent $2.70. It did not amount to much in deficit reduction, but it did feather a lot of their political nests.

But they will tell you that we have got to raise your taxes, and get this, folks, $402 billion, $325.5 billion in tax increases and the rest in fees and other things they are calling spending cuts, $402 billion in new taxes.

And get this: That is more than double the largest tax increase in history, yet they will tell you that is going to solve our economic problems. What it is going to do is put more taxes on the backs of businesses, and then those businesses who have to pass that on to the consumer are going to do so. It is going to price them out of competition. We are going to lose market share around the world to our competitors, and jobs will be driven out of this country.

Economists are telling us that the Clinton proposal will cost 1.4 million jobs over the next 5 years. All of their spending cuts are in the fourth and fifth years. All the tax increases and new spending is on the front end. We are going to have two Congresses elected between now and when the spending cuts take place. Do you think they will really take place? Not on your life.

They are going to raise your taxes and spend the money. We will never see the spending cuts.

So how do we get to a balanced budget? How do we save our kids and the future of this country? We do it by making the hard choices, by cutting spending.

What my budget does is it caps the growth of spending at no more than 2 percent a year, and we get there by changing, out of this $1.1 trillion, we get there by taking $848 billion out of these spending increases to get to the balanced budget. Sure, we are going to have to make the hard choices, but we do not have to take all of these spending cuts.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No. I do not have the time. I am sorry.

We only have to take $848 billion out of this.

But what do they want to do? They want to convince you and the American people that the only way there is going to be any solution to this problem and the only way we are going to get there is by the pain of more taxes and the pain of more taxes to the tune

of more than double the largest tax increase in history.

It is going to put people out of work, drive companies out of this country, offshore into Taiwan and elsewhere, and it is going to hurt the economy dramatically. They are going to do irreparable damage to this economy with those tax increases.

We can cut the spending. The first thing we ought to be doing is taking a meat cleaver to the spending.

Ten years ago we brought in $500 billion in taxes. Today it is $1.2 trillion. We have almost tripled the tax revenues, yet they are still $400 billion short.

The problem is not that we do not have enough money. The problem is they are spending too much.

And now their President wants to load another $402 billion onto your backs.

The answer, if we are going to have shared pain, is not more taxes. The answer is to make hard choices, prioritize spending, cut out a lot of this stuff, and get to a balanced budget, not on the backs of the American people with more taxes, but by spending cuts. That is the answer.

If you look at this chart, you will see that, based upon current revenue projections by CBO, we will be at a balanced budget with a 2-percent solution by right at the turn of the century. If we use their plan, make no mistake about it, in 5 years you will be saddled with these taxes, and the budget will not be balanced. It will be worse. We will be in a bigger deficit hole, and we will have much more unemployment, and for each 1 percent of unemployment, it costs the Treasury and you, the taxpayer, $42 billion, $42 billion, and that is just another one of the problems they are going to create by hurting the economy with higher and higher taxes.

I would just like to say to my colleagues that lest you believe what I am saying, look at what they are doing; lest you believe what I am saying, the first bill they are bringing before this body, spending bill, is $19 billion, and it is almost all pork.

They will tell you that they are trying to cut spending and do the responsible thing. Let me just tell you what is in that bill: $5 million for a beach parking garage in some Congressman's district, $1 million for a cemetery in some Congressman's district, a movie theater, $3.5 million, for historic preservation in some Congressman's district, $4.5 million in gym replacement in some Congressman's district, $3.25 million in a pool, swimming pool renovation, and yet they tell you they are doing the responsible thing.

Cut spending, America.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would like to say simply that the presentation which I just heard made by the gentleman from Indiana is, in my opinion, and I think it would be backed up by any credible analysis, almost completely and totally incorrect and, I presume, presented to this House for some motive other than simply trying to pass the amendment that he was talking about. I would observe, and I think it is very important to observe, the Committee on Rules permitted the ranking Republican member of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], to bring forward his proposal for how this budget should be treated as an alternative to the Democratic proposal, and also permitted the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Rules, to bring forward his proposal regarding the budget.

I am sorry, Mr. BURTON, that they did not let you bring yours forward, and all I can say is with regard to this long list you very dramatically dropped out here in front of the House, apparently the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] did not agree with you either, and apparently the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] did not either, because their amendments do not include what you showed the Members of this House.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYANT. And I would say to the gentleman the same thing he just said to me a moment ago when I asked him to yield: Mr. BURTON, I do not have the time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. You do. You are the only speaker on your side. Yield for just a moment.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, I stand before the House today——

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. You do not want to answer?

Mr. BRYANT. I would observe, Mr. BURTON, that you did not yield to me, and so I will not afford you the same courtesy. If you choose to stand before this House and present what, in my view, are totally incorrect inferences and totally incorrect assertions, I do not believe that you ought to be allowed to do so without having to defend it and then come forward and ask us to yield to you, and I will not yield to you for that reason.

□ 1220

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Clinton budget and of the Budget package of the Budget Committee of the House. I think it is indeed the first genuine and dramatic step forward in dealing with the economic holocaust that we suffered in the 1980's, when we added approximately $2 trillion to the national debt, based upon budget proposals which came from two Presidents nominated by those on the Republican side of the aisle.

I suggest that it is time for us to step up to the plate and recognize our responsibilities, which are, number one, that we must deal with this budget problem in a way that eliminates deficits and also takes into consideration the absolute necessity to maintain economic growth.

This budget reduces deficit spending over the next 5 years by $510 billion. It is a dramatic improvement in what we have been doing and it is a genuine step forward toward economic viability. It reduces deficits by more than the Republican package which is before us today.

It also limits discretionary spending to the same level that was enacted for 1993, that is for this fiscal year, during each of the next 5 years, and in my opinion that is also a dramatic step forward.

It cuts $63 billion more in spending than even the President proposed to us.

It is a responsible package. It takes into consideration the need to protect economic growth and also to eliminate these deficits, and it is a courageous proposal on the part of President Clinton to come forward and tell the American people that he is not going to be another one of these no pain Presidents. We have had no pain Presidencies for 12 years, and now the pain facing the American people is greater than anything we could possibly have imagined.

I submit to you that a President who is willing to come forward and say we need to make cuts and we need to increase taxes in certain areas is a President with courage who deserves to be followed, and I call upon the Members of the House today to vote for this rule and to follow him.

These new taxes apply to wealthiest Americans who have reaped the benefits of 12 years of Republican rule, who have reaped the benefits of tax changes that have increased their share of the national wealth at the expense of everybody else.

It is not wrong to suggest that they might endure slight increases in the tax rates which they must face on April 15. It is not wrong of us to say that taxes are a part of the solution to a budget problem that is completely out of control.

I submit to you it would be wrong to turn down this package. I urge you to vote for the very responsible rule now pending before the House and to vote for the budget package which follows.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I just would like to call to the attention of my good friend, the gentleman form Texas, that I did not include the Burton freeze in my substitute simply

because my substitute goes even further. I would be putting spending back in if I did that.

But let me say this. That issue of the freeze is a legitimate issue that should be on this floor for legitimate debate by both sides.

There was a substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] which has a check-off of 10 percent of your income tax to go toward reducing this deficit.

Now, some people agree with it, some do not.

They are legitimate issues that should be debated on this floor, and to make those substitutes in order and to have free and open debate would be fair.

I think the gentleman's constituents in Texas would like it. I know mine would, and that is all that I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] was tying to make on that point.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas and for the edification of my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, that all of these cuts came from the Kasich plan and the Heritage Foundation. They are very real cuts. They are not imaginery.

The problem is the Democrats do not want to make the hard choices. They would much rather load taxes on the backs of the American people and spend the money, instead of making the hard choices on the cuts that are necessary.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BYRANT. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to observe that if indeed the cuts of the gentleman from Indiana are in the plan of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] or they are in the plan of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], that I cannot understand what the gentleman is complaining about. We are going to vote on what the gentleman proposed. If that is true, then the gentleman has no complaint.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if I might just reclaim my time, his freeze is not in any of the plans.

Mr. BRYANT. Why not?

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, because it is a different concept and that different concept ought to be debated, because some of us want to make such deeper cuts in specific items.

Mine, for instance, eliminates the superconducting super collider in the gentleman's State of Texas. The gentleman does not like that. Some other people do not like it.

Mine eliminates one-third of the cost of the space station. Some people do not like that. He should have had his day in court.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, this past decade has been a decade of deficits, deficits created by a gridlocked National Government, a gridlock that resulted because of an unwillingness on the part of political leaders to address honestly those elements of our Federal budget which needed to be restrained if we were truly to eliminate the red ink.

For a decade we denied that in order to solve this monstrous problem, every item within the Federal budget needed to be placed on the table and cuts needed to be applied fairly throughout those accounts.

We denied the reality that in order to get rid of 200 or 300 billion dollars' worth of red ink that Pentagon spending needed to be dramatically curtailed.

We denied the reality that tough choices needed to made within the domestic discretionary spending agenda and that at the very least a spending cap or a freeze needed to be achieved in that area to force programs to compete one against another so that lower priority programs would be cut and higher priority programs would be benefited.

We denied that entitlement spending needed to be part of a budget solution. Yet, health care costs and retirement costs and farm program costs and other mandatory program costs are really the dragon that is eating up so much of this Federal budget and causing a large share of our deficit spending.

We were afraid for a decade to admit that even with the deepest of cuts in the Pentagon and in domestic programs and in the entitlement areas, we would probably have to raise taxes to balance this budget.

The American people proved in 1992 that they were ready to hear the truth. In response, we can credit President Clinton for presenting an honest budget to the country, a budget that has changed the dynamic of the debate about Federal spending.

President Clinton did what his predecessors would not. He put everything on the table.

President Clinton suggested 150 specific program cuts.

President Clinton opened the door to Social Security cuts by suggesting that the wealthiest seniors pay some taxes on their Social Security income as a way of contributing to our deficit reduction goals.

President Clinton admitted that taxes had to be part of the mix. As a consequence this year for the first time in a decade we have had a relatively honest discussion of budget priorities and budget decisions as we approach a solution to this Nation's deficit problems.

The House Budget Committee did the President one better. In the course of their work, they added $63 billion worth of spending cuts to the President's budget package. Effectively they have presented to us a budget that will call upon us to adhere to a 5 year spending freeze on discretionary spending. A spending freeze for 5 years is a tough proposition any way you look at it.

Further, they included additional entitlement cuts by limiting COLA's on certain retirement programs.

This is a tough budget. This is an honest budget. Those of us in the Democratic Party who led the call for additional cuts appreciate the cooperation we have received from the White House and from Chairman SABO in pursuing these additional savings.

As a result, we now have a budget that will help us move closer to the President's goal of reducing the Federal deficit by 50 percent over the next 4 years.

This time around we have an honest debate. This time around we have all the elements on the table.

□ 1230

For the first time in a decade American's and their leaders in Washington are finally facing the fact that there is no easy way to eliminate the deficit, that tough decisions are required. While this may be a tough vote for some Members of Congress, it is the right vote for the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a yes vote on the budget.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to praise the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for the excellent job that he has done in presenting and preparing a freeze resolution.

I have long felt that this is the only sensible way to move on the most difficult question this Congress faces, which is how to get under control the massive deficits in which the Government has been engaged for decades and will be for more.

I particularly appreciate the words of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] that this proposal deserves its day in court.

Mr. Speaker, this is the only proposal before the House that does either not increase fees or not increase taxes. We do not touch Social Security or comparable government retirement programs. We freeze the budget at 2 percent growth rate per year, and by the year 2000, Mr. Speaker, the budget would be in balance, and $848 billion would have been saved.

I say to my colleagues, "If you're talking about fairness, fairness means all programs, but a very small number treated equally and feel the pain equally."

A few weeks ago I introduced H.R. 1099. It was based on two principles, and I suggest that we face up to those principles:

No. 1, that Congress should act like a true board of directors and set the broad target, but set it firmly; No. 2, the President should be held accountable for moving funds within that broad target.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has approached that. I have approached it. H.R. 1099 is before the Committee on Government Operations. The freeze type proposal in the nature of a substitute deserves a hearing in committee and on this floor. The Budget Act of 1974 in this regard is completely outdated.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for yielding this time to me, and, Mr. Speaker, I am obviously disappointed that this rule did not allow a variety of alternatives to come to the floor, one of which the Committee on Rules had before them that was an attempt to allow me to offer the 10-percent check-off debt buy-down amendment which would give the American people an opportunity for the first time to check off on their tax form money to buy down the national debt and, thereby, at the same time reduce the deficit because it forces the Government to match dollar for dollar every debt buy-down dollar with a dollar of spending cuts. This particular proposal not only balances the budget in 5 years, but in 15 years, worked optimally, accordingly to CBO, this is something that actually wipes out the entire national debt.

Now whether my colleagues agree with that as a concept or whether they do not; maybe there are people in this body who just do not want the American people involved in the process, but at least it is something that deserves discussion on the floor. It was an entirely germane amendment. What I am told is that we were told at the Committee on Rules that we could not do this because it was not in the form of a substitute and they only allow substitutes. Well, that is not right.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1991, when we were debating the budget resolution for 1992, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] offered a perfecting amendment. He was given an opportunity because he is a Democrat to come to the floor with something other than a substitute. However, Mr. Speaker, when a Republican goes to the Committee on Rules, asks for a perfecting amendment, asks for a procedural amendment, Republicans are told, "No, you may only bring a substitute," and, if you are Mr. BURTON and bring a substitute, you are told, "No, you can't even have that."

Now, if my colleagues wonder why we think this place operates unfairly, just consider how the budget has been debated thus far. First of all, on the budget resolution they got 5½ hours of debate on the Democrat side. We got 4½ hours of debate. That is pretty unfair. They got their amendments; we do not get our amendments. They get their substitutes, and, as my colleagues know, we get only a couple of substitutes, but not what we ask for.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this rule is a travesty.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EVERETT].

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot today on how taxpayers must suffer. Share of pain we call it. I have not heard anything about how the Congress must share the pain with the public.

Yesterday in the Committee on Rules I asked to offer a simple amendment to the budget resolution. It would express the sense of Congress that Members should not receive an increase in pay if there is a budget deficit left by the preceding Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress talk a good game of deficit reduction, but in the end do they really care about the fiscal responsibility since there is no penalty? There is a perception in the public that they do not care.

Most American workers get paid according to their job performance, Mr. Speaker, and I ask, "Why should our work place be any different? Why shouldn't Members of Congress receive compensation on a pay-per-performance basis just like other Americans? If Congress cannot reduce the deficit in an effective way, then freeze the pay level.

We are public servants. We serve the public. If anything, we should face higher standards as public servants. There is a national perception that Members of this institution seem to have it backwards.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that before Congress can lead this Nation to face the difficult tasks before us that we must show the Nation we are willing to lead by example. The House should be given a chance to state its position on this concept. The amendment would help change the perception that Congress protects its own purse while taking from the taxpayers.

It is a fair amendment, Mr. Speaker, fair to the Members of Congress and fair to the taxpayer. It would penalize Congress if it did not perform, and it should have been allowed.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the President's investment plan. It is exactly what is needed to restore this country to its rightful place as the leader in the international global marketplace through emphasis in education and basic research. This 5-year budget plan will increase funding for education by over $38 billion. This is a solid boost which will arm our students with higher level curriculum, better trained teachers, better equipment, more books and an enhanced teaching capacity in all of our classrooms across America.

President Clinton has put forth a comprehensive plan. I give it vigorous support because it will enhance the lives of women all across this Nation.

Let us not forget that half of American jobs are held by women. A jobs program will help women.

Women have suffered disproportionately over the last decade from failure of the prior administrations to think in terms of investing in the human needs of our working population: education, job training, child care, health, and equal opportunity.

We now have a President who speaks and thinks in terms of investment in human infrastructure.

Today 62 percent of those in poverty are women. Clinton's plan will put thousands of women back to work. This is a direction and priority that has been missing for the last decade.

Head Start for a million more children means jobs for tens of thousands of women. Providing high quality educational programs for these young children will not only employ thousands of women in the Head Start Program, but it will enable thousands more of the mothers of these children to get into jobs and job training.

Of all families who live in poverty, 51 percent are headed by women; 4.5 million women who work, live in poverty despite their jobs. Every time that our program lifts these women out of poverty into better paying jobs, it is a step up in the effort at deficit reduction.

Every child in Head Start opens up the possibility that the parent or parents have a better chance too to tool up their skills and seek a better job to work their way out of poverty. The dividends from our investment in Head Start are enormous.

It is this kind of investment plan seen throughout the Clinton program that promises the best hope for the future in terms of economic recovery and family stability.

Likewise, full funding of WIC for poor women, infants and children will save lives and lower the cost of health care among these most vulnerable and at-risk persons in our society. Every child this program captures means dollars in savings in the future. It is a long-term investment in our future which will pay dividends from the day it feeds a hungry child.

Earned income tax credit will stimulate low-wage earners earning under

$30,000 to stay on the job to receive this credit. Many, if not a majority of these families who will be helped, consist of women wage earners. As they work their way out of poverty they will be reducing the deficit.

Child care support is included in the Clinton plan through the block grant program. If I have any grief about what is missing in the Clinton program it is that it does not provide enough in child care support funding. Women need good, high-quality child care programs. Women with young children make up a good percentage of the work force. They need quality programs where they can leave their children with confidence that they will be receiving a good educational program, as good, if not better, than Head Start. America does not have a nanny problem. Most women cannot afford such a luxury. Women need affordable child care programs available at the workplace, at their colleges, close to their homes and in their communities.

Education funding like chapter I, Job Corps centers, summer jobs for teenagers, job training programs, and others included in the President's plan will help young women move toward their first job better prepared and more highly trained.

To protect them in their jobs, to assure their right to advance without discrimination and harassment, the Clinton plan also provides for additional enforcement in the civil rights of workers, in particular the minorities and women.

Women must be assured access to jobs in this renewed, revitalized America—whether it is infrastructure jobs, small business investment loans to start a new business, or promotions into positions of management.

The President's plan is preserved in tact in this House budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 64. It is good for the economy, it reduces the deficit, it raises taxes and cuts spending on an equal ratio of 1 to 1, it will rebuild lives, create jobs, and give hope to millions that finally we have a President who cares about people and indeed puts them first.

I urge a "yes" vote for this resolution because it is good for America and more importantly because it is good for women, and it is the best beginning we have had in 12 years.

□ 1240

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from the midwest coast of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I believe, contrary to the impression we may have been giving for the past few hours to people watching at home, there are many things upon which we can all agree here today.

We all want America to remain the strongest country in the world, both militarily and economically. We want our children to grow up healthy, well-educated, drug free and prosperous. And we want to reduce the burgeoning Federal deficit.

Make no mistake. We don't like it. We don't like having to say, over and over, that Federal Government spending must be contained, that waste must be eliminated, that the bloated bureaucracy must be deflated and that all programs must be examined with an eye toward cutting. We don't like to argue, over and over again, that we need a balanced budget amendment and a line-item veto.

No, it would be much easier to just keep piling money on every program year after year, regardless of effectiveness or continued need. It is far easier to spend money than it is to save money. It is much more pleasant to create programs than it is to cut programs.

In short, it is much easier to give than it is to take away.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all of us would like our President to succeed. But this budget will inflict real and long-term pain on average Americans in many ways.

But perhaps the most important aspect of the President's plan is that the taxes that he has proposed will come immediately, while deficit reduction remains a vague promise and a dim light at the end of the tunnel.

The President's budget raises taxes on Social Security recipients, cuts Medicare reimbursements and imposes a brutally regressive energy tax on everyone, regardless of income.

Americans have said they would pay more taxes to reduce the deficit. They have said they are willing to sacrifice. But they want results. And the fact is that the new tax money which is proposed, tragically, will not go toward reducing the deficit. It will go toward new spending.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinghished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

The question is on the decision of the Committee on Rules not to allow certain amendments to come before this body. I am disappointed that seven Members of the Committee on Rules can dictate what Members of the U.S. Congress will even be allowed to vote on.

We have heard a lot of talk about whether or not we want to balance the budget. During the election campaign, politicians proclaimed that "the Federal Government ought to live within its means" and led voters to believe that they could stop overspending.

My proposal to the Rules Committee, in a request to allow this Chamber to vote on the only balanced budget resolution before it, was denied. This resolution would have frozen wages of not only Government employees, but legislators. It would have limited the growth of Government in the early years from a freeze to a 6.5-percent increase. It would have cut the fat out of much wasteful Government spending. It would have cut $1 trillion out of Government spending over the next 5 years. Eliminating Government overspending would result in interest savings alone of $112 billion. The proposal included budget cuts supported by the Heritage Foundation, the Cato Institute, Bush administration, and Clinton administration.

As we look at this 55-page document that Jon Gauthier of my staff and I put together, it is important to put our actions where our mouth and our political rhetoric is. Government ought to have the kind of restraint on spending that American families must have in order to balance their checkbooks.

Congress agrees that the Federal deficit is not fair to future generations. Congress should not only be allowed to vote on a balanced budget, in fairness to taxpayers, it ought to be required.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER].

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

We have been hearing a lot of claims about what this budget of Mr. Clinton's will do. We have been told we cannot tolerate this debt, that we must eliminate the deficit, and that this budget reduces debt. I wish it were true.

□ 1250

If it were, I could support it. But under Mr. Clinton's own numbers, under his own predictions, this budget is going to in 4 years increase the debt of America by $916 billion. That is in one term $183 billion more than the first Reagan term. In one term it is $238 billion more in deficit than under the Reagan second term.

In 4 or 5 years under this program, welfare becomes the third largest item in the budget, larger than defense.

Mr. Speaker, this is a budget-busting proposal to move moneys from defense to welfare, and it ought to be defeated.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for consideration of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994. The rule makes in order three alternatives to the Budget Committee's recommendation and allows us to debate the flaws and virtues of each before the American public.

The debate will be about differences of opinion in how we achieve a common goal of reduced deficits, a healthy economy, and meeting the needs of our people. We are not going to quibble over details. The debate today will lay

out the basic philosophies of our two major parties and highlight the differences within each party.

Two Republican proposals and two Democratic proposals will be considered. I don't agree with everything in any of them. Everyone who listens to the debate today and everyone voting in this Chamber will find merits in each bill—and problems in the details of all of them. Democracy is a process of principled compromise. In looking at the four proposals that will be debated today, the strongest package—the one that I believe will prevail in the debate—is the budget crafted by the House Budget Committee. It cuts spending deeper than the President requested. It produces $510 billion in deficit reduction over 5 years. It is based on careful assumptions about revenues and spending. It includes incentives for business to invest in the future growth of our economy. It calls for tough decisions on spending priorities and entitlement programs.

I commend the efforts of my Republican colleagues Mr. KASICH and Mr. SOLOMON and my Democratic colleague Mr. MFUME, as well as Budget Committee Chairman SABO. I ask all my colleagues to support the rule so we can move forward with this debate.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the author of the freeze.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just say to my colleagues who may be off the floor, or those who are here on the floor, that we will be having a vote on the previous question. Since we were not able in the Committee on Rules to get our 2-percent-plus freeze brought to the floor for a vote, the only vote we will be able to have on whether or not Members agree with that, will be on the previous question in just a few minutes.

Let me just say to my colleagues, if you do not want to vote for the Democrat $402 billion tax increase, if you would rather approach this from the freeze-plus-2-percent-and-cut-spending approach, then vote for our position on the previous question when it comes up in just a few minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are at about the end of this debate, and I would like to just make a few wrap-up remarks in my remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think that it is important that our colleagues understand that we are not going to be allowed to consider under what is in fact a restrictive rule—and it is not the most restrictive rule, but it is a restrictive rule—we are not going to be able to consider the Michel amendment to protect against extraneous matters being tacked onto the budget. There is certainly not going to be any consideration of the budget freeze proposals we have heard so much about in the last hour. There is not going to be any consideration of the approach of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] to limit the growth of Government spending, and that is something we have had on the floor in past years.

We will not get a chance to fully debate the idea of a national taxpayer checkoff, which has been kicked around quite a while. It has been in the campaign, has been on the floor, is back again, and it is something I think is worthy of debate, and I know many Members would like to have the opportunity to vote on it. It would at least ensure that some of the tax dollars we are talking about would go toward reducing the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on. I think this is probably going to be the No. 1 task of this Congress. The fact we are not going to have a chance to debate and vote on those issues somehow seems to me wrong placed.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out we have an automatic debt ceiling extender in this budget resolution, and it means that ceiling is going to go up. I suppose when it gets up over $4 trillion, people's eyes begin to close about that. But the fact is that is serious and it is just going to happen sort of automatically.

Mr. Speaker, I have to urge defeat of the previous question, because that is a vote for Burton, for Walker, and Michel, and I would like to say it is a vote for getting a question of the debt ceiling on the floor too, but it is not.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think we have done a pretty good, and a pretty fair, job on this particular rule. As I mentioned at the outset, all Members will have before them, available for a vote, four comprehensive budget blueprints, two of them by Democrats, and two of them by Republicans, from which they may choose the best course for the Federal budget for the next 5 years. So I ask support of this rule. I think it is a good rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to rule 5(b)(1) of rule XV, the Chair may reduce to 5 minutes the time for any recorded votes that may be ordered on adoption of the resolution without intervening business.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 250, nays 172, not voting 8, as follows

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—250

Abercrombie	Gibbons	Murtha
Ackerman	Glickman	Nadler
Andrews (ME)	Gonzalez	Natcher
Andrews (NJ)	Gordon	Neal (MA)
Andrews (TX)	Green	Neal (NC)
Applegate	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Bacchus (FL)	Hall (OH)	Obey
Baesler	Hall (TX)	Olver
Barcia	Hamburg	Ortiz
Barlow	Hamilton	Orton
Barrett (WI)	Harman	Owens
Becerra	Hastings	Pallone
Beilenson	Hayes	Parker
Berman	Hefner	Pastor
Bevill	Hilliard	Payne (NJ)
Bilbray	Hinchey	Payne (VA)
Bishop	Hoagland	Pelosi
Blackwell	Hochbrueckner	Penny
Bonior	Holden	Peterson (FL)
Borski	Hoyer	Peterson (MN)
Boucher	Hughes	Pickett
Brooks	Hutto	Pickle
Browder	Inslee	Pomeroy
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Poshard
Brown (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Rahall
Bryant	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Byrne	Johnston	Reed
Cantwell	Kanjorski	Reynolds
Cardin	Kaptur	Richardson
Carr	Kennedy	Roemer
Chapman	Kennelly	Rose
Clay	Kildee	Rostenkowski
Clayton	Kleczka	Rowland
Clement	Klein	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Klink	Rush
Coleman	Kopetski	Sabo
Collins (IL)	Kreidler	Sanders
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Sangmeister
Condit	Lambert	Sarpalius
Conyers	Lancaster	Sawyer
Cooper	Lantos	Schenk
Coppersmith	LaRocco	Schroeder
Costello	Laughlin	Schumer
Coyne	Lehman	Scott
Cramer	Levin	Serrano
Danner	Lewis (GA)	Sharp
Darden	Lipinski	Shepherd
de la Garza	Lloyd	Sisisky
Deal	Long	Skaggs
DeFazio	Lowey	Skelton
DeLauro	Maloney	Slattery
Dellums	Mann	Slaughter
Derrick	Manton	Smith (IA)
Deutsch	Margolies-Mezvinsky	Spratt
Dicks	Markey	Stark
Dingell	Martinez	Stenholm
Dixon	Matsui	Stokes
Dooley	Mazzoli	Strickland
Durbin	McCloskey	Studds
Edwards (CA)	McCurdy	Stupak
Edwards (TX)	McDermott	Swett
Engel	McHale	Swift
English (AZ)	McKinney	Synar
English (OK)	McNulty	Tanner
Eshoo	Meehan	Tauzin
Evans	Meek	Taylor (MS)
Fazio	Menendez	Tejeda
Fields (LA)	Mfume	Thornton
Filner	Miller (CA)	Thurman
Fingerhut	Mineta	Torres
Flake	Minge	Torricelli
Foglietta	Mink	Towns
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Traficant
Frost	Mollohan	Tucker
Furse	Montgomery	Unsoeld
Gejdenson	Moran	Valentine
Gephardt	Murphy	Velazquez
Geren		Vento

Visclosky
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—172

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—8

Brewster
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Henry
Herger
McDade
Quillen
Washington

□ 1315

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Washington for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Mr. HORN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 251, noes 172, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

AYES—251

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—172

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—7

Browder
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Henry
McDade
Quillen
Washington

□ 1324

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Washington for, with Mr. Quillen against.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). Without objection, a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the House agreed to House Resolution 133.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. BEILENSON

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] to lay on the table the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] to reconsider the vote on House Resolution 133.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 250, noes 172, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

AYES—250

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—172

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Flake
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—8

Crane
Ford (TN)
Hamburg
Henry
Hinchey
McDade
Quillen
Washington

□ 1342

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Washington for, with Mr. Quillen against.

So the motion to table was agreed to.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 60, nays 360, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

AYES—60

Allard
Armey
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Bartlett
Bentley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Collins (GA)
Cox
Crane
Doolittle
Dornan
Duncan
Dunn
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodling
Greenwood
Hancock
Hansen
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hunter
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
King
Kingston
Livingston
McCandless
McKeon
Mica
Molinari
Paxon
Pombo
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Spence
Stump
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Vucanovich
Walsh
Young (AK)

NOES—360

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dreier
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hoagland

Hochbrueckner
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walker
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—10

Berman
Ford (TN)
Hamburg
Henry
Hinchey
Johnston
Kaptur
Pickett
Quillen
Washington

□ 1401

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). Pursuant to House Resolution 133 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 64.

□ 1401

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. 64) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, with Mr. SERRANO in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on the prior legislative day, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 133, the concurrent resolution is considered as read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 64, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 64

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

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994.

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990).

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, and October 1, 1997:

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

Fiscal year 1994: $905,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $970,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,030,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,086,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,135,600,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $27,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $36,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $51,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $66,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $65,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $93,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $104,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $111,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $116,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $122,500,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $1,222,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,288,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,337,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,393,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,461,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $1,217,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,276,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,315,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,355,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,424,800,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $312,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $306,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $284,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $269,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $289,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $4,715,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $5,076,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $5,428,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $5,776,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $6,141,400,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, and October 1, 1997, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $21,400,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $148,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $22,100,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $152,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $32,400,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $145,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $43,800,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $137,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $45,500,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $137,400,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1994 through 1998 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, $263,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $276,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

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

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, $262,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $271,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

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

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, $253,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $264,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $247,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $253,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $251,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $19,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $18,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $17,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $17,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $18,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $19,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $20,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $20,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $21,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $4,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $5,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $5,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $5,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $20,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $22,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $22,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $22,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $22,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $15,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $12,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $11,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $16,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $84,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $85,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $17,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $87,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $88,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $89,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $91,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $9,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$10,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $91,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $94,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $10,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$7,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $93,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $97,000,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $40,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $40,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $41,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $43,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $44,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $8,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $8,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $3,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $8,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $3,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $3,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $9,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $3,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $56,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $60,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,00,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $62,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $11,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $63,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $23,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $66,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $24,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $119,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $133,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $148,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $163,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $180,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $151,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $171,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $167,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $184,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $183,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $201,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $201,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $221,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $221,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $209,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $210,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $218,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $219,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $229,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $224,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $243,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $234,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $249,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $243,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $6,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $7,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $7,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $34,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $35,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $36,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $36,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $36,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $15,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $15,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $15,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $16,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $12,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $13,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $239,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $260,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $280,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $280,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $297,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $314,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $314,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$10,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$10,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, −$30,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$30,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$31,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$31,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$32,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) Not later than May 13, 1993, the House committees named in subsections (b) through (n) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the House Budget Committee. After receiving those recommendations, the House Budget Committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $258,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $396,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $1,067,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $1,918,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $2,187,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in an increase of outlays as follows: $523,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $1,524,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $1,527,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $1,533,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $1,551,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(c) The House Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $186,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $470,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $782,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $1,119,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $1,383,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: $2,012,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $3,231,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $4,117,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $5,103,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $5,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(d) The House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending, sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $220,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $266,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $482,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $704,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $726,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: $141,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $164,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $273,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $373,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $406,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase revenues, as follows: $63,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $65,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $68,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $70,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $73,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(e) The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays by $66,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, and to reduce outlays as follows: $93,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $1,309,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $3,044,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $3,564,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(f) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $4,343,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $7,493,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $13,047,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $17,133,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $21,347,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: $137,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $236,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $663,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $621,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $650,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(g) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $2,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $7,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $12,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $16,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $18,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(h) The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $0 in fiscal year 1994, $0 in fiscal year 1995, $111,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $115,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $119,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(i) The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $0 in fiscal year 1994, $0 in fiscal year 1995, $67,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $68,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $70,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(j) The House Committee on Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $137,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $201,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $339,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $406,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $414,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: $137,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $236,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $663,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $621,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $650,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(k) The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $228,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $935,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $3,445,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $4,833,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $4,896,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: $2,906,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $4,660,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $5,825,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $7,169,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $8,164,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(l) The House Committee on Public Works and Transportation shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $31,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $49,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $62,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $76,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $78,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(m) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $266,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $364,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $382,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $405,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $1,163,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(n) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit, as follows: by $29,488,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, by $41,319,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, by $61,583,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, by $81,484,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and by $84,935,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(o) For purposes of this section, the term 'direct spending' means spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and new budget authority as defined in section 3(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 5. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

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

(1) from time to time the United States Government should sell assets; and

(2) the amounts realized from such assets sales will not recur on an annual basis and do not reduce the demand for credit.

(b) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—For purposes of points of order under sections 302, 303, 310, 311, 601(b), 602, and 605 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, the amounts realized from sales of assets (other than loan assets) shall not be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues under those sections.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "sale of an asset" shall have the same meaning as under section 250(c)(21) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990); and

(2) the term shall not include asset sales mandated by law before September 18, 1987, and routine, ongoing asset sales at levels consistent with agency operations in fiscal year 1986.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TAX REVENUES AND DEFICIT REDUCTION.

It is the sense of Congress that any legislation enacting tax increases called for in this budget resolution contain language providing that the net revenues generated by the legislation shall not be counted for the purpose of calculating the amount of any deficit increase called for in section 252(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendments are in order except the amendments printed in House Report 103–37, which shall be considered in the order printed in the report and by the named proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to 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 and reported back to the House.

At the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be an additional period of general debate, which shall not exceed 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member on the Committee on the Budget.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 103–37.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

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. 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:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994.

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990).

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, and October 1, 1997:

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

Fiscal year 1994: $878,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $933,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $979,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,019,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,069,400,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $0.
Fiscal year 1995: $0.
Fiscal year 1996: $0.
Fiscal year 1997: $0.
Fiscal year 1998: $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 1994: $93,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $104,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $111,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $116,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $122,500,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $1,183,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,226,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,277,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,350,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,428,900,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $1,184,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,216,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,256,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,312,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,389,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $305,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $282,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $276,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $292,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $319,600,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $4,714,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $5,055,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $5,394,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $5,747,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $6,123,100,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, and October 1, 1997, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1994 through 1998 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $264,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $263,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $262,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $271,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $269,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $271,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $277,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $16,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $15,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $15,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $17,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $17,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $18,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $18,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $19,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $4,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $4,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $3,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $3,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $20,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $21,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $21,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $21,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $22,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $15,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $16,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $16,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $8,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$11,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $9,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$8,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $38,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $39,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $39,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $42,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $43,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $8,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $7,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $7,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $7,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $51,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $51,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $51,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $52,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $54,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $118,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $129,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $128,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $142,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $156,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $155,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $172,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $171,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $147,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $163,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $158,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $179,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $177,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $199,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $197,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $220,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $219,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $206,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $206,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $211,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $212,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $219,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $215,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $232,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $223,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $236,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $231,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $6,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $7,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $7,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $35,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $36,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $37,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $37,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $15,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $16,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $17,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $13,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $14,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $239,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $258,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $258,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $277,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $294,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $294,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $313,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $313,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, −$16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$21,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$35,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$28,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$31,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$28,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$30,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$24,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$26,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$35,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$35,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) Not later than May 1, 1993, the House committees named in subsections (b) through (n) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the House Budget Committee. After receiving those recommenda-

tions, the House Budget Committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $2,849,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $3,012,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $2,444,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $2,511,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $2,473,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in an *increase* of outlays as follows: $554,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $783,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $852,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $911,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $955,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(c) The House Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $900,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $2,010,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $1,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $50,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $80,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: $920,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $2,360,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $3,980,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $5,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $6,680,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(d) The House Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending, sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $429,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $545,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $711,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $703,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $778,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: $87,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $473,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $1,209,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $1,827,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $2,065,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(e) The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays by $3,215,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, and to reduce outlays as follows: $3,265,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $2,725,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $2,785,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $2,745,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(f) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $9,813,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $18,779,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $22,777,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $25,613,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $28,099,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(g) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $551,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $891,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $1,194,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $1,248,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $1,281,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(h) The House Committee on Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $12,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $45,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $108,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $186,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $254,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(i) The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $0 in fiscal year 1994, $0 in fiscal year 1995, $67,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $68,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $70,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(j) The House Committee on Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $160,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $170,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $189,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $190,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $190,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(k) The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $419,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $666,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $4,847,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $6,140,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $6,506,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: $4,141,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $7,196,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $17,980,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $23,644,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $26,784,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(l) The House Committee on Public Works and Transportation shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $18,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $31,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $94,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $108,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $115,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(m) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $478,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $602,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $641,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $668,400,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $1,438,100,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(n) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit, as follows: by $8,875,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, by $17,873,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, by $25,196,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, by $33,234,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and by $42,688,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(o) For purposes of this section, the term 'direct spending' means spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and new budget authority as defined in section 3(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

At the end, insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that any increase in receipts from higher taxes on benefits should be dedicated to the OASDI trust funds as provided under current law; and any diversion of these receipts to other programs will serve only to undermine the integrity of the social security system whose receipts were taken off-budget as part of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

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

Mr. Chairman, I maintain today, as we begin the final legs of the debate, that the choice really is very clear. The Democrats favor larger central government. They think a large Federal Government is the answer. The Republican plan, Mr. Chairman, believes that empowering the individual and getting government off the individual's back is the answer with a smaller Federal Government. The Democrats believe in more taxes. The Republicans have no new taxes. We believe we should cut spending first. The Democrats believe that more government spending is the answer. The Republicans say no new government spending, a smaller Federal Government. The Democrats favor the same, tired, old government institutions. The Republicans stand for change. The Republicans stand for reform in a 84-page reform-oriented document. The Democrats, and my colleagues will not believe this one, they are the ones for gridlock. The Republicans went to the Committee on the Budget and offered 35 amendments to improve the Clinton package by reducing the taxes and substituting specific spending cuts. The Republicans, while trying to be constructive, were absolutely, totally and positively rejected by the majority side who favored gridlock in the House Committee on the Budget. The Democrats are the ones that are blocking the Clinton change program. The President came to the Hill and said he wanted to have more cuts and less spending, but his own party says they will not bear the traffic of reducing the size and scope of the Government. The Republicans, on the other hand, have put the specifics down on the table. We welcomed the Clinton change program. We welcomed the Clinton change agenda. It is unfortunate that he cannot get his own party to support him on that. The Democrats have the job-killer program. The Republicans have the job-creator program.

My colleagues, it all gets down to one simple thing; the choice really is clear. There is a clear choice here, not an echo. The Republicans are for less government, less taxes, less spending, less Federal interference as to a stated philosophy on the majority side that indicates that a larger Federal Government, a larger central government managing the affairs of the United States, is the answer. It did not work in New Jersey. They could not tax their way to prosperity. It will not work in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we would hope the Republican plan would be adopted. But if the Democrat plan is put into effect, and we believe it will have, unfortunately, a very negative impact on this economy, we will be glad to cross the aisle, and, in the spirit of bipartisanship, end gridlock and get them to accept the notion that reducing the Federal Government, being reform-oriented and believing in change is ultimately the answer for the United States of America.

I urge my colleagues to support the Republican Committee on the Budget

substitute to the big government, Democrat plan.

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

Mr. Chairman, first, lest I forget later, I want to say, you've done a great job in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. SABO. The gentleman in the chair has been fair and courteous to all the Members in his usual way, and we thank him.

Let me also again express to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], an appreciation for his courtesies and all his hard work because he really has worked hard, and the members of his caucus and his staff have worked and, I think, represented the minority well in this process of dealing with the budget.

However, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated yesterday, there is only one thing wrong with all the hard work, and that is they are wrong on substance. The Republican program is not true. It is really sort of an austere version of Bush that got us into the current problems. It is the philosophy of government that, if it had prevailed over the decades, would have us still on gravel roads.

Plus they are driven by another very fundamental fear, a very fundamental fear that we might ask the most affluent in our society to pay some more to reduce the deficit.

□ 1410

We are asking for additional revenues in our package, 73 percent of them paid by individuals with incomes over $100,000 a year, and, boy, that hurts Republicans. They do not like it.

Let me be clear about the Budget Committee resolution that is before us today. It moves forward the program and the vision of a new President who wants to lead this country into a new century of prosperity with jobs that pay decent salaries and an economy that is competitive in the world.

We do that by moving forward his investment program, by his program of streamlining Government to make sure that the Federal Government works effectively.

There are some things I hope my Republican colleagues are right on. I hope they can find all the Bush waste and mismanagement that they talk about. Clearly that will help us meet our budget targets.

But let us be clear about the Budget Committee resolution we have before us. It contains real deficit reduction, $5 to $10 billion over the 5 years, more than the Republican package. More important, in years 1997–98, as we project to the future, it is $25 to $30 billion of additional deficit reduction beyond the Republican plan.

But at the same time it still says we must invest in our kids, we must train our workers, we must invest in the technology that will lead us into the 21st century. We must invest in our infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, we do have a unique opportunity today. We have the chance to end gridlock. We have the chance for Congress to move forward with the program of a new President with a new vision for America. I ask for an "aye" vote.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

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

Mr. Chairman, in response to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], I would say that we do not particularly admire his position, but we do admire the discipline of the Democrats on the Committee on the Budget. We offered, as our vice chairman pointed out, 30-plus specific recommendations. We offered an alternative that amounts to 428 billion dollars' worth of deficit reduction, more than the President's proposal plus the Democrats on the committee, without a tax increase, and we should not forget that.

We offered specifics, as we were challenged to do, but I want to focus on one specific.

Nothing has greater impact on the growth in Federal spending and the deficit than the issue of health care cost. Anyone who says they can significantly reduce the deficit in this country or eliminate the deficit without addressing health care costs is simply not facing reality.

Let me just mention a few things: Medicare and Medicaid in the budget in the current year will total $226 billion. They did not exist 23 years ago. In 1994 the baseline budget in Medicare and Medicaid would be $259 billion. That is a 15 percent increase over 1993. As you look out over the next 5 years, it increases at an average rate of 12 to 13 percent per year to total $405 billion in 1998.

Medical care costs generally in this economy are increasing at four times the rate of inflation in this country. That is true for the private sector, and it is true for the Federal Government as well. They must be brought in line with the overall rate of inflation, both in the general economy and in the Federal budget as well.

President Clinton, no less, affirmed that principle in his State of the Union Message in which he said health care costs need to be brought in line with the general rate of inflation.

To achieve it, my colleagues, we need to save $330 billion in 5 years out of Medicare and Medicaid against the baseline budget of $1,651,000,000 on those two programs projected over the next 5 years.

That does not mean cutting it, it simply means moderating the rate of increase by 20 percent. President Clinton in his proposal saves $60 billion in health care costs, not counting the $21 billion in additional taxes on Social Security that may be flowed into that program.

Our alternative, the Republican alternative, saves $93 billion, reducing the rate of growth from the average of 12 percent to an average rate of growth of 10 percent. That is not enough, but it is a significant start.

We use most of the President's proposals on health care, and we add some that total some $33 billion in additional savings.

Our savings, and admittedly it is difficult to do this in the absence of health care reform, but our proposed savings are designed to anticipate the probable focus that health care reform is going to make on defensive health care costs caused by excessive litigation, excess capacity, and excess overhead. Any serious health care reform proposal has got to address the cost drivers in the system, and we do this in including everything that the President included, and then some.

We basically go back to managed care in the Medicaid segment of the budget, which is likely to be a part of health care reform and proposes significant savings. Under Medicare we are making moderations in the rate of increase in payments in the first year to hospitals and physicians. That will not go on over the full period of time, but that is interrelated with the whole issue of their refocusing their efforts on the things that are driving up their health care costs: defense practices, excessive overhead, redundant capacity. We can urge them to do that through this process.

We are also trying to advocate consistency in copayments by beneficiaries, which is already very much a part of Medicare. But there are exceptions to that. We recognize that certain low income people cannot do it and we are willing to entertain a modification of that in that respect.

But on balance, it is good public policy for people to pay at least a percentage of the health care costs, because they are the ones that should be most concerned about it and can take action.

Finally, we make some adjustments among the very rich in the premiums that they pay to participate in Medicare. Those that we suggest make significant reductions in the deficit, but will not impose a serious burden on those individuals.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the final solution, but it is an important beginning on achieving some of the cost reductions interrelated with health care reform. I realize that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will say let us wait and deal with this under health care reform, but I would point out to them that there are dissenting views

published by certain members of the Committee on the Budget that state that they are disappointed that the Democratic plan did not address the issue of entitlement spending more than we do in their resolution.

I would suggest that the Republican alternative does exactly that, and, in the words of the President, that we can do better. I think the Kasich amendment does, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, before I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], let me just commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] on his interest in health care reform. While I do not agree with his copay requirements on certain services that he proposes in this budget, clearly he has focused on a very fundamental problem that we face, and I think everything the gentleman has said about the problems of escalating costs in Medicare and Medicaid are all compelling reasons why President Clinton's approach to having fundamental reform of health care is so incredibly important. Really a cornerstone of what we are doing here today is our expectation that we will have very comprehensive health care reform coming to this Congress from the President in May of this year.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] for his interest and work on that issue, because he is right. If we are going to handle the deficit in the long term we need to control health care costs. If our economy is to be competitive, we have to control health care costs. Plus equity demands that we deal with the access problem in our society.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

□ 1420

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I, at the outset, want to express my personal admiration for the very fine job done by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] in putting this budget together. It is a very difficult job, perhaps the most difficult chairmanship to manage in the House. I am very proud of the work that we have done and proud of his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican amendment which is before us today might fairly, I think, be labeled the "no-pain amendment."

We have had 12 years now of no-pain Presidents who promised us that we could make this country run without anybody having to pay for it, who promised us that we could continue cutting taxes for the wealthiest segments of our society and still continue to have a government that was meaningful in its ability to take this country forward down a path of progress and to protect our interests abroad.

I think it is very clear, in 1993, that those promises of no pain were false promises, that it was a mistake to promise that to the American people and that, unfortunately, the price which they paid is more pain today than we have ever, ever imagined we would have to suffer in terms of our budget deficits in 1993.

I think also that the Republican amendment is an amendment that dramatically underestimates the American people. Nobody wants to pay more taxes. Nobody wants to suffer budget cuts. But the American people understand that we have to pay for what we do. They understand that we cannot go down a road promising everything, that we cannot avoid having to pay for the benefits of having a strong government that provides roads, that provides a health care system, that provides an education system, that protects our international interests. They understand that.

Yet the Republican amendment one more time comes up here and suggests to all of us who are in this room and who are watching that somehow or another we can continue to step forward as Americans into the world and lead and accept our responsibilities without anybody having to bear any kind of discomfort. It is a false promise. And the American people, who are at a much higher level of understanding than the Republicans think, know this. Unfortunately, as one might expect, this no-pain amendment is also a no-gain amendment.

It provides less deficit reduction than is provided by the Democratic amendment on the floor today. In fact, it only provides, as I understand it, $495 billion in deficit reduction over the next 5 years, whereas the Democratic proposal is $510 billion in deficit reduction over the next 5 years.

If we want real deficit reduction, then vote for the Democratic budget; vote against the Republican alternative. And though it is characterized by its author as being highly specific, anyone who examines it closely will recognize that one-third, fully one-third of the savings that are claimed by this Republican alternative, cannot be found. They are unidentified. They are found in function 920, allocated in a general fashion so that no one knows exactly what they are.

Finally, the Republican proposal is not only the no-gain amendment, it is the no-investment amendment: No additional funds for Head Start, the one program which is unanimously recognized as having done an enormous amount toward raising the children of our least privileged Americans to a level that they can begin to compete and expect to have a future. In the Republican amendment, we do not invest more funds in Head Start.

No defense conversions. I wonder, do they argue to us that it is actually a savings not to invest money in defense conversion, not to invest money in Head Start? Surely, anyone with common sense would recognize it costs us more in the long run not to put money into those needed areas.

No new highway funds. No child immunization increases and no health care increases. Do they actually argue to us that we save money by not increasing the funds we are spending on immunizing children? Surely they would recognize that it costs us more in the long run not to increase funding in that area.

And no increases for education or job training. Do they promise the American people that it is a savings not to increase our investment in education? Surely that is the one area in which a failure to invest will cost us more in the long run.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Committee on the Budget majority has come forward with a budget this year that dramatically cuts spending and, in fact, adds $63 billion in cuts above what the President has asked us to do, that recognizes the need to charge a tax structure which has been responsible for the movement of wealth to the upper class and away from working-class and middle-class Americans and instead begin to put the tax burden where it ought to be; that is, fairly borne by all segments of society, rather than just the middle class, and also recognizes the need to begin to invest in our future.

It is a prudent package. It is one that I am proud to stand here and advocate. I am proud of the work done by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] and members of the Democratic Committee on the Budget. I strongly urge Members today to vote against the Republican alternative and vote for a strong future for the American people.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

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

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

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that, again, the Democrats are up to their old tricks and bad estimates. Look in the area of allowances. My colleagues can see that we here are very specific in terms of what we do. COLA freeze for Federal civilian workers, repeal of Davis-Bacon, eliminate the successorship provisions in Federal contracts. They are very, very specific.

They can lump them any way they want to, but they are the ones that got the "F" on the specific test.

Furthermore, in terms of the area of administrative cost savings, Clinton has about 34, we got about 48. We go all the way down to object class 20, never even though of by anybody on the side over there that did not go with specifics.

Mr. Panetta himself has now, referring to Federal contracts and object class 20. So stop the distortions. They are inaccurate, along with the deficit numbers.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just quickly correct one thing that was said at the outset of this debate. The suggestion was made that there are more savings, there is more deficit reduction in the Democratic plan. Let us be very clear about that.

The CBO has scored the Clinton plan at $362 billion. The CBO scored the additional Democratic cuts at $63 billion, for a total of $425 billion.

Our plan has $429 billion, slightly more, but roughly equivalent.

Any statement to the contrary that there are more savings scored by CBO in the Democratic plan is not true. It is false. It is a misstatement. It is wrong. It is deceptive.

It is not more savings in the Democratic plan.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contributions.

Mr. Chairman, let's go back to square one and the fact everyone in this Congress hoped we could see an end to gridlock and achieve real deficit reduction and economic recovery.

In that regard, President Clinton galvanized public support for these goals with his State of the Union speech. Now, the question is, will the President's plan achieve these goals.

We still do not have access to all of the administration's budget details, they change almost daily and once again we are being asked to vote for a budget plan where snakes will come out of the budget box and bite the beleaguered taxpayer for years to come.

That is no way to conduct business but let us at least take a look at one part of the budget. Last night, the distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Committee pointed out in eloquent and in most pertinent fashion that one of our budgetary goals should be fairness. He was referring to agriculture.

Simply put, the Clinton budget plan is not fair to rural and small town America and to our farmers and ranchers. Yes, we in agriculture are more than willing to self sacrifice, that is the point. As Chairman DE LA GARZA pointed out, since 1981, the Committee on Agriculture has cut $57 billion from budget authority. The Budget Act of 1990 cut farm program spending by 20 percent. Contrary to public perception and vocal critics, only farm program spending has declined since 1985, an average of 9 percent per year.

Yet, we are singled out for $8.7 billion in budget cuts on top of 4 years of budget cuts. We have had our fingers and toes on the chopping block. With President Clinton's cleaver, we are talking about arms and legs.

This budget vote is not only a vote on the budget but a vote for program policy and who gets represented and who does not. The agricultural share of Department of Agriculture funding is now approximately 32 percent. What's that you say, farm related programs only comprise 32 percent within the Department of Agriculture? That is right and under the Clinton budget that figure will go down to 17 percent at the end of 4 years. This budget dismantles the USDA with little or no debate.

And, what does it do to farmers? Our Republican staff of the House Agriculture Committee estimates the cost of the energy tax close to $2,000 a year for your typical Kansas wheat farm, more in the Pacific Northwest, equally burdensome in the Midwest, California and west Texas; it hits all commodities—not to mention senior citizens in rural area, moving essential goods to rural areas requires more energy.

And, what do we get in return for discriminatory cuts, means testing the farm program and hit hard with an energy tax? The tax pain does not result in any real deficit gain. Thirty-one of the so-called spending cuts are actually user fees that citizens will pay. The ratio of spending cuts to tax increases is completely out of whack and changes daily. The so-called stimulus package is a collection of 75 appropriations that were labeled dogs, cats and pork in the last session and have somehow been magically transformed into essential investment this session. I believe latest Congressional Budget Office estimate is that we are talking about $93,000 per job creation.

And, to make matters worse, the increased tax revenue from the pocketbooks of hard-pressed taxpayers will not go to reduce the deficit but to pay for the laundry list of social welfare programs the President has proposed.

But, back to the farm. It would be one thing if farm prices were even close to the cost of production. They are not. Large crops, a weak global economy and an uncertain export picture due in part to the Russian crisis have caused sudden and deep price declines at the country elevator.

Mr. Chairman, the fact this budget is being presented during National Agriculture Week is a paradox of enormous irony. With this budget plan the President is stepping on the gas for more spending while jamming on the brakes with punitive taxes. The result is we will end up in the ditch. In farm country, this budget is a blueprint for disaster.

Please, my colleagues, let us not go down this impossible trail. The proposals for a spending freeze still make sense and still would result in real deficit reduction. The Kasich budget represents a better alternative. That is a paved road we can all travel and achieve the goals we all want to see accomplished.

□ 1430

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE], a member of the committee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, our debate today is about real choices, choices to move the country forward and build sustainable growth, choices to slash the mountain of debt built up over the last 12 years, choices both to spend less and to spend what we do spend more intelligently, to restore fairness to our Tax Code, to invest our scarce resources in educating and training our people, building our transportation and communications networks, expanding incentives for new research, business development, and job creation.

The President spelled it out dramatically in his economic plan. "Continuing the failed policies of the past 12 years is a choice without a future," he said. "To restore our Nation's economic vitality and reclaim our vision of America we must change course and we must do it now."

We are offered today four alternative budgets, four choices about how to reach a better future. I want to focus my remaining remarks on the proposal now before us, comparing it to the President's plan as reported by the House Committee on the Budget.

Let me begin, though, by commending the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] for rejecting calls from within their party to sit back and promote stalemate and continue the partisan bickering we have seen over the past 12 years. They have put together a comprehensive package that is worthy of debate, but in my opinion it does fall severely short on several grounds.

The Kasich budget, first of all, has less real deficit reduction, to be specific, $15 billion less in deficit reduction, than the committee resolution. The Kasich budget has no growth incentives, no investment dollars, higher deficits, and more Government borrowing. Those are not the ingredients for a bright economic future.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] claims that his budget plan is the most specific plan offered today. He also claims CBO scoring of his plan. However, CBO was never asked to score this proposal. With regard to the specifics, what he really means is that he

plagiarized most of Clinton's specific cuts and then went to the CBO options book and pilfered a few more. Most of the Kasich specifics, in fact, are Clinton specifics or CBO specifics. Fully 80 percent of the real savings in this budget are borrowed from the President or from CBO. Since his budget calls for more borrowing, perhaps it is not surprising that the budget itself has been borrowed!

Let us look at the specifics, those that were not taken from the President or CBO. There are fully $145 billion in this budget in unallocated savings. Since about 50 percent of what he likes to call these overhead costs occur in DOD, presumably he is hiding up to $73 billion in additional defense cuts here. However, it is confusing, because the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] claims that he will limit the defense hit to 10 percent or $14 billion of this unallocated pot of money. If so, the remaining $130 billion would have to come out of domestic discretionary spending. That would be a massive, unspecified cut in transportation, health research, education, training, new technologies, and law enforcement. Can he really, seriously believe in that kind of choice?

Another element of the choice is mandates, mandating, for example, that the States impose managed care on Medicaid and then removing $10 billion in funding to the States. Members will want to take special note of this. This is another Federal mandate with less money for the States. If our Governors and local officials hate unfunded mandates, how do we think they are going to feel about defunded mandates?

Then the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] proposes something called WIC Plus, to put all nutrition funds into a block grant and cut funding by $8.3 billion. What he really ought to call it is WIC Lite.

The Bush recession, the anemic recovery, mean that more Americans than ever, nearly 26 million people, now need food stamps every month. How many millions of these people would be put on a crash diet by the Kasich budget? WIC Plus, indeed.

Then the Kasich budget would require cash payments from the poorest seniors, who live only on Social Security, for Medicare services like home health care and lab tests, which are currently free. That would take nearly $20 billion out of the pockets of those least able to pay.

What is the bottom line, Mr. Chairman? The Kasich budget includes no full funding for Head Start and WIC, no dollars for defense conversion, no full funding of highway and mass transit and airports, no investment in new technologies. No investment tax credit for business expansion, no targeted capital gains tax cut, no extension of the research and development tax credit, no extension of the tax exemption for mortgage revenue bonds, no extension of the low-income housing tax credit. And for all of that, less deficit reduction and more borrowing.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to reject this Kasich choice and to support, instead, a program for economic growth and tax fairness and sustained investment in American workers and American business, building a brighter and more prosperous future for all of our people.

Support the committee resolution.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are back to the same old false claims again. It is incredible. I tell the Members, we first had the Democrats saying they were one-for-one in spending cuts to tax increases. In the first year it is seven in taxes to one year in cuts, but this logic, and I do not understand how they can even keep getting up and charging it, is so wrong it just calls into mind the credibility of many other figures.

Let us go back to the question of allowances. The Democrats can stand up and they can talk about the fact that there are unspecified allowances, but I urge the Members to pick up a copy of our plan, our most specific plan, where it spells out, and this is the last time I am going to get into it, the COLA freeze for Federal civilian workers, the Davis-Bacon effect, the reduced Federal civilian employment. That is not unspecified. When we have a COLA freeze on Federal workers, that is not unspecified. That is very, very specified.

The problem they have on their side is that they have the gall to come up and talk about laying down our specifics, and then they march into the Committee on the Budget, they march into the Committee on the Budget with 249 billion dollars' worth of tax increases, and when it come time for them to lay their specifics down on the table, their $63 billion that they needed to get under the budget caps, because CBO said their numbers were goofy, when they came back to the Committee on the Budget they would not put their fingerprints on the cuts.

That is why editorially across this country people have said that the House Republican budget committee has the most specific plan, and shame on them for the gridlock, shame on them for spending 10½ hours rejecting it on party line votes, rejecting our specific recommendations, including in the area of allowances.

In the area of allowances, their President has about $30 billion, $34 billion in these allowance cuts titled "streamlining government." We do not just come up with some unspecified term like "streamlining government." We are down in the paper clips, we are down in the travel, we are down in the transportation, we are down in the supplies and printing.

Thank goodness Mr. Panetta has now agreed that it was necessary to do that, and that is why he is sending his OMB circulars saying, Let us get into Government contracts, let us get into object class 20.

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

Mr. KASICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I just want to make a point, because it was made again a moment ago, that there is more savings in the Democratic plan than there is in the Republican plan.

Let me repeat it again. Scored by the Congressional Budget Office, the Democratic plan is $425 billion of deficit reduction. The Republican plan, scored by CBO, is $429 billion. Any statement to the contrary is false, untrue, is a misstatement, is misleading.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, any statement to the contrary is simply not true. The only difference between the two plans, of course, is that we achieve that deficit reduction by spending cuts, by a margin of more than 3 to 1. The Democratic plan achieves that by tax increases.

I also want to comment on something that has been said about the WIC Program, talking about salvaging the WIC Program. I would like to point out that the average funding for WIC, as a component of all food and nutrition programs, has been 5 percent of the total fundings.

□ 1440

Our proposal includes a floor of 12-percent funding for the WIC Program, more than double the historic average that has been spent on WIC. So let us just be straightforward and get the facts straight here.

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

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to two points that the gentleman from New York just made with respect to the tax incentives that are in the gentleman's proposal. I would simply point out that the Christmas tree with the presents under it that you outlined totaled $70 billion in tax reductions over 5 years, but you pay for those by a Christmas tree that costs $337 billion. So the net increase in tax is $267 billion. Now that may sound good, but it is basically going to be a high cost.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, the other thing that I would simply relate to is what I think is an erroneous characterization of the benefits of managed care. We are picking out the Arizona

plan from the gentleman's home State, and that is a very constructive way of dealing with out-of-control costs in the Medicaid Program. And the CBO has scored that if it were applied nationally to be a savings of $10 billion, which is exactly the kind of thing that we need to be undertaking if we are going to solve both the problems of cost and access.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY], a member of the committee.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin my remarks by commending the fine work of our chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO]. I believe his leadership has been extremely fair and produced an excellent product for this body's deliberation today. I am pleased to be a freshman member of this body and a freshman member of the Budget Committee.

Many of us were sent to Washington as a result of last fall's elections on a wave of change. The voters have had 12 years of Republican economic policy dictated out of the White House, a policy based on three principal components. First, coddle the financially comfortable; second, ignore the poor; and third, mislead the middle class with empty words of support while yielding a financial situation in this country that left them worse off and sharing a higher burden and a higher level of debt that imperiled the future of the next generation. The voters demanded a change, and they got one starting at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, a change that has brought forward before this body today an economic recovery package and the steepest deficit reduction package ever proposed by a President and brought to the floor by a Budget Committee.

In contrast, the amendment before us, and I applaud the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for going through the difficult rigors of preparing and overcoming the objections within his own party to put it before us, but when you look at the alternative proposed by this amendment, it is as if the election never happened. It clings fast to the failed policies rejected decisively in last fall's election.

First, it coddles the financially comfortable. Eighty-eight percent of the $240 billion revenue difference between the plans comes from the failure of the Kasich plan to address the incredible wealth amassed by the wealthiest Americans over the last decade, by the failure of the plan to impose restrictions on lobbying deductions or any other taxes for corporations.

The plan clings to that Republican tenet of ignoring the poor. It eliminates all new investment in Head Start, child nutrition, and eliminates the proposed earned investment tax credit designed to help the working poor, and reduces fully 50 percent college student aid.

And, finally, it continues the past failed practices of misleading the middle class. They say no new taxes, no new taxes are in this plan. But if you look at the Medicare section alone, there are new charges assessed without regard to ability to pay, projected to bring in nearly $20 billion. They call them copays, but to the extent these are charges not presently assessed, they are a tax, a tax imposed in the most unfair way of all. Rather than a broad-based tax, rather than a tax based on ability to pay, the $20 billion they will pull in from Medicare recipients comes from the sickest, most elderly of our population.

A final flaw with the Kasich alternative is timing. The same group that said do nothing, do nothing to help this country from slipping into a recession that displaced millions of workers across the country, now want to do nothing to get us going again. And in fact, they front load their cuts in a way that is almost sure to push us back into yet another recession while we are barely sustaining a recovery today.

Small wonder, I think it is small wonder that many Republicans never wanted to see this plan come to the floor. In my opinion, it presents all too clearly the stark contrast in the alternatives before this body today.

I urge rejection of the Kasich amendment.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS].

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I do not want us to lose sight of the big picture issue that we are dealing with at this moment, and the issue that we are responding to, the challenge issued by President Clinton to be specific, to come forward with literally dozens of sensible, common sense driven suggestions by which we can reduce the oppressive tax burden on the people of America as well as begin to roll back some of the unnecessary spending that has taken place in this city over the years.

I believe we have met that challenge, and I want to point to one place where I think the American people can relate to just how significantly this Federal Government of ours has grown over the last 20 years.

I would point out that the budget for travel in the Federal Government, the travel budget alone is in excess of $7 billion. This is the class 20 classification the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] talked of earlier, $7 billion in travel.

Do Members know what we found when we actually looked at how these moneys were disbursed? In the 12th month of the fiscal year, the very last month, there was a 48-percent increase in the amount spent on travel. Why? Because managers in government decided they should spend down all of their available travel allowances, so it shows up in the final month of the fiscal year.

If we would compel that in the 12th month of the fiscal year they spent simply the average amount spent in the other 11 months, we could save $2 billion. That is how soft the underbelly of this Federal Government has grown.

There are enormous opportunities in telephones, in travel, in printing, in consulting contracts. The Democrats are silent. The Republicans have stepped up and said let us look at these categories. Let us work in good faith to reduce the overhead, administrative expenses of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, my State of New Jersey took a route 3 years ago which said you can tax yourself into prosperity. It has been a disaster, a disaster for the middle class that the proponents of that tax program said that they were seeking to help.

The new energy tax from President Clinton, the tax on Social Security for our seniors, those are going to be harmful to this country. We ought not increase the tax burden. We should meet our responsibility to be specific.

That is what this Republican alternative budget has done.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE], a member of the committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, before I talk about infrastructure a little bit, this travel thing kind of interests me. It came up in the Budget Committee. I agree that you found some incidents where there has been an abuse of travel or places where apparently travel could have been cut back, and that certainly needs to be done and I applaud you. Of course, that is what we have been doing on our side, and that is what the commission that Vice President GORE has been heading up is doing.

□ 1450

I just have to ask: Who has been signing the travel vouchers for the last 12 years? Where did this suddenly come from? Did these folks just walk out to the airport without any kind of control?

It seems to me before you come in here talking about all of these great finds, where have you been for the 12 years? That is the problem with your budget. It is a 12-year-old budget. It is 12-year-old rhetoric.

This election was about getting this country moving again. It was not about stagnation. It was about being willing to make the public investment that has to be made, and so just as we are hearing the same tired talk to the last 12 years, I think it is time to realize that there is a new breeze blowing here.

This new breeze is this: There is a siren song out of the Kasich budget, "Oh, we can do it all in cuts. Happy day, all in cuts; there are no taxes. It is only candy. All in cuts, will not hurt anybody." Of course, there are no tax cuts in this one either, the tax cuts that are in our stimulus package. There are no investments in this either, but, "Oh, no, we can do it all."

Well, let us talk about it. There is a reason that public investment is down by one-half, 50 percent, in the last 30 years, from roughly 4½ percent of gross national product to roughly 2½ percent. Why is that? Because of the decline in investment that you have got in this budget that you would propose.

Indeed, we are talking about growth. Let us talk about highways. Under the Kasich budget, do you think you ought to be getting away from the orange barrels that are blocking traffic, the fact that you cannot do the maintenance, the fact that we never get the full amount back from the gasoline taxes that people pay? Do not look to the Kasich budget, because that will cut you over the next few years around $7 billion.

What about mass transit? Do not look to the Kasich budget. That is about a 50-percent cut in that.

Airports: Are you tired of the fact that we only built one major airport in the last 20 years? Do not look to the Kasich budget. They cut that.

Clean water: mandates, once again, without money; the clean water program would be cut roughly $9.2 billion. That is sewers, that is cleaning up our environment, $9.2 billion over 5 years.

Economic conversion: so important that the President has recommended not only in the stimulus package but additional sums to economic development and administration, cut by the Kasich budget. They would not exist, these increases.

What about all of the defense plants that are closing down and the towns and communities that need assistance? They get no help from this budget. Do not look to them.

This election was about getting the economy moving. The Kasich budget is a guarantee of gridlock. It is a no-growth budget.

If you do not believe that investment in this country is important, do not invest in the House budget, but if you do believe that investment is so important, then you have got to invest that vote in the House budget which is very, very crucial: highways, mass transit, growth, economic conversion, all of it in our budget, none of it over there.

I think now people understand why it is so important that the election was about new priorities, and this vote today is about new priorities and whether we get about them.

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

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 4) 37

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

Mr. INGLIS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I could not help but, on listening to the last speaker talking about themes, think for the moment that maybe we do have a new theme, the Fleetwood Mac Presidential theme song now ought to be, "Tax, Spend, Think About Cutting Tomorrow." That is the new theme.

Mr. INGLIS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Arizona wants to sing that rather than just speak it. That would be nice.

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

I think it is very interesting to follow the gentleman from West Virginia, because two things I have found very interesting in the discussions over the hearings that we had in the Committee on the Budget, particularly from Lloyd Bentsen, Secretary Bentsen.

There are two things that he said that were very interesting to me, or one that I observed there, and actually one when the Director of CBO was speaking.

When Secretary Bentsen was there, I asked him, "Mr. Secretary, I am concerned that this stimulus package is largely a package of pork, that constitutes really a big lump of sugar that is going to help the medicine go down," and the Secretary—and this is in the testimony—the Secretary said, "Well, Mr. INGLIS, it was necessary to get enough votes to make this package work." I appreciate his candor. But the candor does show the problem.

This stimulus package is in large part pork, and the result is that it becomes a big lump of sugar, and that helps the medicine go down of the largest tax increase in the history of the United States.

The second thing about this stimulus package, and this is actually the Director of CBO that testified to this, he pointed out that a $30 billion stimulus package, or if it is, in fact, a $16 billion, and it is sort of difficult to account which one it is, if it is that small, he said it is an insignificant stimulus to a $6 trillion economy that is taking off. However, it is a significant increase in the deficit.

That is what it is, My colleagues, I would ask you to look very closely at that stimulus package and realize that it really is very insignificant to a $6 trillion economy.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR].

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Chairman, let me ask this of my colleagues and fellow Americans: If not now, when?

If not now, then we do not deserve to represent the people of the United States in this Chamber.

If not now, then we will not be able to look the children of those people in the eye.

If not now, then we place on those children a crushing burden we do not have the moral fiber to shoulder ourselves.

If not now, then we live with the disgrace of our shame, indecision, and outright cowardice for the rest of our lives.

If not now, then we are saying never, and I weep for our country.

The time for change is now.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the head of the Republican conference.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me begin this process by first congratulating the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the members of the Republican Budget Committee. In the 8 years that I have been in Congress and watched this budget process, this is the most professional, most dedicated, and most real effort that I have seen by any budgeteering group.

They have got the right conceptual framework, that we ought to grow down the size of the Government and allow more freedom to grow up the free-enterprise sector of the American economy, that only by growth in the private sector can we generate the revenues to support this enormous Government spending program, and only then can we decrease the deficit if we combine with that growth in revenues from a growing private sector a containment of growth in the public sector.

It takes courage. It takes commitment. It takes details.

A few weeks ago we were challenged on our side of the aisle to put up or shut up, and the fact of the matter is the Republicans on the Committee on the Budget put up details, pain, sacrifice, not sacrifice by those of us who Senator GRAMM says are pulling the wagon and paying higher taxes by heaping on more taxes, but sacrifice by those who are in the wagon by reductions in Government largesse and containment of the size of Government.

What do we have from the Democrats? The Democrat package can be broken down into three components: the pain, the payoff, and the promise.

The pain is the massive tax increases which are immediate and certain on all of the American people, and if in fact you happen to be earning $30,000 a year and suffering a tax increase by this Clinton plan, they will perform the magic of redefinition and give you by a redefinition of your income the status of being a wealthy American by imputing to you through the Government alleged earnings of your children, the rental value of your home, the inside value buildup of your retirement programs, the cheating on your taxes that this Government under Clinton is as-

suming that we all do by either unreported or underreported income, they will make you wealthy.

This Presidency is going to make us all wealthy by simply redefining income.

Now, in addition to that pain, we have the payoff to all of the Government agencies, the supporters, the communities. In addition to all of that payoff in this Government stimulate pork package, we have then the promise.

The promise we have all heard before to the American citizens is, once again, the Democrats have said, "Take the pain of the higher taxes, allow us to fulfill the payoff to our constituency groups, allow us to provide the pork early, and we promise you the cuts later."

□ 1500

Ladies and gentlemen, the cuts will not arrive, the cuts will not get off the launching pad. The cuts are the fiction of Democratic budgetary policy. The pain is real, the suffering is optional.

Vote for Kasich, vote against the Democrats' fiction.

Mr. Chairman, the plan offered by President Clinton and the Democrat majority and the one developed by the Budget Committee Republicans offer the American people a stark contrast in our respective parties' approach to tax and budget policy. The Democrats want to tax the people and grow the Government, while Republicans want to grow the private sector and constrain the Government.

The Democrat package contains the largest tax increase in American history and tens of billions in new spending. By contrast, the Republican alternative cuts spending and the deficit $430 billion without increasing taxes, without slashing defense and without cutting Social Security.

The Democrat package can be broken down into three components; the pain, the payoff, and the promise. The pain is massive tax increases, which are immediate and certain. The payoff is the stimulate Government package which, even the Washington Post notes, is an effort to reward Democrat constituencies with taxpayer money. And the promise—one we've heard so many times before—is that a few years from now we'll cut Government spending.

In reality, the Democrat plan will grow the Government and shrink the economy. It will mean fewer jobs for ordinary Americans, particularly when coupled with the new wave of regulations we are certain to see on behalf of Big Labor and other special interests. The reason job growth has been stagnant is that the tax and regulatory burden on small business has increased 34 percent in the last few years. And I remind my Democrat friends that during the Reagan boom—the longest peacetime expansion of the economy in history—it was small business that created 75 percent of the new jobs in America.

What does the Republican plan do? It achieves more deficit reduction than the Clinton plan by reducing Federal spending less than 3 percent. That's right, 3 percent. It's appalling that my friends in the Democrat majority and the new Democrats in the White House would stick the American taxpayer with the largest tax increase in American history while refusing to reduce Government by even 3 percent. In fact, the Democrat plan adds tens of billions in new spending.

While the Democrat plan asks all Americans to pay higher taxes for more Government, the Republican plan asks the beneficiaries of Government largesse to contribute to deficit reduction. The Republican plan cuts Federal overhead, reduces Congress' bloated budget, asks wealthy Medicare recipients to pay a larger portion of their health care costs, requires Federal workers to work until age 62 like everyone else instead of retiring at 55. It reforms foreign aid, puts Medicaid patients in a managed care program, and saves taxpayer dollars by empowering low-income Americans to use housing vouchers instead of building expensive, crime-ridden public housing. And best of all, the Republican plan eliminates unnecessary programs and Government agencies like the Interstate Commerce Commission, which was created in 1887 to regulate the railroads.

I would like to compliment my colleague, Mr. KASICH, and the other Republicans on the Budget Committee for putting together an honest, fair, and well-balanced plan that reduces the deficit without raising taxes. This plan attacks the root of our deficit problem: runaway Federal spending.

Balancing the budget and encouraging a prosperous and growing economy requires a two-point plan. We must first limit Government spending, as this plan does. And we must pass a progrowth package which reduces the cost of capital and labor and encourages our people to save and invest.

Mr. Chairman, I would say in closing that the Clinton tax-and-spend plan will fail. As I told another President 3 years ago during the 1990 budget summit, higher taxes and higher spending will stifle growth in the private economy, kill jobs, and not reduce the deficit. The Clinton plan is the 1990 budget deal part II in super 3–D with twice the tax increase. I urge my colleagues to reject the Big Government Democrat agenda and support the Kasich alternative, which cuts $430 billion from the deficit and gets America back on the path to prosperity by asking Government to sacrifice, not American taxpayers.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party is running scared. They could not believe that Bill Clinton would put together a real budget with real numbers that really reduce the deficit. And he did.

He ran on a platform of reinvesting in America but in reducing the budget deficit, and here we are; we are doing it.

Now, I must say I give some credit to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH]. Unlike most of the other Republicans who did not want to put up any budget at all, at least he has had the decency and the courage to put together a list of cuts. I wonder how many votes it will get on that side of the aisle. It certainly cannot get a majority of votes.

We are back to playing the same old game, every single Member in this body can put together their own list of cuts that they can vote for without much political damage, without substantively bothering them, and we end up with 435 budgets. But we end up with no budget, and the deficit gets bigger and bigger and bigger.

Well, the American people asked for one thing in the election more than anything else, they asked for an end to gridlock. They really were asking, even those elected from your side of the aisle, to come over and compromise and work on a bipartisan budget. But that was not to be.

And so we alone have come up with a budget. Do we have differences in opinion about what it might be here? Sure. But we are going to pass a budget, and we are going to reduce the deficit, and we are going to play the games that have been played on that side of the aisle about putting together something that 100 or even 150 Members might vote for but cannot carry a majority, because above all we must act.

The Kasich budget puts a dagger at the heart of urban America and puts together a budget that knocks out whatever is left of urban programs. I could do the same and put the budget together that did the same to rural America and get 150 votes on my side of the aisle, but it would not pass and it would not reduce the deficit.

So I say to my colleagues here there is really only one game in town and that is a budget that can pass and reduce the deficit and get us on the road to recovery and end the gridlock.

The budget that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has taken from the White House and, even, improved is that budget. I urge a "no" vote on the Kasich amendment despite his commendable courage in putting together cuts; and I ask for a "yes" vote on the Democratic proposal.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, in the last election there was a mandate for change and not a mandate for more of the same. What I am hearing in the course of this debate today is you cannot cut this and you cannot cut that.

Back in 1985 a group of us got together and in 1986 offered budgets on the floor to avert the precise fiscal crisis we are faced with today, and we hear the same refrain: "You can't cut this and you can't cut that."

You are darned right we are front loading the spending cuts; it is no coincidence that in the President's economic plan that all the spending cuts are safely deferred to the years 1997

and 1998. That is because they are never going to happen. Now, the Kasich plan demonstrates how you can achieve the same deficit reduction numbers in the President's economic plan but doing it through spending cuts, without having to raise taxes. And it is specific.

My major concern with the plan on the other side is that we are not going to get the spending cuts. Two, we are not specific.

I have yet to hear how they arrived at the $510 billion. The last we knew through the CBO scoring, it was $425 billion, including the $63 billion in unspecified cuts.

Now, understand, the $30 billion of that $63 billion occurs in 1998. A plug of $30 billion in 1998 that we do not know what is going to happen in terms of cuts.

Now, we know the appropriating and authorizing committees can achieve a recommended aggregate number in a different way, but we have an obligation as members of the Committee on the Budget to at least demonstrate one feasible way as to how you arrive at those numbers, so that we are not reduced to just picking numbers out of the hat, which has happened time and time again here in this Congress. And that is why we are in the situation in which we are today.

Let us look at foreign assistance, because I think it illustrates the difference between the Kasich plan and the budget resolution out of the Committee on the Budget.

We have doubled the cuts in foreign assistance over the budget resolution passed by the Democratic majority in the committee. We doubled them. The President's economic plan originally called for an increase in foreign assistance in 1994 by $51 million. Now, the majority came back and inserted another $2 billion because they realized that it was deficient in this category, but we still doubled them.

Now, the point is that they have not yet been able to specify how they are going to make those cuts in foreign aid. Now, ladies and gentlemen, if you are asking my constituents, whose average per capita income is $14,800, to pay more in home heating oil because of the energy tax, do we not owe it to them to say, "Yes, we are going to cut foreign assistance substantially?" I think they deserve to know from us that we are going to specify cuts in programs like foreign assistance. We can at least double our cuts in foreign assistance if we are asking them to pay more for home heating oil. I think that is logical and fair.

So, what are we getting in return for the largest tax increase in the history of this country? Well, we are getting more spending this year, we are getting a spending cut of $6 billion in 1994 out of a $1.5 trillion budget; only $6 billion in spending cuts. We get spending increases each and every year under the Clinton economic plan.

In return for the taxpayers in this country paying for the largest tax increase in the history of this country, that is, and yes, the spending cuts I have referred to, the majority of them occur in 1997, 1998; only 6 percent of them occur in the first year.

I think we owe the American people more than that, ladies and gentlemen. We can do a better job.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], a member of our committee.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say initially that I join with some of my other colleagues in paying my respects to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] at least on the process of getting a budget alternative together, putting it out there, providing specifics. He has met the process test.

But on the substance of the budget, I think you have to say this is truly a budget with no vision whatsoever. There are no investments, there are no changes in the priorities. This is a budget that represents the same tired priorities of the last 12 years: neglect, supply-side voodoo economics, and trickle-down mythology.

There appears to be no investment issue either in the spending or in the tax reduction side. There is blatant neglect of education and training priorities.

The Kasich plan does not include full funding of Head Start by 1999. Only 37 percent of eligible children can be enrolled in the Head Start Program, based on the current funding levels assumed in the Kasich alternative. There are no initiatives for the National Service Corps budget. There is no mention whatsoever of youth apprenticeship programs to prepare non-college-bound high school students to make the transition to careers. There is no increase here for summer youth employment and training to put youth to work in summer jobs.

□ 1510

There is no commitment in this budget to research and development.

There is no short-term investment tax credit for new startup companies to accelerate expansion plans and order new equipment.

They do not even propose the permanent extension of credit for research and experimentation.

There is no permanent extension of tax credits for targeted jobs.

There are shortsighted cuts in this budget that hurt the poor, that hurt the environment, that hurt our industrial competitiveness, and make a fundamental onslaught on our basic tenets of foreign policy. I would like to speak to that for just a moment. It is a portion of the budget that I have worked on.

The Sabo budget proposes cuts in the area of the foreign affairs function. But how can anyone in this Chamber who wants to talk sense to the American people propose a budget that rejects and cuts the administration's own suggestions for dealing with the most important national crisis of our time, because everything we want to do in the area of deficit reduction, new investments, downsizing of defense spending, focusing on domestic priorities, all that will be cast aside if the most fundamental question of what happens in the Republics of the former Soviet Union is not dealt with.

The administration proposes focusing on that. The Kasich substitute just wipes out that proposal in its entirety.

This is an issue that can get a lot of applause from people who want to appeal to the lowest common denominator of what the average voter wants to hear, but a budget that requires leadership cannot ignore what the leadership of both political parties, whether it is Richard Nixon or Bill Clinton or any of the people who have thought about this subject say we must do in this particular area.

This budget wipes out all the proposals for peackeeping operations that are now going on and that have been given bipartisan support on both sides of this Chamber. This is making a mockery in order to say, "Oh, look what we have been able to cut in the administration's proposed budget."

I would like to touch on a couple other areas as well. We have had many debates here about Legal Services, controls, questions of how the program should be run. It is very easy, I guess, for the people who put together the Kasich substitute to decide to wipe out all Legal Services programs, the good ones along with the bad ones, the ones that are doing great jobs along with the ones that might be done, wipe them all out from any Federal budget deficit. Who cares what happens to the poor in the particular area?

On the program again that has tremendous bipartisan support, the Women, Infants, and Children, the WIC Program, and the School Lunch Program that everyone acknowledges are two examples of the best that the Government has been able to do in helping people who deserve to be helped, they combine these programs, assume a massive reduction in funds by savings that they give no discretion of how they will be achieved, and if they are not achieved will pit two of the most vital programs we have here, WIC and the school lunch program against each other for a vastly reduced amount of moneys. That is not a responsible, imaginative, and visionary budget.

I just want to touch on one last issue and that is the assumptions about the Medicare freeze and medical malpractice.

The Kasich substitute says we are going to achieve $14.9 billion in savings

by freezing provider costs for Medicare. But will that affect the providers? No. Because the assumption here is that we reform the medical malpractice insurance system and that the $14.9 billion in savings will come from savings realized by those particular kinds of reforms.

The fact is that less than 1 percent of our national health care costs are spent on medical malpractice insurance premiums. The defensive medical malpractices that are assumed for this are totally unrealistic. No expert detached objective person analyzing this could assume there is any logic to that.

So even in the area where they seek to throw out the challenge the most on the credibility of the specifics, the Kasich substitue falls woefully short.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this substitute be defeated and that the Budget Committee's proposal be adopted.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

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

Mr. Chairman, I just heard the comments that were made about WIC, the nutrition program. I just want to make it very clear, that the savings we get are scored by the Congressional Budget Office. They are real savings. They are in there. They are scored by the CBO.

How do you get that kind of saving? By taking 5 percent of all the nutrition programs when you block grant them and when you eliminate the duplication, when you eliminate the overlap of programs, you would probably get more than 5 percent. We used the very conservative number, that is the CBO number of 5 percent.

The Governors want these programs block granted. It is a program that would work for the States and save the American taxpayer $5 billion and not cut any services and allow the same number of dollars or more dollars to go to the WIC Program, which is everybody's No. 1 priority.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich amendment and in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 64. In my view, Congress should forget new taxes, forget new spending, and for once prove to the American people that Congress is interested in and can cut spending. Why do I say this?

First, because as a result of our annual deficits, the national debt is now $4.1 trillion. It is very, very serious.

Second, even if one assumed this budget resolution would be followed, and I frankly do not believe it will be insofar as cutting is concerned in spending, an additional $1.65 trillion will be added to the national debt over the next 5 years, according to their own admission, and still there would be no balanced budget in sight. Perhaps some time in the next century we may get to that, and in the fifth year of this budget, guess what, the deficit would in fact be on the rise, going up.

Third, the public has no faith in the collective will of Congress to cut spending. That is zilcho. New national taxes and spending are up front and forever, but real spending cuts are rare and they are in the outyears.

In fact, House Concurrent Resolution 64 increases spending over fiscal year 1993 in 15 out of the 19 of the major functional categories of the Federal budget for fiscal year 1994.

The people of this Nation do not have to be challenged with new taxes and more spending. They are used to that. They have had enough of it. Congress is the one to be challenged, and the challenge is to cut spending, clean out the barn.

I came to Congress in 1985, the first year of the heralded spending limits of Gramm-Rudman. Those limits were avoided, waived, repealed, scuttled, rewritten, bypassed, and ignored by Congress each time a serious spending cut was required.

I also saw the 1990 budget deficit law passed with its massive new taxes and $500 billion of promised spending cuts. Likewise I saw it manipulated, avoided, waived, abused, and bypassed while deficits and the national debt continued to climb to all-time heights.

Indeed, the stimulus package of $16.2 billion for fiscal year 1993 which soon will be passed by this body is based upon an avoidance of the firewalls and the spending limits of the 1990 Budget Deficit Act. How? Very simple. Just declare the whole darn stimulus package an emergency and, presto, the firewalls and the limits on spending for fiscal year 1993 come tumbling down and we add, guess what, another $16.2 billion of deficits for our children and our grandchildren to pay.

I would submit that Congress has to stop financially abusing future generations of Americans. Our children and our grandchildren have a right to expect Congress to act responsibly.

This is deja vu all over again, the same thing I saw in 1985, the same thing I saw in 1990.

Forget the new taxes. Forget the new spending, and for once show the Nation that this Congress can do something for the Nation in regard to cutting spending. That is the message we ought to be hearing.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], a former member of the Committee on the Budget and current chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, let me say that this morning's newspaper reported that Mr. KASICH's budget was rejected by his Republican conference. I think the gentleman from Ohio deserved better treatment from his Republican colleagues. He at least had the courage to stand up and to make his plan specific and to say what he would do to reduce the deficit, and my hat is off to him.

He came to Congress with me in the same year. He has shown himself to be a man of his word, but I have to echo the comments of the previous speaker, the gentleman from California, though Mr. KASICH has met the procedural requirements, on substantives I find the gentleman's offering wanting.

□ 1520

Let me tell my colleagues why. The Kasich budget is good news for fat cats, bad news for kids. The Kasich budget is good news for the independently wealthy, bad news for infants and children.

During the last 12 years, Mr. Chairman, the tax policies of the Reagan and Bush administrations have given substantial benefits to the wealthiest people in America. Working families know it. They have paid more year in year out. President Bill Clinton has said that, as part of deficit reduction, the wealthiest among us must pay their fair share of taxes, and 70 percent of all of the new tax revenue he is asking for comes from people making over a hundred thousand dollars a year.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican Kasich budget literally insulates all of the fat cats in America from any increase in their income tax rates. Yes; he would freeze in place the current inequity in the Federal tax system which heaps the burden on working families. In that respect the Kasich budget fails the fundamental test of fairness, and then, when we take a look at where the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] would make up for that money that he would not take from the wealthiest Americans, we will find that he is cutting programs that are fundamental and essential for the growth of this country, programs for which our Committee on Appropriations has the responsibility.

Let me give my colleagues one specific: the Women, Infants, and Children Supplemental Feeding Program. For those who are not aware of it, it is a program which brings in poor pregnant mothers to help them through their pregnancy, to give them the prenatal care, the nutritional advice they need to have a normal pregnancy and a healthy baby, and then we stay with them. We bring the mothers back with their small children, make sure the children are well fed, go to the doctor and follow the basic requirements to have a normal and healthy life.

My colleagues, this is an investment in the future of America. We cannot build new jobs and a new future for America with low-birth-weight babies who literally break the bank of the Federal Treasury when they show up in

the intensive care units and need to be taken care of for months at a time.

Unfortunately the Kasich budget takes a serious cut at the money that is available for the WIC Program by providing a block grant that over a period of 5 years cuts over $6 billion, part of it from this important program.

Second, Mr. Chairman, the Kasich budget is going to eliminate President Clinton's call for universal immunization in America.

It was my pleasure and honor to serve on the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families for several years. Children who receive vaccinations in America are healthier kids who avoid the measles and diseases which put them in the hospital and run up the bills again in medical costs. We save $10 for the American taxpayer for every dollar we put in immunizing children.

Unfortunately, my colleagues, under the plan offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], immunization is an extravagance. He would not tax the wealthy so that we could immunize the children. I see things differently, and so does President Clinton.

The other point I make is that the President's offering suggests that we improve the earned income tax credit, which is a benefit, a tax benefit, given to working families who are still struggling to get beyond the poverty level. I thought we all agreed, Democrats and Republicans, that, if the husband and wife, mother and father, would go to work and do their 40 hours a week plus, and have small kids at home, that in this Nation of America they should not be living in poverty. With a tax credit we say to these people, "We'll give you a helping hand for your effort. We want you to understand that you are participants in America's future."

Unfortunately the Kasich budget, because it will not tax the wealthiest among us, cuts off this effort by President Clinton to bring dignity to families that are striving to pull themselves out of poverty and welfare.

The bottom line is this: The Democrat budget which we are supporting is going to reduce the deficit more than the Kasich budget, and the Democrat budget is also going to get this economy moving forward again. We are going to ask the wealthiest to pay their fair share. We are going to invest in kids and our future in training, and education and health care because we believe in people.

Those who stand here and support the budget offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] are saying by and large, "We should cut out all these programs. We don't need them."

We do need them. Americans need the Democrat substitute.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I sure would like a little less praise from the Democrats and a whole lot more accuracy in regard to our plan.

I think, as everybody here knows and as has been pointed out, I think, on three separate occasions by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], of course in our block grant program we have full funding of WIC and guarantee that the States can spend no less than 12 percent, and we have covered all these arguments that they make over, and over and over again, and it is almost like saying, "Well, we've got one for one in spending cuts and taxes." That is phony baloney, just like the previous speaker in talking about us gutting WIC. It is simply not true. We have full funding for WIC under our program.

But I will tell my colleagues what we do. We get rid of all the tired, worn-out bureaucracies out there, and we bring real reform.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS] for having yielded to me.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

This week it become so much easier to show my differences with the Democrats in respect to how to spend my constituents' money.

First, a Democrat report said we should oppose the Kasich budget because it moves in the opposite direction of the Clinton plan. It does not raise taxes. I ask, "Can you believe that? Be against it because it doesn't raise taxes?" Eliminates all spending increases. "Can you believe that? Be against it because it does not eliminate all spending increases?"

Mr. Chairman, that is why I am voting for this Kasich amendment. It does not increase taxes or spending.

Today these same Democrat politicians will approve over $16 billion in deficit spending. That is not just continuing wasteful spending. It is increasing it.

There is $28 million for the District of Columbia, $23 million to change light fixtures in government buildings, $150 million for the IRS. This is spending. The President and the Democrat Congress increases, and this is what we want to cut. The differences are that clear.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the taxpayers, "Grab your wallets and run. This President and this Democrat Congress think you can't be trusted with your own money."

Now the Democrats are selling us on how to invest our constituents' money, and I ask, "Can you believe it? They are now calling taxes an investment?" What a sad commentary, a Democrat controlled Congress that has no idea as to how to operate in the black are now reborn financial planners who want to invest our money. What a joke. Give them more money, and they will spend it.

Mr. Chairman, I think Americans can be trusted to keep their own money. Let us try that philosophy for a budget and an economic policy.

Support the Kasich amendment. It takes the first step toward deficit reduction. It cuts spending and does not raise taxes. It is a good budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], president of the freshman class.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I speak today to the urgent need to pass the budget resolution that is before us, and not the Kasich plan. Today we are challenged to take a brave stand for our Nation and the people of our districts. The eyes of the American people are upon us. We are being watched to see if we can make the tough decisions that will enable the American people to again feel secure about their economic well being. To move this country forward we must not be content with business as usual. There are those who will tell us that the economy is well. They will lead us to believe that Main Street is once again booming, and all of our workers are again full at work. While there have been some changes in the economy, there are still far too many Americans caught in the hopelessness and despair of unemployment. Far too many of our children are dying because of inadequate prenatal health care, and far too many of the roads and bridges in our towns and cities are at a point of dangerous disrepair.

The budget resolution before us presents an opportunity for us to make a bold statement, to do the right thing. The deficit is at an unacceptable level and a plan is offered to address the problem. Painful spending cuts across the board are included in this plan. Let me briefly say to my colleagues, that the budget resolution certainly does not please every one, but it is indeed moving in the right direction. It moves us toward a future of investment in the critical physical and human resources that are vital to our Nation's survival.

It directs much-needed attention to the education and immunization of our children.

It prepares our work force for the changing nature of our economy.

It addresses the special nutrition program for women, infants, and children through the WIC program.

It addresses tax changes proposed in the Presidential budget to move the economy, and it has built-in measures to keep it going once it gets on track.

In summary, the budget resolution speaks to the heart of the need once

again to focus on the needs of the people of this great Nation. And yes, it also contains a deficit-reduction plan that is not smoke and mirrors. Unfortunately, Representative KASICH, the ranking Republican member on the House Budget Committee has offered a plan that is the reverse of what the House Budget Committee has recommended. Let us look at just a few points of the plan that the Representative has proposed:

DEFICIT REDUCTION

The Kasich plan only lowers the deficit in the first 2 years. It is estimated by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities that because of the timing difference, this plan does not achieve as much long-term deficit reduction as the President's plan.

Most importantly, this plan places the greatest burden for reducing the deficit on low- and middle-income citizens.

There is no investment in our children, families, or the public infrastructure of our towns and cities.

Job training for our workers is ignored, as is research and technology development. I say it is time for us to reject business as usual, and move quickly to reject the Kasich plan and accept the budget resolution before us. It is a measure that will move this great Nation and its people forward.

Mr. Chairman, let us do this today because it is the right thing to do.

□ 1530

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE].

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Chairman, the President challenged those who oppose his budget to offer their own. Well done, Mr. President. Good politics—good policy. A democratic process should promote the public discussion of alternatives.

So today's debate is about choices, economics, and leadership. Upon what principles do we base our resolve and our approach to deal with the deficit?

I believe we have a deficit because the Government spends too much and is too ineffective and inefficient. The Democratic leadership believes we have a deficit because people are taxed too little.

I believe, and the Kasich plan reflects, the fundamental economic fact that we will never get the deficit under control until the Government gets spending under control.

The Democratic leadership believes we will never get the deficit under control until Government taxes more and spends more.

The energy tax will hurt Americans and cost jobs. Mr. President, western Pennsylvania has thousands of jobs tied to energy sensitive industries. Good jobs in competitive global markets which will be lost. Steel, paper, aluminum—and the list goes on.

Taxing our way to deficit reduction will put some of these people on the unemployment lines. The tax is regressive, inflationary, and a very bad idea.

New spending will increase the cost of long-term Government which predictably will require more revenue. The expansion of Government is a novel approach to deficit reduction. It doesn't make sense to me. We should be looking for ways to make a $1.5 trillion Government better, not bigger.

My colleagues, we cannot tax our way to prosperity and we cannot bluff our way to a balanced budget.

The only way to reduce the deficit is to permanently reduce spending and, by doing so, the size of Government.

In 1980, the American people sent $517 billion to Washington for the Federal Government to spend. By 1989, revenues had grown to nearly $1 billion, yet we remained over $150 billion in the red. So, in spite of taxpayers digging deeper and paying more, the Government's insatiable appetite still could not be controlled.

That's the picture, the more people pay, the more Government spends. Let us add one more certainty to Ben Franklin's list—the only certainties in life are death, taxes, and more Government spending.

The Kasich plan recognizes the need to reduce spending as the only way to reduce the deficit. I don't agree with all of it. I differ with my friend on his approach to Davis-Bacon, legal services, and other components. But, like any blueprint, we can move some lines around to accommodate different priorities. As a spending blueprint for Congress, the Kasich plan offers the most promise to deal honestly with the deficit.

The Kasich budget simply recognizes that before we ask people to open their wallets and pay more taxes, Government should tighten its own belt, and do a much better job with the dollars the American taxpayers already send to Washington.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD].

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the Kasich substitute and in support of the Budget Committee's fiscal year 1994 budget resolution.

The gentleman from Ohio is to be commended for his diligence and his passion in crafting his substitute amendment. There is much in the plan that I can support, and will support as the reconciliation process moves forward. I too want to kill World War II-era agricultural subsidies. I especially want to be able to support a budget that doesn't increase taxes.

The Kasich substitute calls for significant budget cuts, no question about it. But it fails on a number of other counts. Most importantly, it fails to pass the test of fairness. The Kasich amendment puts an incredibly unfair burden on the elderly and the poor to balance the budget. It calls for an additional 50-percent cut in Medicare beyond what the Budget Committee recommended, yet it does so in the absence of any plan for comprehensive health care reform.

Kasich asks our senior citizens to pay more, but makes no commitment to seniors to address skyrocketing health care costs.

That's just not fair.

The Kasich plan calls for $8.6 billion in savings over 5 years by consolidating WIC, food stamps, and the School Lunch Program. Mr. Chairman, there is a reason that WIC has bipartisan support—It works. Right now WIC serves just 60 percent of the Nation's women, infants, and children living below the poverty line.

Mr. Chairman, that is just not fair.

The Kasich amendment fails to address the economic realities facing our Nation. We are facing a painful transformation as we wean ourselves from the defense buildup of the 1980's. Cuts in weapons systems have already hit my district. In a few weeks, we are going to vote on a plan to close dozens of military bases nationwide. Yet under the Kasich budget, we cannot help any of the thousands of workers and their communities as they go through this painful transition.

It's just not fair.

Mr. Chairman, we must do more than cut spending if we are to see progress in deficit reduction. We must reprioritize how we spend, for the economy must grow to bring in adequate revenues. Without significant investments in highways and airports, education, job training and R&D, the private sector can't provide the growth necessary to bring the budget into balance. By cutting student aid, by maintaining the status quo on job training, and by eliminating the Commerce Department, the Kasich budget fails to prepare us for the economy of the future.

Mr. Chairman, it's just not fair, and it's just not smart.

Finally, I feel obligated to point out that the Kasich budget includes a provision of particular detriment to the schoolchildren of Utah. Specifically, it would prohibit all Federal land acquisitions for 5 years. This provision could devastate years of negotiation to resolve a long-standing dispute between the Federal Government and the State of Utah over the use of State-owned school trust lands.

I am prepared to cast difficult votes—that's why we were sent here. I want to ensure that the 103d Congress, and the Clinton administration, are heralded by historians as the ones that brought an end to gridlock in Washington and set our Nation on a new course of fiscal responsibility.

The Budget Committee has given us a good framework—a fair framework—

to begin this transition. The Kasich budget in spite of its good points, falls short. I urge its defeat and the adoption of the committee plan.

□ 1540

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentlewoman from Utah, if she was worried and concerned about military base closings last Friday, if this Clinton plan gets enacted, which I am sure Les Aspin does not favor, really, if he had his way it would not be anything like this, almost everybody in this country who has anything to do with the military is going to be shaking in their boots when we get to the base closing commissions that are yet to be ahead under this blueprint for Pentagon devastation.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich amendment. It has been a very long debate, and I have listened to most of it. We have all thought about this a great deal.

I was particularly interested in my friend from Illinois. He and I had made a trip to Europe last year to help the Baltic States get away from having too much government because that was not an answer to their problem.

I think all of us here have decided where we are. There is no need to talk, in my view, about details. Everyone here, I think, wants to achieve certain goals. Such goals as a strong economy, good, strong dependable jobs, the ability for people to own homes and educate their children. We all want to do this.

Frankly, I am not persuaded that more taxes and more spending is the way to do that. I am not persuaded that we continue to take more money out of the private sector, put it in the public sector is the way to achieve those goals.

Indeed, it seems to me that we do better in achieving these goals with less government, rather than more. Pretty simple. If we have less taxes, rather than more. Pretty simple. We leave dollars in the private sector. That is where jobs and wealth are created.

I cannot imagine the largest tax increase in our history helping us achieve the goals of a stronger economy.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Kasich substitute to the House Budget resolution. The Kasich substitute not only falls about $15 billion short from the committee's deficit reduction efforts, but it also does not include any of the Clinton initiatives for education, for health and job training, nor does it include any of the President's tax incentives for small business investment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to focus my remarks this afternoon on the Republican proposal to lump together several Federal nutrition programs, including WIC, food stamps, and school lunch into one block grant for States.

In the past, Mr. Chairman, we have heard this siren song of block grants being more efficient than targeted Federal programs. And, like in the past, the Republican proposal to throw these programs into one budget bag and then cut them back in their funding by $6.8 billion falls short of what is good.

Why is it that when we have a defense program in trouble, like the B–1 bomber or the C–17 transport plane, defense hawks say we can fix those problems by putting more money or throwing more money at them? Yet somehow, domestic programs like WIC or school lunch are expected to work better and serve more people when we give them less money. And we are, under the Kasich proposal, giving them less, $6.8 billion less over the 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, study after study has shown that cutting WIC funding would be penny-wise and pound-foolish. My subcommittee has jurisdiction over this program, and I am very familiar with it.

The USDA and the GAO and others have found that each dollar spent in the prenatal component of WIC results in savings of between $1.92 and $4.21 in Medicaid costs due to fewer low-weight babies needing hospitalization.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], I am sure, because I have great respect for him, sincerely believes that WIC is protected in his proposal. But it is not, I assure him. It is not.

I do not think there is anyone in this House more familiar with WIC than I am. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, the Republicans' WIC-plus proposal does not make sense from an administrative efficiency point of view.

Usually, block grants combine Federal programs, which are run by the same State or local agency. However, in this instance, State health departments run the WIC program, because eligibility is based upon health-related needs. Schools, on the other hand, operate the School Lunch Program, because that is where the schoolchildren are, in school. And county welfare agencies operate the Food Stamp Program because eligibility is based upon income level.

We have three separate Federal nutrition programs with three very different target populations with different needs, different venues.

Mr. Chairman, the Kasich substitute has less deficit reduction, over $145 billion in unallocated ghost savings, and has unworkable new proposals like WIC-plus which do not make economic sense or administrative sense.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is very sincere. I commend him on his work. But his work falls short of what is needed here. I urge my colleagues to reject the Kasich substitute.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], for one more refutation.

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

I have just heard about this program once again. Here we go.

We are not cutting the WIC spending. We are going to cut the administrative overhead. Is there one person out here that thinks that these programs are so efficient that we cannot take 5 percent out for administrative costs? Five percent is what we are talking about taking out.

This thing has been studied since 1974. There was a recommendation in 1974 that we combine these programs. The Governors are asking for this. They want the savings of combining these programs, of reducing the administrative overhead.

We think we can get rid of this legislation. What is it about the School Lunch Program that makes the gentleman think that we should be subsidizing the sons and daughters of millionaires?

We would target these programs to those that are 185 percent of poverty or under. Not to everybody, as the School Lunch Program does.

Our program would guarantee, instead of 5 percent of funding in all these programs for WIC, now, a floor of 12 percent, 2½ times as much funding for WIC as we now have.

Our program would make WIC a real program and let it be run efficiently.

The gentleman wants to keep the bureaucracies in place in the States and the Federal Government.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER].

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994 and in strong opposition to the Kasich substitute amendment.

We have a choice today, indeed, Mr. Chairman. Do we return to the philosophy of old, a philosophy that has almost ruined the Nation, or do we move forward, move forward with new vision?

We all know that we must reduce the deficit, but the question is, do we do it while at the same time investing—investing in our children, investing in jobs, investing in training and education, or do we choose not to invest in America at all?

The President's economic plan and the budget that has been reported by the Committee on the Budget answers the question by saying that we must

invest at the same time as reducing the budget deficit by $510 billion over the next 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of criticism about this package from the Republicans, but is it not interesting that it is their party that is responsible for the budget deficit that has ballooned in the last 12 years? And now they want to tell us how to cure it.

Mr. Chairman, we Democrats are saddled with the responsibility of reducing the deficit and at the same time stimulating the economy. And, most certainly, we will not be able to do it with the Kasich amendment.

The resolution of the Committee on the Budget contains the stimulus portion of the President's plan and provides for a real package to reduce the deficit. Investment is just what we imagine it to be, sacrificing and spending today for a benefit tomorrow.

We must invest in the WIC Program. We must invest in SBA loans. We must invest with increased funding for people like the people in my district, hardworking Americans, Mr. Chairman, who have resoundingly rejected the gridlock and failed economic approaches of the Bush and Reagan years and overwhelmingly demanded action, and action and investment right now.

The Kasich amendment is one-dimensional. It is concerned with only one segment of society, and those are the fat cats who made off with big bucks in the 1980's and who now do not want to put their fair share into this till in taxation. It is unfair. It is insensitive, and it is not right.

We still have in this country 8.9 million people and more who are unemployed.

□ 1550

We still have in this country a need to put $1 billion into the summer jobs for disadvantaged youth this summer. We have a situation in Los Angeles right now that we are looking at another riot, and we have not recovered from the riots of last year. We need the investment that is reported by the budget resolution of the Budget Committee.

We need $4 billion for emergency unemployment benefits. We need another $2.6 billion for SBA loans, and most certainly, we need the $1.9 billion for the shortfall in funding for the Pell grant situation. We need the $3 billion for highway projects.

We cannot in any way afford the Kasich amendment and all of the concerns for investment that it overlooks and that it leaves out. The people of America elected President Clinton, and now the people of America must reject the Kasich amendment.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Republican alternative of the Committee on the Budget. It is by far the best plan that will be considered today. The Republican alternative is $430 billion of real, specified deficit reduction. It consists of straightforward cuts, which denies the Government a means to spend more. We cut 160 programs and we tell how we did it.

In contrast to the Democratic plan, the Republican plan gets to work immediately by cutting Federal spending $38 billion in the first year compared to the Democrats' $6 billion cut. Unlike the Democrats, who slapped on $60 billion in generic cuts at the last minute, our plan provides point-by-point, program-by-program specifics of who, what, when, where, and the why of how spending cuts are done.

I am particularly pleased with the cuts we made in the area of administrative overhead and personnel. We aim to reduce the waste, fraud, and mismanagement in Government. Simply, we intend to increase the Government's tooth-to-tail ratio, increasing the part that works and reducing the part that gets dragged around behind.

In the area of overhead we went straight to what is called object class 20 of Federal spending, which includes what the Government spends on travel, transportation, rental payments, printing, consulting, communications, and supplies. These categories add up to a whopping $340 billion annually. We then made sure that we took everything out that was not real, direct, Federal spending so that there could be no quibbling that the cuts we made weren't possible.

We got down to what are called the direct expenses—the money the Goverment actually spends and that came to $222 billion. But we didn't stop there either. We went all the way down to the Clinton number of $55 billion.

And from all these billions of dollars, we took out $7 billion in the first year and $48 billion over 5 years.

The Republicans on the House Budget Committee have produced a plan that will lower deficits and create economic growth from day one. Compare this to the Democrat plan that produces taxes from day one and economic growth from day none.

Today, we have a choice: between more taxes and no taxes. The Democrat plan offers deficit reduction through more taxes. The Republican plan offers deficit reduction through more spending cuts. The Democrats would have you believe that the only way to reduce the deficit is to raise taxes. We Republicans are showing that this is not true.

We do have a choice: Between high taxes and no taxes, between obstacles to economic growth and incentives to economic growth, a choice between words and action, a choice between the taxing and spending that Congress has always done and the real cuts that it has never done. A choice between Democrat and Republican plans. When you compare what they do, the choice is clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] that he has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], a member of the committee.

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

The Republicans put together the Kasich budget because we are serious about deficit reduction. We believe that we cannot eliminate deficit spending unless we actually cut spending. The Clinton plan, on the other hand, as brought to the floor by the House Democrats, increases spending by $244 billion, and despite the protestations on this side about significant spending cuts, it contains no net spending cuts, not this year, not next year, not any year in the future.

Whom do you believe? I am going to put my money where my mouth is. I will write out a personal check for $100,000, payable to Bill Clinton and the Democratic National Committee, if next year's spending is less than this year's spending. I will resign my congressional seat and I will write 100 times "I apologize to the Democrats. They were telling the truth. They really did cut spending."

Meanwhile, I will put my money and my vote behind the Kasich budget.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman and the Members of the Republican side of the Committee on the Budget for their very, very fine work. Let me tell the Members, I support the Kasich budget. I do that because it is the only budget we are going to see today that leaves the United States with a modicum of national defense.

Let us go to the baseline and see exactly what we are doing here. President Bush asked the people who won Desert Storm to put together a budget that would maintain the security of the United States and still allow for some efficiencies. Those people, Dick Cheney, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Colin Powell, and others, went to work and they cut about $50 billion out of the 1990 budget agreement. That was the agreement where Democrats and Republicans put together a number that we thought would be adequate to defend America. President Bush went $50 billion below that.

Now the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the Committee on the Budget have gotten together, they have worked on efficiences, they have

pulled down about $60 billion below that level. To me that is just barely enough to defend America, but it is still much better than the Democrat budget.

Interestingly, Mr. Aspin, the former chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, now Secretary of Defense, put together his option C, and it is just about where the Kasich budget is. It is $60 billion below the Bush baseline.

Let me tell the Members, the world is a very, very dangerous place. I want to go over four things that are happening right now that every Member should think about, because every Member here has young men and women in the armed services who need the right equipment. Everyone here has a duty to defend this country beyond the Constitution. That is the most important social program that we give out.

Right now in the Soviet Union, the former Soviet Union, we still have four states, four Russian states that have nuclear systems. The pink slips on those systems, just who controls them, is still in doubt. We have hard-liners taking over, paralyzing the Yeltsin administration. In Bosnia we have a situation that is blowing up. In North Korea we see the North Koreans pulling out of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

We have North Korea posing a great danger to the United States, and we have missiles proliferating around the world, and especially in the Middle East.

Everybody who is responsible here should vote for the Kasich budget. It is the closest thing to the Aspin option C that we have seen, and the Democrat budget absolutely guts national defense. Lastly, the Democrat budget will lead to a round of base closures that will devastate and render into a ghost town every military town in this country.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and in support of the budget resolution reported by the Budget Committee, House Concurrent Resolution 64.

The President and the Democrats in Congress have presented an investment package that carefully balances the needs and ambitions of our country for jobs, housing, education, and economic development, with the daunting reality of an out-or-control budget deficit. The budget accomplishes this delicate balance by fairly placing the greatest burden on those that reaped the greatest returns in the hit-and-run 1980's.

For the first time in more than a decade, the executive and legislative branches of Government are coming together to outline the future of this country. That future is paved by a plan that commits two out of every three dollars saved from spending cuts and revenue increases for deficit reduction, while one out of every three dollars saved is used for new investment. As a result, the budget substantially reduces the deficit while also making sizable investments to address unmet needs.

I admit that I would have preferred a package that went further in addressing the needs of our devastated communities, a package that would have contained more social investment. I was particularly concerned when $63 billion in cuts were added to the President's initial plan. These are real cuts in significant areas, some of which hurt. That is why I feel strongly that the economic stimulus package cannot be altered.

We must recognize that the disastrous economic decisions of the Reagan/Bush years have choked us with a long running economic recession. It has especially affected low-wage laborers and people of color, and damaged the prospects for long-term economic growth in this country.

This Republican substitute sinks us deeper into economic disinvestment. We must oppose the Kasich substitute. We must support the Democratic budget package. And, we must support the President's stimulus package without cuts. Only then, will we get this Nation moving toward investment, growth, and equity.

□ 1600

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the great city of Columbus, Ohio, Ms. PRYCE.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud my friend Mr. KASICH's plan to solve our country's problems without raising taxes.

Yesterday, I listened closely as our colleagues have been discussing how we're going to cut the deficit, restore the economy, and create lasting new jobs—all at the same time.

I can tell you right now that raising taxes on working Americans is not the answer. We have been down that road before—of promised fiscal discipline in exchange for higher taxes. We swallowed the bitter tax pill in 1990, and guess what happened? Economic growth slowed down and valuable jobs were lost.

Every day I read letters from back home and I know that for hardworking taxpayers living in middle America, higher taxes will really hit home.

For a lot of families all across America like those in central Ohio, paying more in taxes will mean really feeling the hurt in everyday life—like waiting another year to buy new boyscout uniforms or dropping the piano lessons or putting off the long-awaited family vacation.

Mr. Chairman, how can Congress ask the American people to tighten their belts another inch when they already know the sad truth that higher taxes leads to greater spending—not deficit reduction.

So when we talk about sacrifice, contribution, and patriotism, let's not forget how devastating a tax hike will be to working Americans across this great country.

Let us make those sacrifices and contributions through spending cuts—not taxes. That will be a true act of patriotism for every Member here.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. KASICH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO].

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address an issue that seems to have completely or partially escaped notice by this body or by the press, therefore our constituents are also completely uninformed.

I am speaking, Mr. chairman, of the 12 years of missed opportunities by this body. Twelve years and millions of dollars worth of work to study, create, and propose methods to eliminate the Federal deficit and balance the budget. I have taken the liberty of bringing several samples to the floor today to illustrate my point.

I have here a book by Alice Rivlin, President Clinton's Deputy Director of the OMB. Written in 1984, this proposal, entitled "Economic Choices," has more meat to it than that proposed by Mr. Clinton.

I am now holding up a copy of a February 1981 CBO report entitled "Reducing the Federal Budget: Strategies and Examples, Fiscal Years 1982-86." This document stresses the reduction of Government spending including infrastructure projects, like highway programs. Let me read the preface to you:

> This report was written in response to a request by twelve members of the House Budget Committee—Robert N. Giaimo, Chairman of the Committee for the 96th Congress, James R. Jones, Chairman of the Committee for the 97th Congress, Barber B. Conable, Jr., Bill Frenzel, Richard A. Gephardt, Delbert L. Latta, Norman Y. Mineta, Bill Nelson, Leon E. Panetta, Ralph S. Regula, Paul Simon, and Timothy E. Wirth—for a report on the possible strategies that could lead to a reduction in the size of the federal budget.

The CBO Director at that time was Alice Rivlin.

And not unlike these books, I have book after book, recommendation after recommendation, all for obtaining the same objective, to eliminate the Federal deficit.

These reports including this 1985 "Compendium of GAO's Views on the Cost Savings Proposals of the Grace Commission."

For 12 years this body has denied the American people any real fiscal responsibility while, all the time it was right here. Right here under our noses volumes and volumes of ideas that would work. They are both Republican and Democrat. And for 12 years, while all of these proposals sat in unanswered waiting, while the years of uncontrolled spending continued. The fiscal dilemma of this Government is not the result of poor administrative policy, rather it is the result of 12 years of unbridled, arrogant, spending at the expense of the American middle class. The same middle class that President Clinton—the Democrat leaders—take more money from.

I would like to offer my support to the Republican counter proposal authored by my colleague, Mr. KASICH. I also want to point out my agreement with my distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], that the U.S. Government has absolutely no problem raising revenues. Federal revenues have nearly tripled in 10 years to $1.2 trillion.

There is no need to raise taxes. The only thing we need to do is reduce and control the spending of the Federal Government. I urge support of Mr. KASICH's plan. I also urge America and this body to read the fine print: The only failed economic policy the last 12 years is that Congress cannot control spending.

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

Let me just indicate, Mr. Chairman, that I have a note that suggests that earlier on limiting travel at the end of the year would save $300 million, which is a good suggestion, one of the problems, frankly, is that in relationship to how the minority budget is structured, 60 percent of that savings would come in DOD. And as I understand the minority proposal, you could only make 10 percent of the savings out of DOD.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, let me first thank Chairman SABO for yielding me this time and to congratulate him on a job very well done. This, of course, is his floor debut as chairman of our committee, and it has been handled very adroitly, and I appreciate the gentleman's leadership; and also to commend my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for also making his debut. And while the gentleman may not win his battle today, he has done his job admirably.

I could quarrel, and will slightly, with the gentleman from Ohio's offering. I think in function 400, according to Budget Committee data, there is a 60-percent cut in mass transit operating assistance in the gentleman's proposed budget and a 50-percent cut in mass transit capital assistance which for us in Louisville, KY, is quite devastating.

Also in function 450, which is community and regional development, the budget data suggest that community development block grants would be cut by $500 million, and the community development banks, which we are getting into at home, would be severely limited.

So I certainly support the offering of the gentleman from Minnesota, our chairman, and oppose that of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

I think it is important to note that there is in the committee bill $510 billion of Federal spending cuts by the year 1997. It reduces the Federal deficit by over $140 billion in that same period of time, and I think it is important to note that the budget numbers used are Congressional Budget Office numbers, which are less optimistic, more pessimistic, than some of the data which could have been used, which means that we have real numbers for a change. We can actually rely upon this data.

I am also told that there is in the near years a $1 to $1 spending cut to tax increase ratio in order to yield these budget savings, and in the out years the ratio is $1.5, actually slightly more, $1.5 of cuts to taxes.

So I think what we have here in the budget is an acknowledgment of what the American people have told us. They want spending cuts more so than they want tax increases, and that is embodied in this bill, $2 of every $3 raised, whether it is raised by cuts or in tax increases, goes toward deficit reduction.

All in all, this is a good investment package, this is a good savings package. Let us adopt the committee bill and oppose and defeat the Kasich amendment.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich budget and compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the members of his committee for their hard work. I disagree with some of the specifics, but unlike the Democrat alternative, it is specific.

What it demonstrates is that we can effectively attack the deficit without raising taxes, and, therefore, without hurting the economy.

If we adopt the Kasich budget, we will at least have an opportunity, a viable concept for deficit reduction and economic growth. We will later have plenty of chances to make specific changes in the authorization and appropriation bills.

One reason the Kasich budget is preferable to the committee budget is because it is infinitely more sensible in the way it cuts defense. Kasich demonstrates that defense can be cut. It cuts defense over 5 years by $76 billion. The committee/Clinton budget would slash defense by $127 billion over this same time. That would be irresponsible. Within a year or two we would have to reverse course.

Do not take my word for it. Listen to one of the most respected congressional experts on defense, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], chairman of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, who today is quoted in the Washington Times as saying that we can't get by for more than 1 year without either spending more money or having a hollow force. That phrase echoes ominously from the Carter administration.

Today, we heard testimony in the Armed Services Committee confirming that even now, we are seeing signs of the hollow-force problem. We are stretched so thin that even a relatively small and benign operation like our help in Somalia has left us unable to maintain Navy training tempo in the Pacific. Similarly, we are allowing some key Army divisions to go undermanned because the pace of the drawdown has caused dislocations. We just have to keep our fingers crossed that these divisions are not needed while they remain undermanned.

Cutting defense, Mr. Chairman, is a serious business. It must be done responsibly. The Democrat budget fails that test. The Kasich budget approaches the issue seriously and responsibly. It is another reason to support the Kasich budget.

Mr. Chairman, ending gridlock seems to mean something different in Washington than it does everywhere else in America.

When the American people talk about ending gridlock, they mean that Members of Congress and the President should put aside partisan differences and produce real solutions to the Nation's problems.

In Washington, ending gridlock means going along to get along. And, let's be clear that going along with the budget resolution before us today will get President Clinton and some Members of Congress the additional funds they need to pay for their favorite programs, but it will also get the American people higher taxes, bigger budget deficits, and a weaker economy.

President Bush negotiated a similarly bad deal in 1990, and I voted against it. Partisanship wasn't an excuse to support bad policy then, and it is not the reason to oppose the Clinton plan now. The reason to oppose the Clinton plan is that it is flawed and won't work.

Problem No. 1: It is weighted far too heavily toward tax increases. The Clinton budget calls for the largest tax increase in American history, including higher taxes on Social Security benefits and a new energy tax that violates the President's pledge not to raise taxes on the middle class. So much for tax fairness.

Problem No. 2: Defense and agriculture are about the only parts of the budget that would actually be cut, by nearly $40 billion, 14 per-

cent and $10 billion, 50 percent respectively. By 1997, defense will have been cut 37 percent since 1985 alone, and defense as a share of gross national product will amount to less than at any time since Pearl Harbor. Other spending will actually increase by about $350 billion, or nearly 24 percent, by fiscal year 1998 under the Clinton plan. So much for spending cuts.

In response to the Congressional Budget Office's criticism that the Clinton program falls more than $60 billion short of the originally claimed savings and receipts, the Budget Committee calls for $63 billion in unspecified miscellaneous spending cuts. So much for specifics.

Problem No. 3: The President's own Office of Management and Budget [OMB] projects that the deficit will fall by only $50 billion by 1998—from the Congressional Budget Office's estimated $291 billion in fiscal year 1994 to $241 billion in fiscal 1998—and then continue to rise thereafter. So much for deficit reduction.

Problem No. 4: The Clinton plan will cause the economy to falter just as it is beginning to recover. According to the National Center for Policy Analysis, the plan will lower capital formation in the United States by $1.8 trillion through 1998; and, as a result, economic growth is projected to be almost half a percentage point lower than it would otherwise be. That translates into 1.4 million fewer jobs created over the next 5 years.

Because the Clinton plan will cause slower growth, the average American family will find itself worse off. The National Center estimates that economic loss to equal more than $1,000 for every man, woman and child in the country.

Mr. Chairman, during the last several weeks, my office has been flooded with phone calls, postcards and letters urging Congress to cut spending first. We have an alternative that would do just that. The Kasich budget includes detailed spending cuts that would produce $429 billion in deficit reduction over 5 years without any tax increases. No one is going to like every spending cut proposed, but it represents the only option for real change and the only option that gets to the root cause of the deficit problem—excessive Government spending.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Clinton budget and support the Kasich alternative.

□ 1610

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I came here 12 years ago with Ronald Reagan, and I hope the American people have not forgotten the mess we had to clean up the last time the Democrats had control of both Houses of Congress and the Presidency. We had the highest interest rates and the highest inflation of any time in this century. We had a lower growth rate and a higher unemployment rate than we have right now.

It took a lot of time and effort for the Republicans to get spending under control and to reduce the increase in taxes that the American people were always facing.

Now, we have that same proposal again from the Democrats. Basically we have the Democrats in control of both Houses of Congress and the Presidency, and they are coming back with the same Carteresque proposals.

The reason the economy faltered 12 years ago, or 14 years ago under the Democrats was not because of Jimmy Carter's stupid smile, and it was not corrected because of Ronald Reagan's personality. It was because of the policies of low taxes and responsible spending policies that gave us the chance in the 1980's to expand.

President Bush gave in to the Democrats 2 years ago and agreed to a tax increase, a Democratic tax increase, which knocked the legs out from under our economy.

The Democrats are now using that as an excuse to even have further tax increases and further spending increases.

I say vote for the Kasich budget. Let us go back to the good old days of growth rather than the really bad old days of Jimmy Carter.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, what we are experiencing here today, make no mistake about it, is the fallacy of Reaganomics, the chickens coming home to roost 12 years later, the fallacy of the Reagan program that somehow you could cut taxes, increase spending, and never have to pay the piper.

Well, this is now the moment of truth. My friend, the previous speaker, just spoke about Reagan budget plans. May I remind him that under those two great conservative Presidents, Reagan and Bush, we have had more budget deficits than we have had in the previous 200-and-some-odd years of the United States of America. So when we talk about fiscal responsibility, let us put it where it is, and let us put the irresponsibility where it is as well.

We talk about balanced budgets. Twelve years of Reagan and Bush, not once did the President submit a balanced budget to the U.S. Congress. We talk about cuts, and we know that it is not true that you can get this budget deficit down solely by cutting programs.

Everyone wants somebody else's program to be cut. Everyone wants programs from the other region of the country to be cut. The fact of the matter is that we need to have a reasonable and balanced program, and that is why I rise in strong support of the Clinton budget proposal, House Concurrent Resolution 64, and in opposition to the Kasich substitute.

This is the first time since I have been in Congress that a President has offered a bold economic program for the country. Under House Concurrent Resolution 64, the deficit would be reduced by $510 billion over the next 5 years, and I commend the chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], and the Committee on the Budget for adding $63 billion in additional cuts to the President's plan.

We face serious economic problems today because we have spent the last dozen years avoiding the growing budget deficit.

I commend President Clinton for changing the debate on the Federal budget deficit from smoke and mirrors to a realistic approach to deficit reduction.

Many political groups from across the political spectrum are supporting the budget proposal issued by the President and the Committee on the Budget. Alan Greenspan, a Republican appointee, for one, says it is going in the right direction. The Wall Street Journal ran a front-page article which reported that three conservative University of Michigan economists predict a stronger economy and a shrinking Federal deficit if the President sticks to his plan. They forecast growth of 3.2 percent this year and 2.3 percent growth in 1994. Additionally, they predict a reduction of the Federal deficit to $275 billion in fiscal year 1993, and in fiscal year 1995, the deficit could fall below $175 billion, which is more than $50 billion below where it would be without the proposed changes today.

There are no quick fixes to our economic problems. It took us 12 years to crawl into this, and it will take us a long time to crawl out of it.

But the easy vote today in the short term, voting for the Clinton plan, is the easy vote in the long term, because making difficult decisions today will build a better future tomorrow.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, for our final speaker, I yield the remainder of our time, 2 minutes, to the distinguished gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to speak on behalf of the Democratic notion of fairness before the House today.

When our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that they want less Government, we need to listen very carefully and hear between their lines.

The American people gave the Republicans 12 years to demonstrate what their kind of leadership means.

The American people voted against them because their record of leadership is very clear.

Republican leadership resulted in the largest budget deficits in our country's history; negative growth in the income of average American families; a decline in child nutrition, health care, housing, and job training.

On the other side, however, Republican leadership also resulted in the enrichment of the military industrial complex and a startling increase in in-

come for those in the top 1 percent of family income groups in this country.

There were very clear winners and losers during the last 12 years of Republican helmsmanship.

It is very clear that Government served the needs of a few of us at the expense of the rest of us.

So the central issue that we must hear between their lines is not about big Government or little Government, but whom that Government is to serve.

Our Nation's budget is a political document that reflects our national priorities—and there are clear winners and losers. But it ought to, as well, be a moral document.

A document that says that we will care for our children; that we will train our youth; that we will prepare our young adults for life that is good and full and productive. And, also, that we will care for our seniors.

Most importantly, Government ought to say to every American child and adult that their talents are wanted and needed.

The budget is where the rubber meets the road. Do we care about diversity? Then we level the playing field so all can participate fully.

Do we care about our children and their education? Then we immunize our children, give them a head start, and teach them to yearn to learn, and then allow them to learn and earn.

Do we care about providing jobs and protecting our environment and just plain old setting a new moral tone in this Country?

We get no relief from the Kasich plan. By contrast, Mr. KASICH is up to the same old time-tested, vote-tested Republican tricks of the past—even cutting food aid for the poor, the WIC Program, legal aid, and community development block grants.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat the Kasich plan, because the Republicans just do not get it.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes, the balance of my time, to the Republican leader, the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich substitute, and I have to say at the very outset that I have been somewhat amused at the criticism being leveled by the big guns on the Democratic side of the aisle against the Kasich proposal, rather than touting their own budget that is supposed to reflect all this change in direction, mandated by the American people's vote for the Clinton administration.

Here you are with an 83-vote majority in this House, and you have to devote most of your time criticizing our plan rather than touting your own. Why are you so reluctant to talk about all of those goodies involved in your increased spending? Is it because, to be credible, you have to also talk about all the taxes necessary to fund this level of spending, and that real deficit reduction will have to wait for another day?

We acknowledge that we cannot play Santa Claus here today and have to face up to reality.

Cuts have to be made in a number of sensitive areas, or all of the rhetoric about reducing the size of government has a very hollow ring.

This is, indeed, a defining moment between the two parties, the Democratic Party's approach, and our Republican Party's approach.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and our budgeteers have shown clearly that significant, specific cuts, can be made and the deficit significantly reduced without raising taxes.

□ 1620

Now, some will say budgets are only political documents, so why bother with the specifics? But you cannot get to the whole without adding up the sum of the parts.

Mr. Chairman, we are proud of our work product, and that is why we offer it as a substitute. Admittedly, this debate on a budget resolution may only be about choosing which road we intend to follow to get us where we want to go through the balance of this year. The real work will be done in the trenches of our committees over the next few months by way of reconciliation and appropriations bills.

You on the Democratic side have the votes to beat us down today, but this is not the end of the fight; it is just the beginning.

We have a long, long way to go.

And every step of the way, we Republicans will be reminding the American people that the Democratic majority prefers to raise taxes on practically everyone and Republicans do not. Run away from that fact, if you can. Deny it, if it makes you feel better for a time. Pound the drums of class warfare loudly, if that sort of nonsense appeals to you. But, sooner or later, the American people are going to see through it all.

And to my fellow Republicans, in conclusion, I say: The President challenged us to come up with specific cuts. I do not believe he thought we could or would do it. But he underestimated our tenacity and our ability to do just that. Mr. KASICH and all my friends on our side on the Committee on the Budget, stalwart members of that Committee on the Budget, met that challenge brilliantly. We can do no less than support them wholeheartedly with our votes for the Kasich substitute here this afternoon.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget proposed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

He and his colleagues on the Budget Committee met President Clinton's challenge to come to the table with alternatives, and their efforts deserve recognition.

I regret that I cannot support the budget proposed by President Clinton. While the President does propose spending reductions, they are modest in comparison to the new taxes he would levy. It is this imbalance that makes it impossible for me to vote for the Clinton plan.

The Kasich plan, in comparison, attacks the deficit by reducing Federal spending.

Radio commentator Paul Harvey struck a chord in my area of Pennsylvania when he urged people to pass on three words of advice to their representative in Congress: "cut spending first."

The Kasich plan does just that. It actually makes the difficult choices we have been talking about for the past decade. I do not agree with each and every spending decision in the plan, but, on the whole, it is even-handed.

Beyond spending cuts, the Kasich plan calls for new user fees to offset the cost of some services, but it does not impose new taxes. While I am not unwilling to consider new taxes, the Btu tax proposed by the administration is unacceptable. The burden imposed by such a tax would fall disproportionately on energy producing States, such as Pennsylvania, and on retirees who are living on fixed incomes.

Finally, the Kasich plan calls for long overdue management reforms, such as performance-based budgeting, that will help to ensure that taxpayers dollars are not wasted through mismanagement.

I urge support for the Kasich alternatives.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Republican Budget Committee's alternative. The Democrats challenged the Republicans to develop an alternative proposal with specific spending cuts. Mr. Chairman, we on the Budget Committee rose to that challenge and developed a plan with real spending cuts, in fact, our plan calls for $429 billion in cuts over five years without new taxes and without touching Social Security benefits.

The Democrat's budget proposal calls for the largest tax increase in history, more government, more spending, and fewer jobs. Deficits are reduced by controlling spending, not by increasing taxes and domestic spending as President Clinton and my friends on the other side of the aisle would have you believe. The Republican plan is a real alternative, with no new taxes, less government, more jobs, and more take-home pay.

Since President Clinton announced his economic proposal on February 17, 1993, my office has been flooded with thousands of telephone calls, letters, and postcards from Americans who want to see Congress cut spending first before raising taxes. Mr. Chairman, the American people are tired of bearing the burden of tax increases to pay for wasteful government programs. It is time that Congress take a long hard look at government programs and learn to make sacrifices and budget cuts as the American public has done for years.

In response to our constituents, the Republican proposal will save the typical American family earning $34,000 in after-tax income from paying $488 more annually in Federal taxes. The Republican plans has no tax increases on energy or consumption and lets the 2.5 cents a gallon gasoline tax expire in

1995 as scheduled. Therefore, take-home pay is increased, not decreased for the average family.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are calling for change in Congress. President Clinton is asking the Federal bureaucracy to scale back 112,000 jobs and take about $33 billion in administrative savings. The Republican alternative cuts 162,000 jobs in the bureaucracy, cuts Government overhead $49 billion over 5 years, calls for a 15-percent cut in spending for both legislative and executive branches, and freezes COLA's for Representatives and Senators as well as other Federal workers.

In addition, the Republican plan calls for several commonsense reforms. One example is in regards to social programs. We suggest combining WIC and other food and nutrition programs into WIC-Plus and funding it through block grants to States. Twelve percent of the allocated block grant moneys must go to WIC, but States are given flexibility, the flexibility they need to allocate funds to the programs which show the greatest need. WIC-Plus should serve as a model of reform for other social service programs by combining programs which often overlap, thus best utilizing Government resources and eliminating needless waste.

In regards to national defense, the Republican Budget Committee proposal reduces defense by about $60 billion as opposed to the Democrat plan which reduces national defense by $122 billion over 5 years with no real plans for achieving these cuts. The Republican plan cuts foreign aid programs by more than $13 billion instead of the Democrat proposed cut of only $3.1 billion over 5 years. The Republican plan also provides for greater burdensharing on the part of our transatlantic allies.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican proposal is less costly to the elderly than the Democrats' proposal. Our plan on this side of the aisle would cut Medicare outlays by $73 billion by means testing a portion of Medicare for seniors with incomes over $100,000 which is only fair. On the other hand, the combined Medicare and Social Security tax increase suggested by the Democrats totals $85 billion over 5 years. The Democrat plan achieves most of their Medicare savings on higher part B premiums that impact seniors in all income brackets.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to share some of the reforms that the Republican Budget Committees' health care working group has suggested. As I have already pointed out, our plan calls for a reduction in Medicare outlays of $73 billion over 5 years and includes a policy to lower malpractice costs thus allowing reimbursement rates to be held constant for 1 year. We also call for coinsurance on home health care and clinical lab services for beneficiaries, increasing cost consciousness in the Medicare system. The health care working group would also like to implement many of the policy reforms suggested by the Republican leader's task force on health. These reforms call for comprehensive health care reform and adopting the Action Now Health Care Reform Act.

In closing, I would again like to point out that in this era of economic recovery, it is imperative that Congress cut spending first before raising taxes. The American people are tired, tired of wasteful government spending, tired of more taxes, and tired of being ignored. They have repeatedly asked for Congress to listen to their concerns and cut spending first. The Republicans have heard the people and our proposal cuts spending first. Mr. Chairman, I ask my friends on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting the Republican committee's budget alternative.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to express my opposition in the strongest terms to the proposal being offered today by Bill Clinton and the Democrat majority in Congress.

The budget proposal offered by the Democrats is a recipe for economic and fiscal disaster. It proposes to increase taxes at a time when Americans are already overtaxed. It proposes to increase taxes at a time when we have a fragile economy—higher taxes will only stifle job creation and economic growth. It proposes to continue the path of excessive government spending—excessive spending is the reason our Federal Government is currently saddled with a massive debt.

Depending on whose estimates you believe, Bill Clinton is proposing to raise taxes anywhere from $250 billion to $315 billion. No matter which figure you use, if his proposal becomes law, it will be the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation. Moreover, regardless of the exact figures, his proposal taxes everyone from the small business owner, to the Social Security recipient, to the working middle income American family. And we thought Mr. Clinton was only going to sock it to the rich.

It is an absolute outrage that a man who actually promised middle American taxpayers a tax cut during the campaign can now turn around and unblushingly propose to raise taxes in a magnitude of historic proportions. Mr. Clinton's assertion that the reason he must now raise taxes is because the deficit figure is higher than he anticipated during the campaign is, quite frankly, bull. In fact, last July during the campaign, Clinton predicted even higher deficits—up to $400 billion—than actually materialized. Moreover, Democrat Budget Committee members advising Clinton during the campaign, and working with their good friends at the Congressional Budget Office [CBO], certainly were well aware of what to expect in the way of deficit figures. Most conspicuous among those members is Leon Panetta, former chairman of the House Budget Committee and now Clinton's Director of Office of Management and Budget [OMB]. For Clinton to rationalize raising taxes based on claims of new deficit figures is the height of hypocrisy. This is just another example of Mr. Clinton trying to be slick.

More importantly, regardless of what the actual deficit figures are, it is excessive spending not insufficient tax revenues that has produced our gushing red ink. Indeed, when you combine Federal, State, and local taxes, you find that the American taxpayer is already being taxed at all-time record high levels. Analyzing the Federal budget over the past 12 years further drives home the point. In 1980 revenues to the Federal Treasury were $500 billion. By 1992, revenues had soared to $1.1 trillion—a massive $600 billion increase in 12 years. In other words, in 12 years the American taxpayer shouldered an additional Federal tax burden that was greater than the magnitude of the entire tax burden it took us over 200 years to reach.

One would think that the Federal Government could do just fine with $600 billion in new tax dollars each year, but alas it isn't enough to quench the insatiable thirst of Democrats in Congress. During that same timeframe, Federal expenditures rose from $600 billion to nearly $1.4 trillion—an increase of $800 billion. This simply illustrates the historical fact that for every new dollar the Treasury receives in taxes, Congress spends $1.60 more. Indeed, the 1990 budget deal which had promised spending cuts for every dollar in new taxes, instead resulted in Congress spending an additional $2.37 for every dollar in new taxes.

Republicans have been willing to make the hard choices and make the spending cuts. How many times in the past 12 years have I seen this Congress, on a party line vote, reject Republican amendments to trim as little as 1 percent from an appropriation bill. How many times have I seen the Democrat-controlled Rules Committee decide to prevent Republicans from offering amendments to cut spending and make economies.

Indeed, in that regard I was deeply disappointed that the Democrats did not allow my good friend from Indiana, Congressman DAN BURTON, to offer his budget freeze proposal. I have long been an advocate of an across the board spending freeze. Mr. BURTON's proposal would have made a bigger dent in the deficit than any of the proposals before us today. Moreover, in my view, Mr. BURTON's across-the-board freeze is the fairest way to spread the burden of spending cuts—everyone who benefits from Federal spending must tighten the belt. However, once again, in an abuse of their uninterrupted control of the House of Representatives for the past 40 years, the Democrats decided to gag the opposition rather than debate a viable alternative on its merits.

Republicans have proposed viable alternatives and the budget proposal offered by my good friend, JOHN KASICH, is the kind of proposal that the American public deserves. It proposes no tax increases and will cut the deficit significantly. I can only hope that there are Democrats in the House that can see the error of Mr. Clinton's ways and join Republicans in supporting the Kasich budget.

Mr. Chairman, Bill Clinton has broken his promise to the American people as he has broken so many other promises in his short tenure. Mr. Clinton does not understand one basic fact—Americans are not undertaxed—Congress is spending too much. In my view, Bill Clinton sold the American voter a bill of goods. I am afraid that this President, who received only 43 percent of the popular vote, and this Congress, do not understand the nature of the problem. As Bill Clinton should say "It's spending, stupid."

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kasich budget proposal. It is a bold plan and is clearly the best choice to reduce spending and the budget deficit.

The Republican plan is detailed and specific and best of all it reduces the deficit by $429

billion over 5 years without raising taxes, without touching Social Security, without slashing defense and without crippling the economy. The Republican plan is a plain commonsense approach of cutting spending by eliminating outdated programs and reforming or reducing many others.

The Republican proposal reforms Medicaid, public housing, foreign aid programs, the medical malpractice system, and child nutrition programs. The plan also reduces funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Arts and Humanities, the Bureau of the Census, and reduces mass transit operating subsidies. The Republican package eliminates unnecessary Government agencies like the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Travel and Tourism Administration. Further, the plan cancels the advanced solid rocket motor, halts acquisitions of crude oil for the SPR, and imposes a 5-year moratorium on all Federal land purchases. Finally, the plan includes deep cuts in Federal overhead, personnel and travel costs. The plan is good policy and deserves our vigorous support.

I am opposed to the Democratic budget resolution. It is as my Republican colleagues on the House Budget Committee said, a "formula for failure" because it resorts to tax increases to reduce the deficit. The Sabo substitute relies heavily on President Clinton's spending priorities and assumes his proposals for tax increases. While the budget resolution does not enact or fund any of the President's proposals, it sets the aggregate numbers to guide the decisions that will be made in the months ahead.

The Democratic package includes $316 billion in tax increases, one of the largest tax increases in history; $186 billion in Government spending increases on favored domestic programs, $112 billion in undefined defense cuts, $156 billion in nondefense cuts, for a total of $362 billion in deficit reduction.

I object to the new taxes not only because I am convinced that Congress will spend the tax revenue, but because raising taxes by $316 billion I fear will stifle the weak economic recovery. Employers who will be hit with higher taxes under Clinton's plan will have to cut costs and that probably means laying off employees—making the 7.1 percent unemployment rate even worse. Fewer workers mean fewer people paying taxes and Government spending more scarce tax dollars on unemployment benefits. Also taking money out of the pockets of consumers in the form of higher income and energy taxes will mean they have less to spend and invest. That will have an adverse effect on economic growth.

While the economy has been sluggish for the past 18 months, there are positive signs of economic recovery. The last thing we need are policies that raise taxes and increase Government regulation and spending. Economic growth is promoted by reducing Federal controls on private sector production, income and wealth creation, not by higher taxes. President Clinton's plan will hamper job creation and economic expansion by increasing the tax burden on all income groups and raising deficit spending on additional Government programs.

Finally, after conclusion of debate on the budget resolution, the House will take up the stimulus package. I believe we should not spend the $16.3 billion on the short-term economic stimulus package. This spending is largely in the form of Government make-work jobs that in the short run will drive up the deficit, and in the long run will not create lasting jobs. We would be better off to reduce the Federal deficit by an additional $16.3 billion.

The President is suppose to be looking for ways to reduce the deficit—estimated to be $327 billion—and instead has found a way to add over $16 billion in new deficit spending. Such spending is unnecessary and expensive and will result in very few jobs. There are roughly 13 programs in this bill that do not create any jobs and there are another 16 programs that create jobs at a cost of $200,000 or more per job. Obviously, jobs are not the main purpose of this spending program. The OMB Director, Leon Panetta, claims the bill will create 219,000 jobs. At $16.3 billion in total spending, each new job will cost $89,041 per job. As the Republican members of the Appropriation Committee pointed out, the private sector created 219,000 jobs in 17 days in February, when the economy generated an estimated 345,000 jobs in 1 month and at no cost to the Federal Government.

The so-called stimulus package is loaded with pork and includes many non-emergency spending programs all of which will be added to the deficit. Some examples of non-emergency spending include $148 million for IRS tax system modernization, $100 million for a variety of energy conservation programs and activities, $28 million for the District of Columbia to reduce its debt, $800,000 to begin preparing for whitewater canoeing at the 1996 Olympics, $560,000 for air circuit breakers and rest room repairs, and $19.8 million for an overseas vaccination program for children.

I am opposed to excessive spending at a time when our first priority should be reducing the budget deficit.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich substitute amendment to the fiscal year 1994 budget resolution because it attacks our Nation's budget deficit at the heart of the problem—that is reducing Government spending rather than raising taxes and revenues.

Before discussing the specific details of the various budget proposals before us today, it is important to keep in mind that the budget resolution is a nonbinding document that is not even signed into law by the President. It simply sets spending and revenue targets for the Appropriations, authorizing, and Ways and Means, and Finance Committees of the House and Senate. None of the assumptions of any of these amendments is binding on the House or Senate. In fact, regardless of what happens with these resolutions today, the real work of the House and Senate to reduce the Federal budget deficit is just beginning and will require many long debates and difficult votes in the weeks ahead.

Also it is important to remember that no member will completely agree with every assumption or recommendation made in any of these budget proposals. In making my decision on which amendments to support, I look at the basic tenants and philosophies each uses to achieve our overall goal of reducing the Federal budget deficit. In the case of the Kasich amendment, the substitute budget offered by the Republican members of the Budget Committee, I support the goal of reducing the deficit strictly through cutting spending without raising revenues.

For far too long, every revenue increase approved by Congress with the intent of reducing the budget deficit has actually increased Federal spending and consequently added to the deficit. This tax-and-spend philosophy is what helped drive our Nation into debt and for which we are now paying almost $300 billion per year in interest on the accumulated national debt. This interest payment has accounted for more than 75 percent of the increase in our national debt over the past 12 years.

In comparing the budget resolution reported by the committee to the Kasich amendment, there are a number of glaring differences. The committee recommends $316 billion in tax increases over the next 5 years, which the Congressional Budget Office estimates will cost families with after-tax incomes of $34,000 an additional $500 a year more in Federal taxes.

The Kasich amendment calls for no new income, gasoline, or energy taxes and it does not accept the recommendation by President Clinton to increase the tax rate on Social Security benefits.

Through spending reductions alone, the Kasich amendment would reduce the 1994 budget deficit by $38 billion—more than twice the reduction recommended by President Clinton—and would provide for $430 billion in deficit reduction over the next 5 years—$70 billion more than the proposal by President Clinton.

The two budget resolutions also differ greatly on how to reduce Federal spending. The package recommended by President Clinton calls for $156 billion in nondefense budget cuts versus $370 billion in nondefense budget cuts in the Kasich budget over the next 5 years. President Clinton recommends $112 billion in defense cuts over the same time period, double the amount recommended in the more responsible Kasich budget.

The budget alternatives before us also take extremely different approaches to reducing U.S. foreign aid payments with the Kasich amendment recommending $13 billion in cuts over the next 5 years, versus the $7 billion recommended by President Clinton. Specifically, I strongly support two major cuts in foreign aid included in the Kasich amendment. The first would save $1 billion over 5 years by withholding any future U.S. contributions to the World Bank and other multilateral development banks which, as I have called attention to for many years, have a history of making questionable and unsound loans to foreign nations—often times our adversaries—which will never be repaid. The second recommendation is that the United States also withhold any future contributions to the International Development Association, or IDA, over the next 5 years, resulting in savings of more than $5.5 billion. IDA is the World Bank affiliate which makes low-interest loans to the poorest of nations, many which have the world's worst domestic policies and human rights records.

Domestically, the Kasich amendment recommends that the Federal Government set an example for reducing spending by saving $100 billion over the next 5 years through reduced Federal bureaucracy and overhead expenses. It would reduce Federal employment by

162,000 civilian positions over the next 5 years, 50,000 more than recommended by President Clinton. It also reduces the budget for the operations of the legislative branch by more than 15 percent, a figure which I believe could be increased to 25 percent or more.

Finally, the Kasich amendment has less of an impact on older Americans than President Clinton's proposal. The Kasich amendment recommends no increased taxes on Social Security benefits, as included in the President's plan. It also does not increase Medicare part B premiums for all older Americans, as recommended by the chairman of the Budget Committee. Instead it would initiate a means-testing program for Medicare, which would raise Medicare premiums and deductibles for older Americans with incomes over $100,000. In the past I have opposed means-testing of the Medicare Program and I believe that this recommendation should be the focus of lengthy congressional hearings before it is brought before the House in any legislation to implement the recommendations approved today.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have spoken out and demanded that Congress work to ensure that the Federal Government learns to live within its means. Many of the people from Pinellas County I represent have applauded President Clinton for putting forth a plan to reduce the budget deficit, but even more have said that although this is a good first step, Congress should go further in reducing spending. The Kasich amendment does just that by significantly reducing spending without raising taxes.

Following consideration of the Kasich amendment, we will consider a second proposal which provides for even greater deficit reduction. The so called Solomon amendment takes the Kasich budget cuts and reduces spending over the next 5 years by another $38 billion.

The Solomon amendment provides for no increase in taxes on the middle-class families, no energy taxes, and no increase in the taxes paid on Social Security benefits. It does provide for a surtax on quarter-millionaires, a new 36-percent tax rate for joint filers with incomes over $200,000, and it eliminates the deductibility of compensation over $1 million for business executives, athletes, and entertainers.

This new revenue is used to pay for the extension of some very important tax incentives that help spur business investment and job creation. These include the permanent extension of the research and development tax credit, the targeted jobs tax credit, and the restoration of the deductibility of losses from passive real estate provisions. The Solomon amendment also provides for a capital gains tax deduction for start-up companies and repels the luxury tax on boats—a tax which has shut down many of our state's and our Nation's few remaining boat builders.

Finally, the Solomon amendment would require the committees with appropriate jurisdiction to report to the House later this year legislation to provide the President with line-item veto authority over appropriations and authorizing bills and a constitutional amendment providing for a balanced budget amendment.

While I support the Kasich amendment, should it fail I will support the Solomon amendment. Although it includes revenue increases, there are half as many as recommended by President Clinton, and there are $38 billion more in spending cuts than the committee bill over the next 5 years.

And as I said before, while I do not agree with every provision of the Solomon amendment, such as the significant cut in space station funding and the consolidation of our Nation's intelligence gathering operations, I believe it serves its purpose in providing a framework for debate which relies much more on spending cuts than the President's budget.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I want to express my serious concerns about the procedure under which we consider these budget resolutions today. We are being asked to vote on a budget resolution which is based upon a package which President Clinton will not formally submit to Congress for another 2½ weeks. We are also being asked to vote on a budget resolution today which if implemented would require significant sacrifices by the American people to reduce the Federal budget deficit. Yet, later this evening, we will be asked to consider, without the benefit of amendment, a supplemental appropriations bill that will add $30 billion to the budget deficit for the current year.

In the 6 months we have until the new fiscal year begins, we must dedicate ourselves to making the tough decisions required to reduce spending and get our fiscal house in order. Gimmicks and rhetoric will not do the job. It will require long hours of genuine debate and a series of difficult votes to enable our Nation to reestablish its budgetary priorities. This is the job the American people have sent us here to do and a responsibility they demand we fulfill.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, during last year's Presidential campaign, candidate Bill Clinton pledged to offer middle-class families $60 billion in tax cuts over 4 years.

However, after the election, President-elect Clinton decided to teach the middle class a lesson in gullibility.

The President has proposed an estimated $328 billion in tax increases over 5 years. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the typical family with an after-tax income of $34,000 will contribute 500 additional dollars a year as their patriotic share of that $328 billion tax increase.

Last month President Clinton defended his broken tax promise to the middle class by stating that the deficit had increased far beyond his earlier estimates.

However, Mr. Clinton was fully aware in July 1992 of more accurate deficit projections.

On July 6, candidate Bill Clinton told Business Week magazine that deficit projections had increased beyond the earlier $250 billion to $400 billion.

In reality, the deficit projected today, $360 billion, is nearly $40 billion less than Mr. Clinton had projected in July.

So I ask, why the radical change in your plans, Mr. President?

I feel that the President's tax-based approach to reducing the deficit is misguided. We have a deficit because of a number of reasons: for example, excessive regulation and paperwork that requires thousands of unnecessary Government officials; billions of dollars of congressional pork projects; and a dominant philosophy in Congress that expensive programs can solve all of our Nation's ills. The only truly effective way for the Federal deficit to be reduced is to put the Government spending machine in reverse. I do not see how taking more money away from Americans is going to make our country a better place.

The President claims that 70 percent of his tax increases will be paid by Americans earning more than $100,000 a year. What the President neglects to mention is that the $100,000 is not based on taxable or adjusted gross income. The $100,000 is in family economic income which includes employer pension contributions and the potential rental cost of a home.

In my district in Connecticut, where the cost of living is higher and homes are worth more, nearly every suburban family will be considered rich under this plan. In fact, according to the independent, nonpartisan Tax Foundation, the residents of the State of Connecticut will suffer more from the Clinton budget than any other State.

Yet the President describes his plan as a deficit reduction plan to gain popular support for his tax increase. Historically, however, tax increases have led to spending increases, not to some new-found responsible management of our Government. The Clinton budget contains no provision to prevent higher tax revenues from being used for more spending. With new tax revenues coming in next year, there will be new apparent opportunities to spend. Do you get the message? Tax and spend.

It's the same old song with a different meaning since Jimmy Carter has been gone.

I support the Kasich plan which offers detailed budget cuts in a credible deficit reduction plan without tax increases.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Mr. KASICH's budget substitute. I do so, even though I do not agree with every specific line item.

First, please let me say that Mr. KASICH, the Republican ranking member on the Budget Committee, has done a great job putting his proposal together. I commend him and his staff for their excellent work.

As we all know, a budget resolution is only a blueprint. It is a map that guides us to our final goal. Before us today we have two competing blueprints. The Kasich plan, which I will from now on refer to as the Republican alternative, and the plan put forth by the President and supported by the Democratic leadership.

Each plan is specific in its own way, however, the Republican alternative is more detailed. Despite these specifics, I believe that the overall blueprint is most important. This is true, since the budget recommendations we pass today still have to go through the authorization and appropriation process. At any time during this procedure, the budget can be altered.

Let me first say that I agree with President Clinton that we need to cut the budget deficit and stimulate economic growth. Despite this mutual goal, however, we disagree on the appropriate solution. While the President advocates higher taxes and increased spending, I believe, as the Kasich plan proved, that the deficit can be cut by reducing spending, not by raising taxes.

This debate and vote today is just the beginning. Throughout the next several months, as we discuss the fiscal future of this great country, I will continue to monitor and fight for the hard working taxpayers of the Third Congressional District of New Jersey. I believe that my constituents deserve more and better jobs, lower taxes, and less government interference. If afforded, they will be able to create a better life for themselves and their families.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich plan because it implements the concept that "the proper solution to spiraling deficits is controlling Federal spending." This plan reduces the Federal deficit by $38 billion in fiscal year 1994 and nearly $430 billion over 5 years without tax increases and without touching Social Security.

During January and February of this year, I conducted 17 town hall meetings throughout my western North Carolina district as well as sending a survey in order to listen to the people's opinions on the issues facing this House. I recently received the results of this survey; over 15,000 responses came back to my office, and they were overwhelmingly opposed to higher taxes, demanding that Congress cut spending first. This, too, was the overwhelming sentiment expressed by the hundreds and hundreds of people who attended our town meetings—as well as the thousands of calls, letters, and postcards I have received in the past 2 months.

The people are speaking and it is our duty to represent their views. Because the Kasich plan does not increase taxes, it is an honest effort at deficit reduction and spreads the pain fairly across all areas. The Kasich plan makes government sacrifice—even the Congress—without increasing taxes on the American people to fund more spending, and without touching Social Security.

We simply cannot use budget gimmickry to paper over this crisis. Yet, for over 20 years, we have had so-called deficit-cutting programs that raise taxes and put off spending cuts until the future—the 1990 budget agreement is a prime example of this. Unfortunately, the future never comes. In the last decade, Congress has increased spending $1.59 for every dollar in increased taxes.

We cannot ask the American people to sacrifice before making the government sacrifice itself. Major American corporations—from IBM to General Motors to Sears & Roebuck—have responded to changes in the marketplace by cutting expenses and becoming more efficient. Before Congress even contemplates raising the American people's taxes it should be obligated to cut the fat from its own budget and make meaningful sacrifice itself. Given its recent history of pay raises, perks, and House bank scandals, Congress needs to adopt a plan to restore its credibility in order to gain the public's support for the tough spending decisions it faces in other parts of the Federal budget. The Kasich plan would save approximately $48 billion over 5 years by reducing the Federal bureaucracy and restraining the growth of Federal pay and perks. In addition, the Kasich proposal cuts civilian Federal bureaucracy by 162,000 and freezes the COLA for all Federal employees, including Members of Congress.

This plan calls for: First, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution; second, fixed deficit targets; third, enhanced rescission authority for the President; fourth, a seven-point test to help eliminate pork barrel projects; and fifth, allowing taxpayers to check off up to 10 percent of their Federal tax liability to reduce the deficit by contributing to a public debt reduction fund.

In addition to supporting the Kasich proposal, I have proposed a plan to cut legislative branch spending by 25 percent—matching the President's efforts to cut White House staff by an equal amount. My recommendation would cut $567 million in Congress' $2.2 billion budget in its first year and save over $2 billion of the taxpayers' money over 4 years. I plan to offer these cuts as amendments when the Legislative Branch Subcommittee begins to mark up the budget for congressional offices, committees, and support staff.

I urge my colleague to support the Kasich proposal; it achieves meaningful deficit reduction without any tax increases or cuts in Social Security.

The CHAIRMAN. 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 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 135, noes 295, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

AYES—135

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Condit
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodling
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hastert
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Livingston
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ridge
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—295

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burton
Byrne
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rogers
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman

Torres	Vento	Williams
Torricelli	Visclosky	Wilson
Towns	Volkmer	Wise
Traficant	Vucanovich	Wolf
Tucker	Waters	Woolsey
Underwood (GU)	Watt	Wyden
Unsoeld	Waxman	Wynn
Valentine	Wheat	Yates
Velazquez	Whitten	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—5

Faleomavaega (AS)	Ford (TN)	Quillen
	Henry	Washington

□ 1644

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Quillen for, with Mr. Washington against.

Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. MINETA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 103-37.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SOLOMON: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994.

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990).

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, and October 1, 1997:

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

Fiscal year 1994: $888,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $952,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,005,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,046,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,096,600,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $10,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $18,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $26,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $27,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $27,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $93,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $104,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $111,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $116,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $122,500,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $1,177,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,217,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,263,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,331,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,408,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $1,180,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,208,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,243,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,295,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,369,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $234,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $186,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $157,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $162,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $180,900,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $4,700,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $5,041,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $5,372,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $5,720,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $6,092,900,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, and October 1, 1997, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1994 through 1998 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $262,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,130,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $260,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,390,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $258,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,170,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $262,650,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $266,350,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $270,890,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,880,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $16,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $14,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $15,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $15,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,250,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $15,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,770,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $15,180,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,590,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $15,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,680,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,130,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $4,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $4,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $2,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,900,000,000
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $3,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $20,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $21,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $21,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $21,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $22,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,800,500,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $14,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,960,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $12,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $10,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,280,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $12,340,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,630,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $12,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,010,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $21,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,140,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $18,190,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,180,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $920,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $9,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$11,820,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$7,950,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $38,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,940,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $38,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,780,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $35,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,440,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $41,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,940,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $42,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,360,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $7,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,580,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $7,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,930,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $6,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,280,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $7,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $7,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,420,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $51,170,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,340,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $51,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,210,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $45,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,660,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $52,890,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,840,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $54,390,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,750,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $118,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $129,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $128,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $142,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $156,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $155,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $172,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $171,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $147,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $163,480,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $158,480,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $176,980,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $176,980,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $199,180,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $197,380,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $220,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $219,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $206,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $206,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $211,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $212,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $214,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $215,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $,0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $232,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $223,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $236,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $231,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $323,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $321,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $339,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $338,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $354,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $354,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $372,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $371,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $390,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $388,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $35,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $37,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $37,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $37,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $15,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $16,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $17,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $13,170,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,280,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $13,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,470,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,960,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,960,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $14,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,260,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,550,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $208,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $208,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $222,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $222,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $234,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $234,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $245,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $245,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $256,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $256,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, −$16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$21,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$35,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$28,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−31,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$28,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−30,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$24,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−26,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, −$40,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$40,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,030,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$42,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$42,730,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$43,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$43,430,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$44,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$44,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than May 1, 1993, the House committees named in subsections (b) through (r) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $3,069,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $3,512,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $2,944,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $3,010,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and $2,993,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(b) The House Committee on Armed Services shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $2,010,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $1,600,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $50,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year

1997, and $80,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(c) The House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $429,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $545,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $711,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $703,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and $778,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(d) The House Committee on the District of Columbia shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(e) The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit as follows: $3,215,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $3,265,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $2,725,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $2,785,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $2,745,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(f) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $9,813,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $18,779,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $22,777,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $25,613,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and $28,099,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(g) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(h) The House Committee on Government Operations shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(i) The House Committee on House Administration shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(j) The House Committee on Judiciary shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $12,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $45,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $108,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $186,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and $254,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(k) The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $67,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $68,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and $70,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(l) The House Committee on Natural Resources shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $160,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $170,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $189,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $190,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and $190,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(m) The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $419,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $666,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $4,847,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $6,140,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and $6,506,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(n) The House Committee on Public Works and Transportation shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $18,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $31,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $94,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $108,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and $115,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(o) The House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(p) The House Committee on Small Business shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and $0 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(q) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $478,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $602,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $641,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $668,400,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and $1,438,100,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(r)(1) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce outlays, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: $8,875,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1994, $17,875,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1995, $25,196,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $33,234,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, and $42,688,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998.

(2) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues as follows: $23,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $22,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $26,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $27,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $27,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(3) In addition to the instructions in paragraphs (1) and (2), the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit as follows: $0 in fiscal year 1994, $0 in fiscal year 1995, $0 in fiscal year 1996, $0 in fiscal year 1997, and $0 in fiscal year 1998.

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TAX REVENUES AND DEFICIT REDUCTION.

It is the Sense of Congress that any legislation enacting tax increases called for in this Budget Resolution contain language providing that the next revenues generated by the legislation shall not be counted for the purpose of calculating the amount of any deficit increase called for in Section 252(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 as amended by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

SEC. 6. SPECIAL PROCEDURES.

Pursuant to section 301(b)(4) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, the appropriate committees of the Congress are hereby instructed to report to their respective Houses, not later than May 1, 1993, for the purposes of implementing and enforcing the reductions in spending and deficits as provided for by this resolution, and to be effective for the fiscal years covered by this resolution, the following:

(a) a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget;

(b) legislation giving the President enhanced rescission, line-item veto authority subject to disapproval only by the enactment of a joint resolution of the Congress; and

(c) legislation establishing Maximum Deficit Amounts identical to those contained in this resolution and procedures for triggering sequestration when actual deficits exceed such amounts.

SEC. 7. TAXPAYER DEBT BUY-DOWN.

In order to reduce the deficit in fiscal years 1994 through 1998 by avoiding the debt service cost that attend the public debt by retiring portions of that debt and further reducing the deficit by providing the public with an opportunity to get dollar-for-dollar deficit reduction for each dollar contributed to debt retirement—

(1) the Committee on Ways and Means shall submit recommendations by August 1, 1993, to the House of Representatives—

(A) proposing changes in law to allow taxpayers to designate up to 10% of their income tax liability to reduce the public debt; and

(B) establishing a public debt reduction trust fund in the Treasury of the United States to receive those designated funds to buy back the public debt; and

(2) the Committee on Government Operations shall submit recommendations by August 1, 1993, to the House of Representatives proposing changes in law—

(A) providing automatic annual sequestrations (except social security, interest on the public debt, and deposit insurance) equal to the estimated aggregate amount of money deposited in the public debt reduction trust fund; and

(B) providing Congress with the authority to propose reductions in spending to avoid any across-the-board annual sequestration referred to in subparagraph (A).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

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

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, fellow Americans, this is the showdown right now.

I voted for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] like a great many of my colleagues did over here, and I was proud to do so. But now that the Kasich budget is no longer an option to this body, my colleagues should know that this is the very last chance that Democrats and Republicans will have to strip the Clinton proposal.

□ 1650

As I said before, I was proud to vote for the Kasich budget. I am sorry it did not pass. But now that it is no longer an option, this is the very last chance that Democrats on that side and Republicans on this side will have to strip the Clinton proposal of two of the most onerous and unfair taxes that this body could possibly levy on middle-class taxpayers and senior citizens, and that, Mr. Chairman, is the Btu energy tax that will drastically reduce the cost of food and gasoline and home heating fuel and every single piece of manufactured goods in America on our constituents. And it will strip out the Clinton Social Security tax increase that almost doubles the Social Security tax on retired American citizens. You do not want to do that.

Mr. Chairman, why is this the last chance? Because if my amendment is defeated on this floor now, your vote against my amendment guarantees that this unfair energy tax and the unfair Social Security tax will become law, and your vote did it.

Mr. Chairman, if Members want to vote for this Solomon consensus, let me tell what it does.

First of all, this Solomon consensus will not raise taxes one dime. It cuts taxes. The Clinton budget calls for $366 billion in new taxes, and we in the Solomon consensus cut taxes by $222 billion, $222 billion by eliminating the increase in the energy tax, by eliminating the Social Security tax, by eliminating the corporate income tax. And we cut President Clinton's tax increase further by changing his new tax bracket from $140,000 up to $200,000 of adjusted gross income before it kicks in. That is a tax cut, not a tax increase.

Mr. Chairman, to stimulate the economy we provide for vital tax incentives. We cut taxes further, not raise them; by extending expiring business tax incentives; by restoring real estate passive loss, that almost bankrupted the real estate industry in this country 6 years ago; by providing capital gains tax deductions for startup companies which is badly needed; and by repealing the luxury tax on boats that most Members on that side of the aisle have sponsored, and just about everybody on this side of the aisle has sponsored. Here is your chance to vote for it, including the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], my good friend.

Mr. Chairman, that cuts $222 billion out of the Clinton tax increases, leaving only this, Mr. Chairman, and I do not address this, but it leaves in the Clinton budget a surtax on millionaires. It leaves some miscellaneous taxes to plug business expense loopholes and it leaves a limit on deductions for executive pay over $1 million.

If there is anything that could be construed as an income tax increase in this substitute here, it is this: we expand that limit of $1 million on executive pay to include movie stars and professional athletes who make 200 times what the average assembly line worker makes at GE in my district or General Motors in your district. Two hundred times.

Mr. Chairman, if Members vote for the Solomon amendment, they remove the middle-class tax increase and put fairness back into the U.S. Tax Code.

Besides fairness, Mr. Chairman, the most important other issue in this budget and facing this Congress and this Nation is reducing the unconscionable deficit that is drowning this Nation in a sea of red ink. Unfortunately, the Clinton budget, even after raising taxes by $336 billion, does little or nothing to reduce spending or to reduce that deficit. Over 5 years President Clinton's budget only cuts spending $219 billion, with practically no cuts in the first 2 years and no procedures to guarantee that we get any cuts in the last 3 years. Members know we will not, without Gramm-Rudman restrictions in there.

Mr. Chairman, here is the real difference between the two bills: The Solomon plan more than doubles the Clinton cuts, cutting $265 billion more than Clinton, and it guarantees those cuts by requiring sequestration procedures that trigger across-the-board cuts if this Congress exceeds these budget limits. These cuts, totaling more than $485 billion, guarantee that we will reduce the deficit by a whopping $620 billion. That is $150 billion more than President Clinton and the Democrat budget over there.

Mr. Chairman, that is real deficit reduction, and it is real tax fairness. Speaking of fairness, remember, as I said in the beginning, this is your absolute last chance to remove the unjust energy tax and the grossly unjust Social Security tax off the backs of the American people who can least afford it.

Mr. Chairman, Members should not let their vote—and I am talking about Democrat Members over there, and their votes over here, Republicans—be the one that saddles these taxes on the American people. If they do they ought to be ashamed of themselves. Members should support this substitute because their constituents will thank them for doing it.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to stand and firmly say I rise in opposition to the Solomon amendment. First of all, I want to compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], which I do not do too often. But I want to say to him I think it is an intellectually honest budget in which he admits there had to be some tax increases, and he really does raise taxes to $150 billion over 5 years. I salute that honesty that is out there.

But the gentleman said make sure you know what your vote is doing.

Mr. Chairman, I know what my vote is doing, and I am going to vote "no" with my vote. But let me tell you why: because I think this amendment kills the seed corn we desperately need in the 1990's to reinvest in this economy to make it go and to get back into the global marketplace.

First of all, I am sorry to see the Solomon amendment on the floor on the day we had CEO's from Fortune 500 companies here having a press conference and having a luncheon with Members of Congress, and pleading with them to focus on America's children, immunizations, Head Start, the feeding program, seeing those as investments in America's future work force.

Mr. Chairman, if you vote for the Solomon amendment, you are ignoring those CEO's. It is wonderful to see CEO's here talking about children, talking about the future, and seeing that as our seed corn and something we need to focus on.

Second, it takes out all the conversion money and all the investment strategies for the future. When it comes to conversion, and I could not mean this more seriously, we are in an adapt or die mode. I think if we do not find a way to do this conversion and to use so much of the technology that we invested in for the military, and that is the majority of what we invested in, we invested for the military, if we do not find a way to apply that in the civilian sector so we can retain a strong technology base, we really are going to harm ourselves vis-a-vis national security.

□ 1700

I think the President of the United States has reached a very important balance on this issue that we all must take very seriously. He has focused on basic research and applied research in these new technologies, talking about information highways, talking about how we throw this stuff over the fence and get it into the civilian sector.

He has talked about energy conservation programs. I am sorry, but we will not get serious about it until we start taxing on it. We have seen that over and over again. And until we work on it, it is not going to happen.

There is all sorts of environmental protection and restoration that this will cut out of his budget that, I think, is terribly important, if we are going to get on, first, with the conversion but, second, also manufacturing things that the world needs.

So this Solomon amendment does a very good job in recognizing the need for cuts. It does a good job in recognizing the need for revenues. He has had the guts to raise taxes. But the thing that I feel very bad about is that he left out the seed corn, and the seed corn are kids, and the Kasich amendment did this, too.

Over and over again, we love children to death till we get them to the budget door, and then we drop them like a hot potato.

Things the President has in this budget are things that this country promised to do 35 years ago. It also leaves out the investment and conversion strategies, and it seems to me that for the average American taxpayer, who invested so heavily in this defense research in the 1980's, it is very important that we make sure this now get out and we do everything we can to make this work.

I would hope that Members would vote against the Solomon amendment, even though, as I say, there are some things in there that he has tried very hard to do, and they should vote against it because we not only need to just look at today, we must look at tomorrow.

Tomorrow is about conversion, investments, the global economy we are in, dealing with the environment, dealing with energy research, all those things we put on hold for over 10 years. If we do not get them back, I worry we will not be players in the 21st century. So the piece that gets us the potential to be a player in the 21st century is missing from the Solomon amendment. Therefore, I will vote "no."

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman mentioning children. I have five children and two grandchildren. One of the things we do that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] will be speaking about in 1 minute is restore the home equity provision, which is going to allow a lot more children to go to college.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

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

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me because, in response to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado, I want everyone to know that from 1994 through 1998, under our proposal, there is a $266 billion increase in revenues through growth. So we have got $266 billion that we are free to reallocate in this program, however we want. We just use the additional tax revenue for deficit reduction.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Solomon substitute. The principles behind this budget are tax fairness for this generation of taxpayers and even greater deficit reduction for the benefit of our next generation.

Mr. Chairman, I received a letter this week from an 80-year-old widow.

Mr. UPTON: I have recently been made aware of the increase in energy taxes that President Clinton has proposed. As a widow, 80 years of age, I am doing the best I can to live on my meager income. I urge you to vote against the energy taxes that the President is proposing.

You, more than most, are aware that Michigan, in particular, is already hard hit by unemployment and welfare without the additional charges that these energy taxes would bring.

During the hard Michigan winter, I try to tighten my belt so I can afford to heat my home—please, I urge you to propose tightening the administration's belt, too.

We had folks like this widow and her granddaughter, who typed it, in mind when we crafted this budget. And unlike the Clinton budget, we do not ask the overburdened middle class to pay more. And we do not ask anyone to pay more in taxes until we cut spending first.

Let me reiterate that, cut spending first. We cut spending in the first year, Mr. Chairman, by $42 billion, this compared to the Clinton budget of $6 billion. And then in the second year, we cut spending by $71.3 billion, as compared to only $10.8 billion in the Clinton budget.

That means that totally, we cut spending $113 billion in the first 2 years of the operation of this budget versus only $17 billion by the Clinton budget.

We ask only that the people who can afford to pay more in taxes, in fact, pay more. But we ensure that this new revenue will not go to new spending but instead to reduce the deficit. We enforce that promise with specific cut suggestions and a line-item veto, a balanced-budget amendment and automatic sequestration enforcement.

By combining the best of the rest, the spending package of the Kasich committee on the budget, along with $38 billion in additional cuts of our own and less than half of the President's tax increases, we reduce the deficit by $170 billion more than the other package.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a copy of the letter to which I referred:

MARCH 8, 1993.

FRED UPTON,
House of Representatives
Washington, DC.

MR. UPTON: I have recently been made aware of the increase in energy taxes that President Clinton has proposed. As a widow, 80 years of age, I am doing the best I can to

live on my meager income. I urge you to vote against the energy taxes that the President is proposing.

You, more than most, are aware that Michigan, in particular, is already hard hit by unemployment and welfare without the additional charges that these energy taxes would bring.

During the hard Michigan winter, I try to tighten my belt so I can afford to heat my home—please, I urge you to propose tightening the administration's belt, too.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

P.S. Thank you to my grand-daughter, Kristen, for typing this letter for me.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise, I am sorry to say, to oppose the Solomon amendment, even though I do want to take note, as my colleague from Colorado, Mrs. SCHROEDER did, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has indeed tried to create something of a coalition and to draw some of us who believe that those who got most out of the 1980's ought to give something back in the 1990's.

I oppose this amendment chiefly because its spending cuts would undermine the impact of any stimulus program. And while I agree with my colleague from Colorado that we need seed corn, the reasons I want to emphasize at this time are somewhat different, much as I agree with the gentlewoman, but I want to stress the need for a stimulus in order to assure that we get out of this recession with a genuine recovery.

Now, some have been trying to have it both ways, Mr. Chairman. They argue that the President's stimulus is too little to matter, and they argue that it is too much in the face of a full recovery. They can speak this doublespeak only if they ignore certain felt economic realities. They have to first ignore the false starts that we have already experienced in this recovery. False starts signal the need for some further stimulation.

Look at the time period of this recession. Technically it went from July 1990 to April 1991. We are almost 2 years into recovery and, yet, out of the last six quarters, in only the most recent one has growth reached the minimum 4 percent that indicates a period of real recovery. That ought to frighten us. It certainly frightens the people whom I represent.

One would further have to ignore yesterday's report that employers are using overtime at a record unmatched since the 1950's. And they are using overtime rather than employing people, which is why we have 9 million people out there saying, "Where is the recovery?"

One would have to ignore the frightening and startling proportion of the recovery that is in part-time jobs with no benefits. In order to assume that no stimulus is necessary one would have to ignore the missing ingredient in this recovery that has been present in other recoveries, and that is some fiscal policy, tax cuts or spending of some kind that encourages job creation. That is what has been missing in this recovery, and we are feeling it and paying for it.

One would have to ignore, above all, the effects that the President's cuts may have on the recovery itself.

□ 1710

I do not oppose the President's cuts. We have been willing to swallow the President's cuts. We do ask for some balance. We have to ask ourselves, for example, what of the 100,000 Federal jobs the President's attrition program over the next 5 years that will not be available and otherwise would have been available? In the Washington metropolitan region for example 22,000 jobs, would not be available but only half of these jobs, Mr. Chairman, are Federal jobs. The other half are jobs that will not be there in the private sector because of the decline in Federal spending.

The private sector needs a stimulus to pick up the people who are not going to be in the Federal sector because we are going to say to 100,000 of them, "These jobs are no longer available to you."

What of the base closings? Who is going to pick up the 57,000 people put out of work because of the base closings? An unstimulated economy, Mr. Chairman? Only an energetic private sector can pick up these pieces, a private sector that is not afraid to grow, as todays private sector is now; otherwise, business would be bringing people back to work rather than using compulsory overtime.

We must begin the stimulus now in the face of government and private sector cuts, even during a period of supposed growth. I predict that we are going to need more stimulus later, much more, if we do not start now. Leave the President's plan alone. Make jobs, not war, on the floor.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentlewoman, we will not be debating the stimulus plan until much later tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY].

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Solomon substitute.

Mr. Chairman, if we stick to the schedule which was published for today, we are going to be considering a so-called economic stimulus package before we leave here tonight. And I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, because if we pass the budget resolution as originally proposed by the President, we are going to be undercutting whatever we, as Congress, do to stimulate the economy.

That is why I supported the Kasich substitute and, failing its adoption, it is why I support the Solomon compromise substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I recall watching the economic summit which then President-elect Clinton called in December. And, I cannot recall one panelist saying that tax increases are what the country needs to bring it out of the economic doldrums. In fact, it seems almost universally agreed that, while tax hikes provide an easy means to close the deficit, they are almost certain to stall whatever recovery is currently taking place.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believes that tax hikes should be used to close the deficit only as a last resort. And, I agree with the President that, if tax hikes are ultimately necessary, they should fall most significantly on those who can best afford to pay.

By seeking to eliminate taxes which erode the buying power of middle-class Americans, the Solomon substitute permits economic growth and helps the President keep his promise to shield the most Americans from taxes they cannot afford to pay.

For these reasons, I will be voting for the Solomon substitute and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to one of our most knowledgeable Members, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], a former member of the Committee on the Budget for 6 years and a present member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, there is so much I would like to say about this issue. I only have 2 minutes. I think there is one point that I think is overarching here.

I applaud what the President is doing. I applaud the fact that he has taken the torch and shown us the way. The thing that I feel badly about, despite my respect for a lot of people who put in a great deal of work in this budget process, it really does not get us where we want to go.

I really think the American people, they hear the bugles and they expect to see the horses coming over the hill. Frankly, the horses will not be there unless something like the Solomon substitute is enacted. I will tell the Members why. Because at the end of these 5 years the American people will say, "We have got our debt in pretty good shape, our deficit is continuing to go down."

Wrong. Under the proposals which I see now, particularly the proposal on the Democratic side, the deficit begins to creep up and our debt, owned by the public as a percent of our GDP, now is 53 percent and at that time will be 57 percent.

Frankly, the debt is the critical issue. It does not make any difference what the deficit is; it is the means to an end: the debt, the debt that our children are going to inherit. If we end up at the end of 5 years with a debt higher than it is now as a percent of our productive capacity, I think we have led the American people down the wrong road. I urge the Members to support the Solomon substitute, because it is the only plan that gets the type of

numbers we are looking for and does not betray the confidence of the American people in what we are trying to do down here.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Solomon substitute amendment. There is much in this amendment to be found objectionable. Many of the cuts proposed in the earlier unsuccessful amendment are contained in this amendment. I believe that in certain instances these cuts represent in fact tax increases to the recipients of the most unfair kind.

In the earlier amendment I mentioned the Medicare cuts, $20 billion removed from this program and replaced by higher assessments on Medicare recipients using the laboratory services, receiving home health care, rather than spread any kind of tax obligation on those who have received and have most prospered under our past economic circumstance, rather than spread it broad based over all of this country.

This singles out elderly, sick people and hits them with $20 billion in additional assessments. For that reason alone I would oppose this amendment.

There is more. Elimination of the Federal Crop Insurance Program, elimination of it at a time when we need to be assisting our agriculture producers in risk management, helping them to avoid catastrophes that are the natural occupational hazard unique to agriculture in this country and around the world, they eliminate the opportunity to ensure against risks. This is not a budget-saving item, this is a proposal which will ensure every single year rural Members of this body will propose specific disaster relief measures, measures that will ultimately be funded off budget, that will impact the deficit the amendment's sponsors speak so passionately about.

Elimination of the Federal crop insurance is yet another bad component of this package, and presents, again, sufficient reason to vote against it. I think there are even more overarching issues at stake.

The economy of this country is sick. It may not be in the depth of the recession at the present time, but its rebound is anything but on schedule for a full, healthy recovery. We are 3 million jobs behind. The Solomon amendment fails most utterly in its failure to acknowledge the fragile and tepid state of our present economic recovery.

The chart before us reflects what really is a guarantee for further recession, if we were to hit 1994 with $65 billion in spending reduction with not one iota of the investment component proposed in the President's package.

In summary Mr. Speaker, this amendment fails the test. It has specifics, and many of the specifics justify defeat of the amendment. Moreover, it fails to correctly assess the interlinked nature of the deficit reduction and economic recovery. If the economy goes in the tank again, there will not be the economic recovery reflected in this plan, and in fact, the deficit reduction proposed, absent any effort at stimulating a recovery, guarantees renewed recession for this country.

For this reason, I urge the Members of this body to oppose this amendment.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], a major player in the writing and drafting and strategy of the Solomon proposal.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I just want to briefly correct a matter of fact. While the Clinton budget raises taxes on Social Security on the seniors, our budget does not. Furthermore, in the Medicare section it raises money by means testing premiums and by freezing reimbursements to physicians, not by freezing premiums at the higher rate that the Democrat budget does.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's remarks.

Mr. Chairman, let me address my comments this afternoon to my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle. It is no secret that many of them are uncomfortable having to vote for $336 billion in new taxes later on tonight.

My plea to them is before they do that, understand that by voting for the Solomon budget they can cut spending first. This plan has $265 billion more in spending cuts, more than the President's bill, a 4 to 1 ratio of spending cuts to revenue increases, and it makes the tough decisions on the pork-barrel projects that are in the other documents on both sides of the aisle.

□ 1700

Second, before voting for $336 billion in new taxes, understand if you are going to do that, taxes ought to go to deficit reduction, not new spending. This is the plan that cuts the deficit by $637 billion over the life of the budget cycle, $171 billion more than Mr. Clinton.

Third, before dealing with just new taxes, understand this is your only chance to vote against the taxes on the middle-income people of our particular proposal. It is this, the Solomon budget, that eliminates the Btu tax, that eliminates the inheritance tax, that eliminates the Social Security tax.

Before voting for new taxes and new spending, know that this is the alternative where you can make sure that that tax increase goes to fund incentives for economic growth, such as capital gains, such as passive loss, such as the tax extenders. Before you vote for $336 billion in new revenue and $178 billion in new spending, know that this is the one plan that is fair.

As Ross Perot would say if he were standing here, he would say if deficit reduction is our goal, and bipartisanship is our mode of operation, it is the Solomon budget that each and every one of us ought to be voting for. Why? Because it takes the best of both to reduce the deficit.

Imagine we are going through all of this $336 billion in new taxes and we are still going to end up with about $200 billion a year in annual deficits. The American people do not find that acceptable, Mr. Chairman. This is the alternative for you to go home, and before you give the President your due party loyalty later tonight, make sure you can go home and say I voted for tax fairness, I voted to cut spending first, and I voted to use new revenue for deficit reduction.

Vote for the Solomon budget.

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

Last year, Mr. Chairman, the American people sent us a very loud and a very clear message. They told us that they wanted us to work together to get our house in order and to put the American economy back on track. They told us that they wanted the deficits that are threatening their children's futures brought under control, that they wanted a fairer and more equitable tax system, and that they wanted us to put policies in place to get the economy moving.

Mr. Chairman, if the Members of this body were really listening to the American people last year, and if they were really listening to them now, they would be voting for the Solomon substitute. We have put together a budget alternative which is closer to what the American people have told us they want than any other budget resolution which has been offered.

Our budget delivers a third more in deficit reduction over 5 years than the Democrat plan with less than half the new taxes. For every $1 in new taxes that our proposal raises, we cut spending by $4. The Democrat proposal doesn't even cut spending by $1 for every new dollar in taxes—a far cry from what the President promised.

Our spending restraints and cuts, moreover, are specified, not promised. The American people have told us that they are frustrated and angry with the budget shenanigans that they see us engage in year after year. This is an honest budget.

Our plan calls for reductions in spending before, not after, we start collecting new taxes. We aren't asking tax payers to buy any more pigs in the poke.

Finally, our budget gives the American people the kind of economic program they want without asking an already overtaxed middle-class to send even more of its income to Washington.

Republican Members of the House have worked together over the past several days to put together a budget resolution for fiscal year

1994 which we believe truly reflects the priorities and the desire for change among the American people. We believe that it is a budget which both Republicans and Democrats can support.

In assembling the Solomon substitute, Mr. Chairman, we identified three objectives: substantial deficit reduction by means of real restraint and actual cuts in Federal Government spending; a fair and realistic package of proposals to increase Federal revenues by asking the wealthiest Americans—and only the wealthiest Americans—to pay more in taxes, and; an overall budget plan that would not threaten or undermine the prospects for a continuing economic recovery. I believe that we achieved each of those objectives and that they are reflected in our budget resolution.

First, let's look at deficit reduction and how we achieved it. The Solomon substitute achieves substantially more deficit reduction next year and over the next 5 years than either of the budget plans that came out of the House Budget Committee. Our budget reduces the deficit of $620 billion over 5 years. That's about $160 billion more in deficit reduction than the Democrat budget achieves despite the fact that it calls for over a quarter of a billion dollars in net new taxes over the next 5 years.

Our budget achieves deficit reduction primarily by controlling the rate of spending growth in most Federal program spending, and by making actual cuts in other nonessential Federal progams. Those of us who assembled this substitute share with all of our Republicans colleagues the view that America suffers under the weight of this monstrous deficit not because the vast majority of her people are taxed too little, but because the Federal Government spends too much—much too much. Our budget reflects that belief.

Because the Solomon substitute takes the Republican budget committee proposal as its base, it adopts what is in effect a baseline freeze on all nondefense Federal discretionary spending. What this means, in terms that normal people can understand, is that spending for more than 90 percent of all Federal discretionary programs will grow over the next 5 years by an amount equal to the inflation rate over the next 5 years. Critical programs like Pell grants and Head Start will not see their funding cut.

Our proposal does, however, call for and specify actual reductions in funding for other programs. For example, we eliminate funding for the superconducting super collider, cut funding for special interest Federal highway projects, cut agricultural subsidies to individuals with nonfarm incomes of over $100,000, and cut funding for support of the already oversized but still growing Government bureaucracies. As a result of our determination to hold the line on spending, spending cuts account for more than 80 percent of the deficit reduction in the Solomon substitute. Unspecified spending reduction accounts for barely half of the deficit reduction in the Democrat package.

Mr. Chairman, I think that JOHN KASICH and my Republican colleagues on the Budget Committee did a remarkable, and a remarkably honest job in their budget on the savings side. They showed that we can make a substantial dent in the deficit without resorting to unspecified promises of spending restraint and without resorting to the massive tax increases that the administration and the majority leadership are calling for. All of my Republican colleagues involved in drafting this alternative budget share that view.

The American people, however, have made clear that they expect us to produce a budget package that makes more dramatic reductions in the Federal deficit that can be achieved by spending cuts alone. It is for this reason that many of my colleagues and I believe that we need to go significantly further than our Republican colleagues on the Budget Committee. And the only way to do that is by asking the wealthiest Americans to make a contribution in higher taxes. Our alternative budget does that. We raise nearly $140 billion in new taxes over 5 years by incorporating already proposed tax increases on the wealthy, while at the same time stripping all of those new taxes proposed by President Clinton and the Democrats—such as the Btu tax and higher taxes on Social Security recipients—which hit lower and middle-income Americans hard. Contrary to the rehetroic, these taxes will hit middle-income American families and retired Americans hard.

President Clinton made a promise to shield middle-income Americans from the impact of new taxes. The President and his party are breaking that promise. We have a budget which gives them the opportunity to keep it.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, the new taxes that we include in our proposal do not get implemented until after the spending restraint and the spending cuts we have proposed begin to be implemented. We are not asking any American to again pay for promises which they know have been made and broken many times before. We do indeed cut spending first.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we sought to bring a budget resolution to the floor which would be pro-growth.

The economy is finally showing signs of life, though no one can take comfort from the extent of the recovery thus far. Job growth statistics, in particular, remain disappointing. Nonetheless, the economy is showing increased strength and the last thing we want to do is sap that strength. We want to support the recovery and keep as many Americans as possible on the job. The Solomon substitute contains a substantial package of tax incentives for business investment which will contribute to productivity growth and the creation of new jobs.

Moreover, though our proposal calls for very substantial reductions in defense spending, it takes into consideration the fact that defense dollars provide more than just guns and jet fighters. Defense dollars provide jobs—millions of jobs for American workers. We have just had a very bitter reminder, Mr. Chairman, of the human pain which defense downsizing entails. And no doubt, there will be more of it. The question, however, is how much more and how fast. Our budget calls for nonadministratively related cuts of $60 billion in defense over 5 years. This is in addition—and it is very important to point this out because many of my Democrat colleagues conveniently fail to do so—to almost $75 billion in cuts that President Bush proposed before leaving office earlier this year. The Democrat budget calls for cuts that are twice as large, will be twice as painful, and will cost twice as many Americans—military and nonmilitary—their jobs.

Mr. Chairman, the Solomon substitute, based on what I've heard from the people in my district and in the places I've traveled across America, is the kind of budget the American people want, and I would urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE].

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Chairman, there is a sense of historic expectation in the House today for we are engaged in a hard-fought battle on issues of real importance. There is an appropriate awareness that the vote on the budget resolution and investment package will reflect a fundamental redefinition of our national goals, a conscious shift from consumption to investment, and a renewed commitment to the traditional ideals of American democracy. In short, Mr. Chairman, if enacted, the Solomon amendment will kill President Clinton's effort to rebuild America.

During the next few hours Members of Congress will rise to present competing visions for our Nation's future. Prompted by timidity and excessive partisanship, some will urge that we reject the President's proposals. By contrast, I believe that 12 years of drift, debt, and decline—12 years of voodoo economics—is long enough. With President Clinton, I believe we must boldly affirm last November's electoral mandate by passing the budget and stimulus package now before the House.

First and foremost, I believe that America's future must be built upon a cornerstone of economic prosperity. It was Hubert Humphrey who once said the best social program is a job. In keeping with that philosophy the Clinton budget will create jobs in both the public and private sectors, rebuild highway and mass transit systems, spur technological research and development, assist urban revitalization through community development block grants and enterprise zones, increase support for small business development, and fully fund the Pell Grant Program so that students from middle-income families can afford to go to college.

Second, I believe that America's future must be defined by the parameters of fiscal responsibility. During the past 12 years we have accrued a $4.1 trillion debt—an unwarranted burden of over $15,000 for each man, woman, and child in America. Mr. Chairman, I want to leave my children something more than a mortgage. The Clinton budget, as amended in committee, reduces the deficit by $510 billion over the next 5 years. The President has proposed 150 specific spending cuts totaling $247 bil-

lion—and thereafter, the Budget Committee has cut an additional $63 billion in proposed spending.

As a Democrat who plans to vote for the balanced budget amendment and for the line-item veto, I commend the President's leadership in crafting a budget which reflects a sense of fiscal restraint so lacking during the excessive spending of the 1980's.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I believe that America's future must be shaped by the traditional ideals of social justice. Taxes must be fair. Burdens should be shared. And opportunity must not be limited to the wealthy few. The Clinton budget will provide full funding for Head Start, WIC childhood immunizations, and the Ryan White AIDs Program. It rejects the special interest tax policies of the last two Presidential administrations.

At the heart of the Clinton budget can be found three basic goals: A realistic stimulus for job creation; a genuine commitment to deficit reduction; and a renewed belief in equality and social justice under law. These are the same reasons I ran for Congress—and these are the reasons I urge my colleagues to reject the Solomon amendment and to support the President's economic plan. The election is over. Rhetoric should be cooled. It is time to govern.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] who is a former member of the Committee on the Budget and now serves admirably on the Committee on Ways and Means and has been indeed an architect of this plan.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, straight talk. Get real. That was Ross Perot's message to Americans and her Government leaders. That was his only message. And the great gift that he gave the people of America was an understanding of the enormity of the deficit and the dark cloud it hangs over our economy and our ability to create the very jobs that our kids' futures depend upon. He gave us that gift, and that is the measure of what we do here on the floor.

I thank my colleague from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] for recognizing the intellectual honesty of the Solomon proposal that I am a part of proposing to you today. Yes, it is very tough. It cuts spending more rigorously than any other proposal you will have a chance to vote on today.

It also raises taxes. I cannot tell you how many people have come to me on the street saying I am willing to pay more, but I want that coupled with an honest, tough budget that cuts spending. Well, this budget does that. It raises taxes on those most able to pay, and couples those tax increases with two things: the extenders to stimulate the economy, to assure continued production of low-income housing, of research and development, of education and so on, and with the toughest budget cuts anyone has proposed. And in the end the benefit is that we reduce the deficit in a way that will assure growth in America's future.

In contrast, the budget that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are proposing will leave us in 5 years precisely where we are, with a deficit the same size as we face now, but with spending far higher.

Ask yourselves: Are new taxes, new spending worth being in the same place in 5 years when that place is destroying the job-creating power of America's small-business sector? Look at the testimony we are hearing on the tax provisions in the Democrats' proposal. Over and over again, we are told the new tax burdens far outweigh the investment incentives to create jobs. Small business in Connecticut will be paralyzed by this proposal. Many are barely surviving now and they will pay higher Btu taxes, higher business taxes, higher Medicare taxes, and assume new and heavy paperwork burdens. The small business sector is the job creator in our society. It is the only sector creating jobs, so will strangling it create growth?

I ask my colleagues, for the people, vote for the Solomon amendment. It doesn't kill our job producers with taxes but couples taxes on our truly wealthy with real, serious spending cuts to reduce the deficit far more effectively than any other proposal you'll have the chance to vote on. To turn the economy around, vote "yes."

Mr. SABO. Before yielding further, I would indicate to the gentlewoman from Connecticut that the majority budget resolution substantially reduces the deficit in 1996, 1997, and 1998.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for giving me the time and for his leadership in bringing this very fine budget resolution to the floor today. I rise in strong support of the resolution and very reluctantly in opposition to the Solomon substitute. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] knows the esteem in which I hold him, but I do not support his budget resolution. I know that comes as no surprise to him.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased today and happy because for the first time in a long time, for many of us it is the first time we will have a chance to support a President's budget, a budget which reflects the values of our constituents. I believe that a budget should be a statement of our values. We spend money on what is important to us. We do that in our personal lives, and we should do that as a country.

At long last we have a budget that does this by recognizing that the strength of our country can be defined in the health and well-being of our people as well as our ability to defend ourselves and to keep the peace.

□ 1730

At long last we have a statement of values in our budget which puts people first by investing in people with increased funding for Head Start, WIC, child immunization, and full funding of the Ryan White AIDS Program. That is very critical to my district, and I thank the chairman for the generosity in the budget on that score.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal about our various deficits. We have had the budget deficit, the trade deficit, the family income deficit, and the list of deficits goes on, and included among those is the social deficit of the last 12 years, a time where social initiatives were starved in order for us to build up other sections of the budget. At long last, this inequity will be redressed, and we will be doing it in a fiscally sound way, fiscally responsible way, as this budget resolution does call for a cut, a reduction, of $510 billion in our own budget deficit over the next 5 years.

In fact, the President asked for cuts, and this Committee on the Budget cut the budget further by $63 billion from the original proposal that they had received.

It is a budget that is a statement of our values, because it creates jobs and gives every person a real opportunity. It assumes increased funding for jobs programs and job training, innovative education and lifelong-learning programs, mass transit, highway construction, research and development, defense conversion, and a variety of other investment programs. It also restores tax fairness to our system by placing the heaviest burden on the most affluent in our society.

This is not about class warfare. It is about redressing the problem of the past 10 or 12 years where the wealthiest in our country enjoyed the benefits of the lightest tax burden. It also contains funds for expansion of the earned income tax credit which rewards low-income people for working. As our President has said over and over again in his remarks, people who work in our country will no longer have an inability to feed their families or to take care of their families, because they will now have the earned income tax credit.

Mr. Chairman, when I was young I remember my parents always saying when there was bad news, whether it was illness or death in the family, "How are we going to tell the children?" I think if we do not support this budget resolution and the stimulus package that goes with it, we will have a difficult time telling the children why, why it was not important to invest in them, why people could understand that investment in infrastruc-

ture, of highways, was a stimulus, and a good investment for our country, but investing in our children's education, in Head Start, giving them all a head start was not considered a good investment.

For these reasons, for the children, for our values, for the strength of our country being defined differently, as I said earlier, and the strength in the health and well-being of our country, I urge my colleagues to support this budget resolution, to defeat the Solomon resolution, and then, in conclusion, to support the stimulus package later this evening.

Give the President a chance. The American people want him to succeed. We should, too, in this House.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Solomon amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to President Clinton's economic package and I do so because I fear we are in danger of squandering a genuine window of opportunity to correct this Nation's fiscal course and halt its competitive slide in the worldwide economy.

The prevailing sentiment from those residents of northern New Jersey who have expressed their support for the Clinton economic proposal—and they are significantly outnumbered by those who oppose it—is that this plan is better than nothing.

I would agree. This plan is better than the status quo. But it is not good enough. And if we fail to act decisively now, we may not get another opportunity like this for years. And by then, it may be too late. Too late to regain our position in the global economy.

Clearly, the budget deficit and our declining position in the global economy require firm action and determined leadership, now. The accumulating national debt pose a real and growing danger to our economic well-being.

The billions of dollars we spend on interest on that national debt is money that is not available to create one job, repair one bridge, pay one medical bill, provide one student loan or train one young American. In addition, those interest payments are slowly strangling economic growth.

Because I view this crisis so seriously, I have always refused to rule out enactment of carefully structured, new taxes designated for deficit reduction. More of this later when I discuss the Solomon amendment.

However, and this is where the Clinton program fails to meet the commonsense test: Before we ask the people of New Jersey and the rest of the Nation to shoulder higher taxes, we must demand significant and enforceable spending cuts. Moreover, we simply can not afford to create new and expanded spending programs.

Yes, there are a number of program cuts in the Clinton package but I am alarmed that it also includes over $180 billion in new spending. Even more alarming is that the President has proposed new programs that—once started—will take on a life of their own and become the budgetary equivalents of new entitlement programs. I speak specifically of the national service program which could open up a budgetary Pandora's box.

No, our approach must be pay as you go—and new spending must be offset by corresponding reductions in other areas. No more of the buy-now-pay-later system that has ruled this city for decades.

And, all spending cuts and deficit reduction goals must be strictly enforceable, with real incentives and penalties to force future Congresses to abide by the framework we establish this year. These enforcement mechanisms are one of the primary reasons the Solomon Amendment gained my support.

Without procedural and system budget reform, any progress we make this year will be in real jeopardy.

Let me remind my colleagues of the path my State of New Jersey has followed. Just 3 short years ago, Gov. James Florio threw money at the schools but without a system of fundamental reforms. We cannot allow President Clinton and this Congress to follow that same failed path.

I am mindful of the President's challenge to those who would oppose his plan to come up with one of their own.

Frankly, the approach that most closely mirrors my approach is that proposed by Mr. SOLOMON of New York and several of my Republican colleagues.

The Solomon plan would bring about a nearly $500 billion reduction in the deficit over 5 years. That is far better than the Clinton's deficit reduction of just $325 billion. The Solomon plan contains no new spending—cuts the Clinton tax increases in half while protecting the middle class and those on Social Security—has a 4-to-1 ratio of spending reductions to tax increases and dedicates all of the higher taxes of deficit reduction. I would add that all of the spending cuts occur before any tax increase takes effect. Most important—the Solomon approach contains mandatory sequestration if, or when, Congress exceeds its budget limits. This is a blueprint, if you will for a sound deficit reduction package. But there is room for improvement and need to modify, for example: It falls into the same old trap of attempting to balance the budget on the backs of those in our society—the frail elderly. It attacks Medicare and Medicaid to the amount of $85 billion. Now, we should not institute a system of means testing without open and complete debate and analysis. This magnitude of cuts I cannot accept because it will greatly tax our frail elderly.

Second, the Solomon plan does not go far enough with some of its spending cuts. Yes, we should eliminate the super collider, but we also should zero out the space station, the advanced solid rocket motor program, the *Seawolf* submarine, end the below market use of Federal lands, significantly curtail the range of agricultural subsidies and the list goes on and on.

What this country also needs is a strong save and invest in America program of tax incentives—targeted capitals gain tax reduction, investment tax credit, expanded IRA's for first-time homebuyers and medical expenses, mortgage revenue bonds, and so forth—that will encourage U.S. business and individuals alike to invest in new plants and equipment to become more competitive in the ongoing global economic wars. We owe it to the American people to take these important steps before we ask them to shoulder additional tax burdens. Indeed, Republicans in the other body are proposing strengthening the package with investment incentives.

Nevertheless, I support the Solomon amendment because it most nearly focuses on the mark for spending cuts and takes the intellectually honest approach of acknowledging the need for marginal tax rate increases and the millionaire's surtax while protecting the middle class.

This is a blueprint that starts us on credible deficit reduction.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], a member of the Committee on the Budget and a former member of the Joint Economic Committee.

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

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I think the real issue here is which proposal is going to make the genuine cuts that would justify any tax increases.

We already learned through the Kasich plan that you can arrive at a $200 billion deficit in 1998 through spending cuts and not raising taxes, but if you want to get below the $200 billion, then, yes, it would require some tax increases. The Kasich plan established the bottomline in beginning the deficit-reduction effort.

The Solomon plan builds on that strength by accepting some moderate tax increases.

The American people have said to us, "We are willing to risk some new taxes provided we meet two prerequisites, that we cut spending first, and we make a dramatic dent in the Federal budget deficit." And the Solomon plan accomplishes both.

We have heard here today that the budget resolution that has been passed out of the Committee on the Budget will cut spending, but, ladies and gentlemen, it cuts spending in the out years, in 1997 and 1998. The average life of a budget agreement in this Congress over the last decade has been 2, perhaps 3 years.

I think it is telling to look at the charts, and when you see what the Clinton plan will accomplish in spending cuts in 1994 and 1995. It accomplishes about 6 to 8 percent of the spending cuts in the first 2 years out of the 5 years, and hope that these other spending cuts will never occur.

The difference is in this plan that the spending cuts are up front, because the American people should not have to pay for tax increases if they are not going to get the spending cuts, not to mention the fact that the resolution of the Committee on the Budget tremendously taxes people.

Should my constituents pay for an energy tax on home heating oil when we are not making a genuine effort to cut spending?

As you can see here, there is a big difference, ladies and gentlemen, in the terms of tax increases versus spending cuts. The tax increases under the House budget resolution are $336 billion compared to the Solomon plan of $112 billion. The big difference is on the spending cuts, a full $685 billion of the Solomon plan, and only $219 billion with the budget resolution. There is a big difference, ladies and gentlemen, if you want spending to be cut.

The more we increase taxes, the more we spend. Therefore, we have front-loaded the spending cuts in order to demonstrate to the American people that we, in fact, are going to cut spending, that we are not going to use the tax increases to increase Government spending.

Furthermore, the Solomon plan increases the taxes on those people who can best afford it, on those who are earning more than $200,000. That is exactly what President Clinton promised the American people during the course of the campaign. He did not promise to raise taxes on people who were earning $20,000, $30,000, my constituents who earn $14,000, but that is what we have in the House budget resolution. You are taxing the low-to-middle income.

We take that out, and we tax the wealthy.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SNOWE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is so right, and I would say to my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], who is the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, and we have great respect for him, he pointed out that, yes, the Democrat budget does have significant cuts in the last 3 years, but the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] has pointed out that sequestration, in other words, the 1990 Budget Control Act, expires at the end of 1995, and if you look at that chart, as you have pointed out, the Democrat budget cuts only $6 billion in 1994, $10 billion in 1995, and then heavy cuts after the triggering mechanism for sequestration is dead and gone.

In our budget there is a chart underneath there which shows that we have legislation written into our budget which establishes a Gramm-Rudman procedure triggering mandatory sequestration cuts across-the-board if actions by this Congress fail to meet these budget-discipline caps. That means we continue the sequestration and across-the-board cuts for all 5 years.

That is why you ought to be voting for this if you really want to do something for the American people.

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the gentleman for his effort. I also should say that we also accomplish another one of the President's campaign goals and promises, and that was to reduce the deficit by 50 percent over 4 years. This budget does that in 4 years, as well as 5.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me assure the gentleman from New York that our expectations are that the discretionary spending caps will be continued beyond 1995, through 1998.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

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

Mr. Chairman, I spoke before about Reaganomics, the Reaganomics of the Reagan and Bush years. I spoke before about how chickens are coming home to roost, that we are now suffering because of the fallacy of Reaganomics, that you could somehow increase spending, cut taxes, and the day of reckoning will never come, but the day of reckoning is here.

□ 1740

We know that the Reagan-Bush policies have given us high budget deficits. What they have also given us, unfortunately, is high recession and high unemployment, and I rise today in opposition to the Solomon amendment and in strong support of the House Concurrent Resolution 64, which is the budget resolution and President Clinton's economic stimulus package.

I support the entire package and especially the stimulus package because I believe it will help many Americans rise out of the recession that has plagued our economy. Some people look at recent economic figures and claim we do not need to act. But I remind those agents of the status quo that jobs are being cut, not created, in the downsized economy. That leaves many people out of work, many teenagers out on the streets and many families wondering how they will make ends meet.

In our deliberations it is easy to get lost in the numbers game while forgetting the impact our decisions have on the lives of the people we serve.

We talk about billions of dollars and thousands of jobs, but rarely do we focus on the value of a good education or a steady job.

This stimulus package will create 675,000 additional summer jobs for our youth. It will provide extended unemployment benefits to people who want to work but cannot find a job. In my region of the country, the New York City area, 10 percent of the people are unemployed.

It will invest in infrastructure and education so that we can offer the displaced workers and their children a brighter future.

Because we are required to account for the money we appropriate, a dollar figure is attached to these programs and we debate their merits. That is responsible Government. But, I ask, how do you measure the value of hope?

The Childhood Immunization Program in the stimulus package will cost $300 million, but its value in future health care cost savings and the added ability to educate a healthy child cannot be measured. The $753 million we plan to invest in mass transit will create jobs and improve our ability to move people in and out of our cities. Can we really tell how much that means to the economic viability of our urban areas or the quality of the environment? When we appropriate $32 million to fund service jobs for older Americans, can we put a price on the knowledge they pass on to our youth?

To be bold or not to be bold—that is really the question we are debating here today. If we fail to act, we will crush the hopes and expectations of the American people.

Some people will argue that this package goes too far, and others will say it does not go far enough. No one will ever be completely satisfied. The fact is that this stimulus package is well-measured and economically sound. It will create badly needed jobs and invest in the future of our people and our economy.

And perhaps most importantly, it nurtures hope—a commodity that is difficult to measure but definitely needed for us to succeed.

I urge my colleagues to support the stimulus package.

We have not had an urban program or a program for our cities in the past 12 years. It is nice to have a President who cares about our cities.

Last year millions of Americans went to the polls and elected our new President.

The American people voted for change. I support this President. I support his plan, and I support the Budget Committee's resolution.

I have found in my district and indeed across the country the American people support this plan. They will support this plan because they believe that the pain is spread fairly. The pain is spread fairly. The American people want to invest in the future. This is a sound plan. The President is right, and I urge my colleagues to reject all the amendments and support the Budget Committee's plan.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCCRERY], a former member of the Budget Committee and now a member of the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means, on the Republican side.

Mr. MCCRERY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, my support of the Solomon substitute reflects my belief that the deficit and the accumulated national debt constitute the most serious

problem facing our Nation. My support is also a reflection of my belief that a short-term approach to dealing with the deficit should contain both spending cuts and revenue increases, but with a heavy emphasis on spending cuts. The Solomon substitute is a serious attempt to deal effectively with the deficit for the short term.

I say "short term" because, as has been eloquently explained by my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], no long term solution to our deficit problem is complete without reforms to bring down the rate of increase in health care costs.

Before I go further, I want to express my sincere appreciation to the President, the Democrats on the Budget Committee, and to my Republican colleagues on the Budget Committee for their willingness to make tough choices designed to bring down the level of deficit spending by the Federal Government.

Whether the choices are tax increases or spending cuts, they are difficult for a politician to make, and those who have honestly faced those choices and taken a stand are to be commended.

I think the President's plan, though, even as modified by the Budget Committee Democrats, is the wrong prescription to cure our ailing fisc.

The Democrats' plan relies far too much on tax increases, and far too little on spending cuts, to reach a deficit figure in 1998 that is still more than half the size it would be if we did nothing at all.

In fact, the Democrats' plan only cuts spending $6 billion in 1994, $10.8 billion in 1995, including debt service savings, and even if all the spending cuts scheduled for the last 3 years in their plan actually take place, and that is a big if, still, fully 55 percent of the total deficit reduction over 5 years comes from increased taxes.

Now, compare the numbers in the Solomon substitute. In the first year of the plan, spending would be cut $41.7 billion, while taxes would be increased by only $10.3 billion, and, over the 5 years of the plan, only 19 percent of the deficit reduction is due to tax increases, while 81 percent is due to spending reductions. In the Solomon plan, you get over $4 of spending cuts for every $1 of tax increases, while in the Democrats' plan, you get only 80 cents of spending cuts for every $1 of tax increases.

Mr. Chairman, as courageous as each of these choices is, there is a clear philosophical difference between the Solomon plan and the Democrats' plan. Both make an honest attempt to reduce the deficit. But one, the Democrat plan, taxes people first, in a big way —(the Democrats' tax increase is retroactive to January 1, 1993) then only later cuts spending, and that's only promised. The other, the Solomon plan, cuts spending deeply, in the very first year, and continues to rely primarily on spending cuts to achieve $155 billion more in deficit reduction than the Democrats' plan.

Our plan would keep the promises made by the President during the campaign:

It cuts the deficit in half in 4 years, the Clinton/Democrat budget does not.

It does not raise taxes on the middle class; the Clinton/Democrat budget does.

It raises taxes only on those making $200,000/year or more; the Clinton/Democrat plan raises taxes on families making as little as $20,000/year.

Yes, the choice is clear between the Solomon plan and the Democrats' plan. If you want the largest tax increase in the history of the United States; if you want a budget that taxes first, cuts spending later; if you want a budget that doesn't even cut the deficit in half over the next 4 years, then vote for the Democrat budget.

But if you want a budget that cuts spending first; if you want a budget that cuts the deficit in half in 4 years; if you want a budget that seriously cuts Government waste and spending, then the Solomon substitute is the clear choice.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], a distinguished member of our budget working group.

□ 1750

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

I would just like to remind the American people and those who are going to vote today that we have almost a $300 billion payment for the interest on the national debt right now. None of that money goes for infrastructure. None of that money goes for investment. That money does not go back to the American people.

There are three points I want to make. Our main mission here with this budget is to reduce the debt. Three points.

First, the Solomon package reduces the deficit more than any other package before us today, that is $637 billion in 5 years.

Second, the economic stimulus part of this package, and it is part of this package, is conducive without a doubt, and you would all agree on this, with economic productivity in the private sector, plus something that we seriously need to consider, and please listen to this if you are watching on your monitors in the office, it creates the infrastructure necessary for those programs that we need for children, for education, for the poor, et cetera. It creates those necessary programs, the infrastructure necessary for that, so that they are available.

Third, fair tax structure for the middle class and senior citizens.

Vote for the Solomon amendment.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY], a distinguished member of our committee.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 64 and in opposition to the Solomon amendment.

Although I am the Budget Committee's newest member, I am proud to have played an important role in crafting a Budget Resolution which fundamentally reorders our Nation's priorities.

The American public called on us to shift spending away from defense to programs that address the real concerns of Americans, jobs, health care, education, defense conversion and deficit reduction.

Our budget recognizes the concerns of Americans which have been ignored far too long, while the Solomon amendment continues to neglect them. That is the essential difference between our proposals.

Now is the time to correct these inequities. That is exactly what I came to Washington to do.

I declare today with confidence and pride that the budget resolution reflects our Nation's common agenda.

The budget resolution recognizes that we can invest in our Nation's future by using defense savings to jump-start the economy, promote long-term economic growth and invest in the people of America.

I am pleased to say that our budget plan will reduce the deficit by $510 billion over the next 5 years. With spending increases being offset by substantial decreases in the defense budget, overall discretionary spending will not increase over the next 5 years under this budget agreement.

Some of my colleagues say that we did not cut enough. Others say that we cut too much. There is no doubt, however, that we crafted a budget that successfully reorders our national priorities in the context of reducing our budget deficit.

Frankly, we were faced with tough choices and we made difficult but responsible decisions.

The budget proposal is balanced, fair, economically responsible and it strikes a common middle ground that will work for all Americans.

We finally have an administration that understands the importance of investing in our infrastructure and in our Nation's most valuable resource, our people.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to defeat the Solomon amendment and support the budget resolution.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the 1 minute remaining.

Mr. Chairman, as we listened to all the debate today, I know that the easy vote on all these Budget Resolutions is no, but we came here to make tough choices. We came here to lead, to govern, and in fact we should say no to business as usual.

For all the folks in this country who want real deficit reduction, this is the best plan, and I would urge a yes vote.

This is fairness. This is cutting spending first and that is what the people want. We can give it to them with a vote in favor of the Solomon consensus budget.

I would ask all my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 20, noes 409, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

AYES—20

Boehlert
Fish
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gunderson
Hoekstra
Houghton
Johnson (CT)
Levy
McCrery
McHugh
Orton
Regula
Roukema
Shays
Snowe
Solomon
Upton
Walsh
Young (FL)

NOES—409

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—6

Faleomavaega (AS)
Ford (TN)
Henry
Myers
Quillen
Romero-Barcelo (PR)

□ 1818

Messrs. PETE GEREN of Texas, FLAKE, TAYLOR of Mississippi, SMITH of Michigan, CRANE, LAZIO, KYL, and SWIFT changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 103-37.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

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

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. MFUME: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994.

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990).

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, and October 1, 1997:

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

Fiscal year 1994: $1,256,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,380,468,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,485,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,599,487,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,698,470,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $0.
Fiscal year 1995: $0.
Fiscal year 1996: $0.
Fiscal year 1997: $0.
Fiscal year 1998: $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 1994: $930,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $104,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $111,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $116,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $122,500,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $1,514,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,558,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,598,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,641,668,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,717,818,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $1,509,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,575,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,598,838,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997: $1,631,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,697,622,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: −$252,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: −$194,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: −$113,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: −$32,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: +$848,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $4,715,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $5,076,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $5,428,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $5,776,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $6,141,400,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1993, October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, and October 1, 1997, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $21,400,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $148,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $22,100,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $152,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $32,400,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $145,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $48,800,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $137,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $45,500,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $157,400,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1994 through 1998 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $251,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,646,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $217,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $251,334,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $187,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $217,525,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $162,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,582,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $167,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $175,583,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $20,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,796,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $19,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,212,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $18,896,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,413,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $18,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,003,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $18,492,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,895,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $18,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,988,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $19,456,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,924,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $20,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,218,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $21,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,872,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $21,758,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,163,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $5,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,187,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $6,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,817,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $6,027,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,751,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $5,975,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,710,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $5,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,689,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $21,605,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,850,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $22,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,161,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $22,901,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,161,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $22,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,134,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $22,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,911,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $15,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,728,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $14,321,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,677,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,568,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $12,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,599,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,657,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,133,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $24,443,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,507,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $84,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $85,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $21,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,969,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $87,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $88,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $19,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,567,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $89,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $91,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $14,321,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$8,499,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $91,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $94,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,557,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $93,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $97,000,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $40,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,780,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $41,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,883,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $43,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,987,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $44,351,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,090,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $45,572,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,194,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $9,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,352,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $9,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,085,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $3,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $9,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,472,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $3,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $9,657,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,472,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $3,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $9,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,549,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $3,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $61,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,010,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $62,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,997,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $63,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,340,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $11,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $65,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,417,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $23,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $68,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,615,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $24,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $123,719,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,648,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 4) 38

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $137,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $136,063,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $152,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $166,551,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $168,199,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $166,561,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $185,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $184,061,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $151,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $150,310,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $176,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $172,319,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $189,726,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $188,490,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $207,648,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $207,030,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $228,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $227,733,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $210,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $211,337,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $228,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $223,554,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $234,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $228,659,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $246,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $238,354,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $253,040,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,624,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $323,050,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $321,699,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $339,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $338,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $355,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $354,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $372,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $371,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $390,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $388,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $35,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,081,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $36,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,193,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $37,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,935,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $37,936,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,677,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $38,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,418,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $16,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,285,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $16,456,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,405,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $16,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,469,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $16,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,872,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,987,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,934,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $13,279,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,468,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, $13,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,521,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,257,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,998,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $13,312,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,023,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,512,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,057,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $208,713,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $208,713,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $223,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $223,740,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $236,376,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $236,376,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $246,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $246,186,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $258,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $258,020,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$10,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,137,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$40,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$40,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$40,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

□ 1820

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

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

My thanks, as a preface to my remarks, to the distinguished gentleman who chairs the Committee on Rules as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking minority member on that committee for making in order this amendment that we present this afternoon on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus in coalition with the House progressive caucus.

Mr. Chairman, we have come here today out of a great sense of urgency and opportunity, a sense of opportunity because we believe we stand on the threshold of the dawning of a new partnership between the executive and legislative branches of our Government, a sense of urgency because the people whom we serve are desperately in need of compassion and immediate action to alleviate the conditions which so imperil and threaten their lives.

Since 1981, the Congressional Black Caucus has developed 10 alternative budgets. The impetus for those earlier budgets was a challenge, quite frankly, from then President Reagan who criticized those who criticized his call for increases in military spending, tax breaks to the wealthy, and the slashing of vital social service programs.

Mr. Chairman, the impetus for the budget that we now bring before our colleagues is to respond to the complete failure, as we see it, of previous business and budget priorities by previous administrations and to create also, as we see it, a new and dynamic approach to national fiscal policy which responds adequately to dramatically changed world conditions.

This budget grows out of the moral imperative that we, as members of the Congressional Black Caucus, and our colleagues in the House progressive caucus believe must be addressed. This alternative is motivated by the pain of those who suffer homelessness, illness without access to medical care, frustrated educational opportunities, the scourge of drug abuse, the violence that runs rampant in too many of our communities, the stagnation of our economy that has plunged millions into unemployment and then despair and then economic marginality.

And so we have worked diligently, Mr. Chairman, in an abbreviated timeframe to develop this document which seeks to find progressive solutions, to advance the cause of human dignity and social progress. We do not posture ourselves today here as an opposition coalition to the President's recommendations or, for that matter, the recommendations of the House Com-

mittee on the Budget. Rather, we have set out what we view as a set of aggressive alternative options for our Nation and our Nation's people.

Americans of all races and of all walks of life have suffered, especially during the economic decline that we are so much a part of. The resurgence in acts of racism and sexism and then class have forced themselves onto the front pages of our Nation's press. Our educational system still fails in many respects to prepare our children for their role as citizens and then workers. Our infrastructure is collapsing and small businesses desperately cry out for help. Millions are unserved or underserved by health care systems. And indeed, Mr. Chairman, we live in a world and in an era in which parents do not believe that their children will lead a better life than they once did.

These children of desperation find themselves having no recourse and lost ultimately into the plight and the misery of drugs and then death and then a world of violence. And so then we must find our salvation in responsible and honest budget proposals that challenge us as a nation and as a House to face the future with scourge and with skill and with compassion.

It is for those people and their parents and their grandparents and the hardworking and honest men and women of this Nation that we advance this alternative to give our view of how we make their world a safer and more supportive environment in which to live.

And in summary, our 1994 budget request allocates $1.343 trillion in budget authority. It spends $1.509 trillion in outlays. It raises $1.256 trillion in revenues, and then reduces the deficit to $252.9 billion next year and then eliminates the deficit in total by fiscal year 1998.

For the past 12 years, the caucus has worked hard on these and other budgets. The alternative budget that we bring before our colleagues today attempts to address the failures of the past by taking into account the realities of the present.

To be sure, the Congressional Black Caucus understands that there continues to be a great deal of pain and suffering and so this alternative budget document reaches out to the homeless also and to the uninsured.

This alternative budget seeks to create new educational opportunities and then to replace the courage of drugs with a sense of hope and compassion to human needs.

Our alternative does not indicate any points of opposition to our President. It simply says that we can do better and we can, in fact, do more.

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, when all is said and done, the budget process and our alternative budget has less to do with politics than it does with the interests of the people who are affected by what we do. The alternative budget we present is fair. It does not pit one segment of our society against another. We are simply concerned that people's interests are protected. The only way we can seek to do that is by being fair and by being compassionate.

This budget we propose today is not about taxing and spending. The alternative budget is about investing and then ultimately receiving dividends on that investment, so we have a choice to pay now, or in fact we can pay later.

We come this afternoon to challenge this House, to confront the real problems of this Nation, and then, after confronting them, to set and make them right again. We are not here for form or fashion, to occupy a place on this floor, to use time or to posture ourselves in any other way.

We have come today to argue the issue of deficits and to argue that those deficits did not come about mysteriously. They came about through misguided priorities.

We are here to argue also for defense, but also out of a realistic understanding that the world has changed. The Warsaw Pact no longer exists. The Soviet Union is but a memory. The Berlin Wall has been reduced to a speed bump, and continued spending of huge amounts on star wars, B-1's and smart bombs while other nations are developing smart minds does not adequately and honestly deal with the people we represent.

We believe that small business development is absolutely crucial. While corporate America continues to downsize and to lay off, it is small business that continues to step forward. This budget embraces that concept and those individuals. It talks about housing and moves us in a real direction.

When the history of this era is written, let it not be said that this House and the Members of this House walked away from an opportunity to really bring about change, walked away from an opportunity, for whatever partisan political wrangling that we ofttimes get involved with, but instead, that we came forward because we were in the North and the South and the East and the West, that we were black and brown and yellow, that we wanted, with white colleagues and black colleagues and people from all sorts of walks of life, to fashion a document that we could bring to this House that we would be proud of, that seeks to reach out to the people of this Nation, wherever they may be.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that Members of this body give serious consideration to both the debate and to the challenge. The challenge is to do more than what we have come here for, and in doing so, to make our plight, which is the plight of the American people, something that is manageable and sensible by realistic budget priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that there is a Member opposed, and we await the opposition debate. I reserve the balance of my time, and inquire of the Chair how much time remains on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute and 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a moment to, first of all, compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and I also, of course, want to pay deep respect to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] and the members of the Black Caucus.

I can tell the Member that I remember back just a few years ago when RON DELLUMS and I would come to the floor and I would get about 20 votes and he would get about 21 votes, for we came here because we believed in things. I have great respect for the document that has been put together, because I do believe it is intellectually honest. I think it is something that the Members have spent time putting together, defining their priorities, and frankly, as we cross the aisle and listen to the debate, there is an awful lot we can learn from the points that the Members make.

I have to say that the Members on this side of the aisle have graduated one from their class, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mike Espy, who reached across the aisle with Jack Kemp in the concept of home ownership reform, and now that gentleman, one of the leaders in the Democratic conference and in their caucus, is now a member of the President's Cabinet.

I come tonight standing in opposition, but really with deep respect for what the Members are trying to do. I just want to commend them for their commitment and courage for putting forward a program that they deeply believe in.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his kind and gracious remarks. I know they are heartfelt, and certaintly received on this side in the same way.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the cochair of the House progressive caucus, the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] and the Black Caucus for the outstanding work they have done, not only this year but for many years, and as the conscience of America.

Mr. Chairman, the President's budget is a very good step forward. But it does not go far enough.

There are 16 million Americans who are unemployed or underemployed, and millions more who work for minimum

wage. If the economy is recovering we haven't seen it in Vermont. It is absolutely appropriate for the Congress to invest in our deteriorating infrastructure—the roads, bridges, mass transportation, and sewer systems which have been so long neglected. We must rebuild America and, in the process, create hundreds of thousands of decent paying jobs. That's the right thing to do and the alternative budget of the Black Caucus and the progressive caucus does it more strongly than any other budget proposal.

Mr. Chairman, it is not acceptable that 5 million of our children go hungry every day; that American kids sleep out on the street and lack adequate health care and that the United States continues to have, by far, the Highest rate of child poverty in the industrialized world. Ultimately, a nation will be judged not be the size of their nuclear arsenal, or by the number of aircraft carriers they possess—but by how they treat the weakest and most vulnerable members of their society—their children. The alternative budget of the Black Caucus and the progressive caucus provides more support for the children of America than any other budget proposal.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation must finally address the huge deficit crisis that we face. We must ask the very richest people in our society, the people who made out like bandits during the 1980's, to finally start paying their fair share of taxes. Further, with the end of the cold war, we no longer need to spend $130 billion a year defending Western Europe and Japan. We can cut military spending substantially. The alternative budget provides more deficit reduction than the proposal offered by the budget committee.

Mr. Chairman, now is the time to show the American people that our government works for all the people—not just the wealthy and the powerful. Now is the time to pass the alternative budget of the Black Caucus and the progressive caucus.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my fellow freshman Republican, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I am here to oppose the proposal, because in many ways it is an improvement over what we are considering to amend. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] suggested that some of our problems have developed because of misplaced priorities. I totally agree. I think priorities probably are more important in determining how we spend our money, rather than increasing taxes.

I am a farmer from Michigan. For a moment, let us try to get some of the tax information out of the mow and down onto the barn floor where we can chew at it a little bit.

What is the goal in reducing deficit spending? I think the goal is to increase savings in this country. This country has a smaller percentage of savings than any of the industrialized countries of the world. Part of that savings is a negative savings because of the overexpenditure of the Federal Government. Part of it is because we have become a consumption economy and we tend not to save, but we have been encouraged to spend, so part of the goal of reducing the deficit is to encourage the amount of money that is available for not only spending for a college education or a new home, but maybe, most importantly, having that money available to spend for improving business and expending business and buying new machinery and tools and equipment.

When we increase taxes, what are we doing? We are reaching into the pocket of what mostly is savings to reduce overspending of the Federal Government, which is a negative spending. In effect, if we are going to really end up with more money that is available to borrow, we have to reduce spending, rather than increasing taxes to deal with the deficit in this country.

I urge my colleagues to consider the fact that now the Federal Government spends half of the total savings of the private sector of the United States of America because of our overindulgence, because of our credit card economy, and our credit card motivations that are putting off the burden to future generations.

I agree with some of the goals and some of the aspirations. I would hope we could realign our priorities to achieve some of those needed objectives, rather than increase taxes.

□ 1840

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS], a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget. This budget demonstrates a true commitment to alleviating the human suffering that many Americans have experienced over the past 12 years. No longer must we sit idly by and cringe at the possibility of the President making an announcement that will take more dollars out of the home and food off the table.

When you support the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget, you will build upon what is good with the Clinton Economic Program. Yet, you will go further in investing in our human capital.

The disproportionate ratio of defense spending to domestic investment is outdated. The CBC alternative will use our peace dividend and invest in the programs people really need. This package will create jobs, feed children, and educate our people.

The American people are screaming for change. Let us hear their cries, and once again invest in our people and their institutions. This investment will stimulate economic growth, and promote the democratic ideal of human dignity. We should do no less.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], who is a real expert on defense.

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

I just want to take this time during these very important budget deliberations to talk a little bit about defense, because this is one area in which we are chartered by the Constitution to provide for the common defense, that is as Members of Congress to see to it that we have adequate navies, armies, and now strategic systems to secure this country. And I think Members may not realize what has happened with respect to defense in this budgeting process.

First, George Bush in his 1993 through 1997 budget brought down the defense budget by $50 billion. He asked Dick Cheney, he ask Colin Powell, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, to put together a budget that they thought will allow for adequate defense and yet secure much-needed dollars to help reduce the deficit, and they came up with a $50 billion cut.

Now the Democratic budget that will be offered, the base budget that was offered by the Budget Committee, is going to pull defense down $112 billion, actually $127 billion in authority but $112 billion in outlays below the Bush budget. So if we add the $112 billion and the $50 billion in cuts, we are actually now $162 billion below the base budget. That is below what we agreed on in 1990 would be the adequate number of dollars needed for national defense.

Let me tell you a few things that are happening in the world right now that I hope are making the White House take a second look at the defense budget, and I hope would make Members of this body take a second look.

First, in the former Soviet Union we still have four states. That is Russia, the Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhistan, which have nuclear weapons. Now theoretically these weapons which happen to be aimed, incidentally, at the United States and our allies, are still under the control of the Soviet rocket forces or the Soviets strategic systems command. But we are not really sure what is going to happen with these missiles. We do not know who has the pink slip on them. The Ukraine is fighting to retain their missiles so that they have autonomous control over these missiles, these strategic warheads that can hit the United States. Mr. Yeltsin now

has been paralyzed by the hardliners in Congress. He cannot move. We do not know what is going to happen. Some intelligence analysts in the world say that Mr. Yeltsin will be gone in a few months. That has been said before, but nonetheless, this is a very dangerous situation.

If we move to Bosnia we still are in a very unstable situation which has a great opportunity for increased violence, a great opportunity or a great possibility that United States forces may at some time be required to move and respond. And we have to look at that situation and realize that we cannot just walk away from Europe because the confrontation with the Soviet Union in Europe seems to be winding down.

If we go to North Korea, we will see that the North Koreans just pulled out of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The North Koreans are building nuclear systems. And a further danger is that the North Koreans are building ICBM's and have ICBM capability to meet up with those nuclear weapons. There is a major danger there. They have a government that is very aggressive.

If we move further into the area of nuclear proliferation around the world, we see abut 20 nations that are acquiring ICBM capability. They are acquiring ICBM capability and at the same time developing, as Libya did, chemical capability and nuclear capability.

So we are leaving this era of confrontation with the Soviet Union, we think we are leaving this era, but we are entering into a new era of terrorists with high technology. And what we are doing in this budget, in the Democrat-based budget is we are going far below and making far deeper cuts than the cuts that Secretary Aspin as the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee advocated.

Let me tell Members what Chairman Aspin said we ought to do in his so-called option C. He said we need to have enough strength to do a couple of things. We have got to be able to fight a Desert Storm conflict, and at the same time have enough left over to have a contingency operation and also carry out air operations should North Korea invade the South.

The Democrat-based budget is $60 billion below that Aspin level that is manifested on this chart.

We should vote against the Democrat budget.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to share the Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus views with this august body. It is difficult in 2 minutes to try to unload the last 12 years of heavy deficit burden that has been placed on our shoulders.

Nevertheless, very few people have the courage to admit that the only way we can handle this is cut back spending, and yes, get beyond the fiscal policy that exists in "read my lips."

President Clinton has had the courage to state that the only way that we can do it is increase taxes as we move forward to cut spending, and always to remember that unless we have all of our Americans working and productive that we are losing not only our competitive edge, but we are losing the ability to raise revenues. To that end we have lauded the President's efforts and believe that we can do better, and that we can do more, that we do not need an energy tax, even though we do have the earned income tax credit. We can remove that and start moving toward weatherization, that we do not have to put caps, remove the expansion of the Social Security tax from 50 percent to 85 percent, put to do something that people do not like to do, to say that we are prepared to increase the taxes to pay for that.

So what we have done is increase the individual taxes from 36 to 38 percent, put a surtax on the corporate tax making a combination of $12.2 billion increase, increase the capital gains tax from 28 percent to 31 percent raising another $3.5 billion, putting a cap on mortgage deductions and removing the $1 million principal that we have, bringing it to a more realistic $300,000, taking away the second home deduction.

□ 1850

By combining this, what we have done is reduced the deficit by $15.1 billion and increased revenue by $23.7 billion. It is a good way to go, and I thank the efforts of both the caucuses, Progressive and Black, for allowing us once again to present our views to the House.

Some are attacking the Congressional Black Caucus budget for its revenue provisions. As I said in the debate last night the caucus has generally been ahead of its time when it comes to tax provisions.

For a long time it pushed the concept that it made no sense to tax the working poor; and in the Tax Reform Act of 1986 Congress took millions of working poor off the tax rolls. Similarly it has been pushing for tax incentives to deal with social inequities and they have been recognized in the low-income housing tax credit and the targeted jobs tax credit that we applaud are being made permanent in this proposal.

The caucus has, in every budget it has presented, called for fiscal responsibility while being able to address the problems of our Nation that required investment in people now if we are to avoid the cost of failure in our communities in the future.

The Congressional Black Caucus always recognized that during the Reagan-Bush years that the tax system was skewed to help the rich with the belief their wealth would trickle down for everyone else. This policy resulted in outrageous redistribution of wealth during the decade and in a failure to invest in our people. The caucus was always ready to challenge this empty fiscal policy of "Read my lips."

The Congressional Black Caucus always believed, as the American people are now so clearly indicating, that they are ready to sacrifice and redirect their resources to invest in the future.

The Congressional Black Caucus applauds the President's budget. It is a major step forward in the investment in our people that we need so desperately if we are to turn around the drain on our economy from poverty, drugs, crime, and despair. But, we and the progressive coalition believe we can do better. We offer a tax proposal that is more progressive and is part of the budget that will reduce the deficit to a level even lower than either the President's budget or the Budget Committee's product while providing comparable, if not more concentrated, investment in our people.

On taxes, we strongly stand by our time-honored belief in a more progressive tax code.

That is why we remove the broad-based energy excise tax. That and do not include expanded taxation of Social Security for retirees with incomes as low as $25,000. We know that the increases in the earned income tax credit, energy assistance, and the food stamps will provide some cushion, but we know how bad poor people have had it for the past decade and we know that these offsets are not likely to be sufficient to make up for their losses and the addition of these increases in energy costs.

We cannot understand why we have to continue to subsidize luxury housing while so many are still homeless or ill housed or doubled or tripled up in inner-city apartments. That is why the Congressional Black Caucus would drop the limit on the mortgage from $1 million to $300,000 of principle and eliminate the deduction for second homes.

We are fearful, as many economists are, that with a higher marginal tax rate for the well-off that the 28 percent rate for capital gains will only encourage the gaming and sheltering that we saw prior to the 1986 reform act. Therefore, we would raise the capital gains rate to 31 percent. There will still be a differential, but not as great.

We believe that the corporations in the Nation must also pay their fair share and that it makes sense to keep the top corporate and individual rates close together. Therefore, the Congressional Black Caucus proposes to raise the corporate rate to 38 percent.

I have always been proud of the Congressional Black Caucus budget. In past years we have found our budget too far away from the one that comes down from Pennsylvania Avenue. Today, we are pleased that our proposal and the President's are so much closer together in numbers and in spirit. Because we know that we have to reduce the deficit, cut the overgrowing burden of interest costs, and redeploy our assets to win the economic war of competition by investing in all our people, including those who have, or are on the verge of, losing hope if we are to ensure a better America for all our children.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the Congressional Black Caucus for its serious and intellectually honest effort to present a budget alternative.

While I disagree with the details of this budget, I want to affirm that there is no problem in America more important than saving the inner city, no problem in America more important than addressing the concerns of the poorest and neediest of Americans.

I look forward very much to working with this reinvigorated and expanded Black Caucus in finding some common and bipartisan efforts to truly help the neediest of Americans.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I would like the RECORD to indicate that in the past where there have been programs targeted to help the poor and the homeless that the gentleman from Georgia has been cooperative, and we in the caucus look forward to any way that we can work together starting today.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE], a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the first time since the end of the cold war our country will be allowed to make significant reductions in our national defense budget, finally realizing the elusive peace dividend.

There is a national consensus that we have an obligation to place most of the savings to take better care of our domestic needs by stimulating the economy, creating jobs, and reducing the national debt. But, at the same time, the Congressional Black Caucus takes the strong position that we also have an obligation to right the wrongs of this same cold war, problems that were created in Africa.

Looking at Somalia as a perfect example, no guns are manufactured in Somalia, but there are more guns in Somalia than any country in the world per person. We say that African countries were used as pawns by both the United States and the former Soviet Union in the cold war. In some countries, the two world powers switched alliances, like in Somalia, as some colleges switch basketball coaches.

We have a moral obligation as Americans who have always stood for fairness and humanitarian values to do the right thing now.

We support the reauthorization of the $100 million flexible fund for the Africa Relief, Rehabilitation, and Recovery Fund, also the United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking, and the United Nations specialized agencies like UNICEF, UNHCR, and UNDP which will also require additional support. The United States should pay up all of its back dues.

We finally request that the African Development Fund receive $1 billion for fiscal year 1994, an increase of $200 million. This is an investment in the future in sustainable development for an environmentally free African continent. America can do no less.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I came to Washington 12 years ago with Ronald Reagan.

After 4 years of having liberal Democrats control both Houses of Congress and the Presidency, our country was left with the highest interest rates and the highest inflation in this century. We had higher unemployment rates and a negative growth rate than what we have today.

As we set out to clean up the mess, all we heard for the last 12 years was carping and nitpicking from the liberals who put us in the hole in the first place. Over and over again, our program of low taxes and deregulation and controlled spending was ridiculed as trickle-down economics.

No matter how the liberals want to rewrite history, the 1980's resulted in at least moderate improvement in the well-being of Americans at every income level. That is because they were focusing on job creation in the private sector, on rewarding hard work and investment, and on relieving the economy-killing tax and regulatory burden on the people. Almost 20 million new jobs were created with low inflation, low interest rates, and decreasing unemployment. We killed the stagnation monster created by the irresponsibility of the Democrats.

By the way, all the liberals and leftist professors who claimed the Reagan years were so bad have intentionally put the last 2 years of the Carter administration into their calculations of how they analyzed the Reagan years. Those years were so bad that they would drag down any analysis of what the Reagan years are all about.

Yes, the deficit did go up under the Reagan years, but let me say that had the same economic figures and the same economic trends that continued during the Carter years, had it continued during the Reagan years, we would have had a much higher deficit much earlier on.

Well, now the liberal spenders have again captured control of both Houses of Congress and the Presidency. What do they propose to do? Enact the largest tax increase in American history, and they promised not to hit the middle class, and now they propose to clobber the middle class and everybody else.

In 1990 these very same liberal Democrats pressured George Bush into a tax increase in the name of scaling back spending. Well, the spending was never scaled back. I predicted then it would knock the legs out from under the economy and throw people out of work and result in a higher, instead of lower, deficit. That is exactly what happened, and George Bush lost his Presidency in the process.

Incredibly, the economic hardship created by their last tax increase is now being used to justify another tax increase and a further increase in spending which they call stimulus spending—1990 was really the end of the Reagan economic era.

Today, however, we make it official. This budget makes it official. They are back in control, and I predict the economy is going down, and they are going to have to take credit for it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], a fellow freshman.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to register my opposition to the $16.2 billion so-called stimulus package that the House will vote on today. This package will add $16.2 billion to the deficit at a time when Americans want the deficit cut.

I would like to point out some of the items in this appropriations package. These items do not constitute an emergency and they will not create jobs—$28 million to forgive D.C.'s budget deficit; $117 million for the National Institute on Standards and Technology; $22 million for historical preservation; $23 million to promote a green agenda; $28 million for alternative fuel vehicles; $148 million to the IRS for new equipment; and $38 million for buildings at the Agricultural Research Service.

The list goes on the on. This package is full of pork to pay off political constituencies. Everyone gets something. Everyone except the American taxpayer who gets stuck with the bill.

The administration claims that this stimulus package, which will cost $30 billion when the tax incentives are added, will create 500,000 jobs. Even if this were true, each job is costing $60,000. This is ridiculous when the private sector can create a job for $40,000. And the truth is that this deficit spending program combined with the Democrat tax hikes will destroy more jobs in the private sector than it will create in the Government sector.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my fellow freshman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA].

□ 1900

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I brought my 7-year-old daughter, Alicia, to the floor with me when I voted. Looking at her optimistic face, it troubles me to think that Congress

is running up massive expenses that will burden her 20 years from now when she is starting her family and career.

Think about it—today's purchases will be tomorrow's headaches for your children and mine.

Is it not ironic that our voting cards are about the same size as a credit card. The spend now, pay later credit card addiction runs rampant in Congress. Members of Congress just insert their cards in a slot and run up the Nation's bills without worrying about paying for them right now.

But eventually someone will have to pay these bills.

Today we will be voting on a budget which promises deficit reduction but delivers debt. I urge my colleagues to think about the future happiness of our children and the future strength of our country when they vote today.

Let us not use our voting cards as credit cards to run up the Federal deficit. Let us be responsible and vote against this budget.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, like many of the Republicans, I admire the Black Caucus budget. Unlike them, I plan also to vote for it. The caucus has done the best job, it seems to me, of any of the budgets presented to us in allocating spending according to where it ought to go. No budget is perfect. There are elements of this I would disagree with; when specific implementation came forward, I would vote against one or two pieces. But overall they have done the best job in saying that the victory of the United States in the cold war frees up substantial resources for us to use elsewhere.

They correctly point out that many of those resources in the first instance should go to easing the pain and transition of those who have served this country. The Black Caucus budget deals very well with the short-term problem of those who will be disadvantaged, but it does by far the best job of taking advantage over the longer term of providing funds where we need them: Clean water, housing, et cetera. In the United States this is the best budget for putting the resources where they need to be. If it fails, I will be pleased to vote for the second best budget, but this is the best one today.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Black Caucus, and I also agree that they have made an effort. Let me talk about a few areas that I would totally disagree, as a businessperson.

I was at Miramar Naval Air Station just 2 weeks ago, and a young man came up to me, he was a pilot. He said, "DUKE, I am an American; I am not an African-American. I want to explain to you why. I was an enlisted man, and I worked real hard in the Navy and the officers noticed me and they recognized me for the officer program. I worked hard in the officer program, and they elected me to go to pilot training." He is now a young pilot.

Many of the young men and women that serve in our military forces today receive an education by far better than they would in any vocational school that exists in this country today, better than you would from any conversion dollars that you will use today.

I think when you cut the military, you also cut the minority programs. Last week, two of our Democratic Senators from the State of California stood up and said, "We don't want any of our bases to be closed. It impacts our economy too much." But those same two Senators 3 days ago voted to cut $127 billion from the defense programs. You cannot have it both ways. What we need to take a look at, I think, is a balanced defense program that not only aids the military but defends this country and at the same time provides those programs for the inner city. I want to remind the gentleman from the other side that the 29th of March is the anniversary of the Los Angeles riots. If we really want to do something, we need to come up and get some programs that affect those areas.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS].

Mr. TOWNS. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to my good friend, the gentlemen from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] that this budget deals with the Los Angeles riots. That is what this budget is all about. It deals with the problems in terms of what happened in Los Angeles.

Mr. Chairman, over the past 12 years, America has been gutted. The inner cities and rural areas have been decimated by Government policies which taxed the middle class and gave the rich tax breaks. The scheme bankrupted America, destroyed the spirit of this country for millions of her people, and created a culture of greed and expediency which continues to eat away at the foundations of this country. It is time to rebuild America and place the firm foundation of the American dream in every heart. The CBC alternative budget is the only measure which can do this.

Our budget provides meaningful economic opportunities for those citizens who are able and willing to work, own and become active participants in the economic life of our country. It provides a helping hand to those who have been displaced by changes in the civilian economy or the military atmosphere. It is a sane and humane response to the deeply entrenched and longstanding problems in this Nation.

It is in this budget alternative that their hopes can be made real and their dreams can be given a chance. It is in this budget to rebuild America and provide hope and a change to people who have struggled with unbearable hardships for 12 long years but who refuse to go away and be forgotten. It is in their names that we offer this budget to rebuild their hopes and give their lives and dreams a chance. It is only through this kind of intense infusion of assistance and revenue raising that we can begin to heal the economic hemorrhage that has sapped the lifeblood from every artery in this country.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

The clerk read as follows:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana moves that the committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that resolving clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, it is 5 minutes on each side, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for interrupting the proceedings, but we have a very important reason for doing that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mrs. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. First, I want to applaud my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME], who has spoken so eloquently in behalf of the Black Caucus alternative. Because of my deep respect for him and his beliefs, I wish I could go along with it. However, as I understand it, this alternative calls for substantial hike in taxes.

Mr. Chairman, somewhere along the line many Members in this House are forgetting that the American Revolution was kicked off as a result of taxes, more specifically taxes without representation.

For example, Mr. BURTON and I were prevented from bringing our plans, which are parallel, because they call for a flat freeze of all Federal expenditures plus 2-percent increase across the board. This combination would balance the budget by the year 2000 without any increase in taxes of any kind, and that would help not only those areas that the Black Caucus want to boost as

well as all America, again without raising taxes.

The only real difference between Mr. BURTON's and mine is that I included reconciliation language instructing the Committee of the Whole to reduce what the budget experts say was necessary, the expenditures, by $17.1 billion.

□ 1910

I wanted that so it could be seen by everybody that the budget process was taken out of the back rooms and on to C-SPAN for the public to see. This is the only time the whole budget would be in front of Congress and all Members should be allowed to offer their alternatives, to offer specific budget cuts.

That is the way it should be, in my opinion.

An example. I would cite the efforts of many people to cut the honey subsidy, but the merits of that subsidy should be weighed against everyone else's—in one forum, in one discussion.

When production line workers from McDonnell-Douglas lose their jobs to DOD cuts, these workers have a right to know why. If we show them that their paychecks are being taken away so that others can receive subsidies of one kind or another, these workers will understand what is going on.

That is honesty. We owe them that.

We all need a chance to have more than an up or down vote. I could not support the Kasich program because my constituents are impacted by cutting Amtrak and the Federal workers would be treated unfairly. I wanted to offer amendments, but no rifle shot amendments were made in order.

During the discussion on the rule, Mr. BEILENSON made reference to the fact that some of the proposed amendments would have taken much time on the floor, and the Rules Committee nixed them.

I think the majority was wrong. I believe the country does want to see honey subsidies, defense, and highways debated. In my opinion, last year's election was a referendum on opening up the process.

Since I first proposed an across-the-board freeze in 1988, I have talked to many people, from farmers to seniors to veterans to Federal workers. They all say the same thing: "The budget should not be balanced on my back alone." All of them have been willing to shoulder the burden—if everyone else also does.

Equity, and equity alone, should drive the budget talks.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her kind comments.

Let me just say that we have not had the luxury of bringing our freeze plus 2 percent to the floor for a vote because the Rules Committee would not allow it; so what we have had to do all day long is find a way to bring this to the floor so that people could vote up or down whether or not they want a freeze plus 2 percent, which will get us to a balanced budget by the year 2000 without a tax increase.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that our program will not hit the COLA's of senior citizens on Social Security or Federal employees or military retirees. It is a program that will work under the 2 percent cap, and we can get to a balanced budget without the $402 billion in tax increases that President Clinton wants and it will do the job.

The only problem is, it pinches some toes. The American people are willing to sacrifice, but they do not want to spend more taxes. They want us to take a meat cleaver to spending. This is the way to do it.

My colleagues, we will be having a vote on this, so if you are for the freeze plus 2 percent instead of these huge tax increases, I hope you will support the Bentley-Burton proposal.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, obviously I rise in opposition to the motion. We are proceeding with the debate. We intend to move to the conclusion of the budget resolution this evening.

I would urge Members to vote "no" on the Burton motion.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in support of the position enunciated just a moment ago by the chairman of the Budget Committee.

We believe that striking the enacting clause of this bill is the wrong thing to do. It has been an orderly process. We hope to continue that way.

We recognize there are diverse and oftentimes clashing differences on the budget that have been before us, both this budget proposal and the two preceding ones, but we believe quite frankly that to strike the enacting clause is the wrong thing to do and would urge Members to resist the gentleman's motion.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 122, noes 302, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

AYES—122

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bateman
Bentley
Bilirakis
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Canady
Castle
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Hancock
Hefley
Herger
Hoekstra
Horn
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Inhofe
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kim
King
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Michel
Moorhead
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Weldon
Williams
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—302

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Inslee
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)

Neal (NC)	Rowland	Stupak
Norton (DC)	Roybal-Allard	Swett
Oberstar	Rush	Swift
Obey	Sabo	Synar
Olver	Sanders	Tanner
Ortiz	Sangmeister	Tauzin
Orton	Sarpalius	Taylor (MS)
Owens	Sawyer	Tejeda
Pallone	Schenk	Thomas (CA)
Parker	Schiff	Thornton
Pastor	Schroeder	Thurman
Payne (NJ)	Schumer	Torres
Payne (VA)	Scott	Torricelli
Pelosi	Sensenbrenner	Towns
Penny	Serrano	Traficant
Peterson (FL)	Sharp	Tucker
Peterson (MN)	Shaw	Underwood (GU)
Pickett	Shays	Unsoeld
Pickle	Shepherd	Valentine
Pomeroy	Shuster	Velazquez
Porter	Sisisky	Vento
Poshard	Skaggs	Visclosky
Price (NC)	Skeen	Volkmer
Pryce (OH)	Skelton	Walsh
Rahall	Slattery	Waters
Rangel	Slaughter	Watt
Reed	Smith (IA)	Wheat
Regula	Smith (OR)	Whitten
Reynolds	Snowe	Wilson
Richardson	Spratt	Wise
Ridge	Stark	Woolsey
Roemer	Stenholm	Wyden
Rose	Stokes	Wynn
Rostenkowski	Strickland	Yates
Roukema	Studds	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Clinger	Maloney	Taylor (NC)
Faleomavaega (AS)	Myers	Washington
Ford (TN)	Quillen	Waxman
Henry	Romero-Barcelo (PR)	

□ 1935

Mr. PORTER and Mr. MILLER of California changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ZELIFF, ROTH, THOMAS of Wyoming, McINNIS, EMERSON, STUMP, McCANDLESS, PAXON, DORNAN, STEARNS, GALLEGLY, COBLE, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, would it be a violation of the rules of the House to characterize a Member as petulant and puerile for continuing to call a series of unnecessary rollcall votes to interrupt the business of this House and the orderly debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that that is not a proper parliamentary inquiry.

The Chair would announce that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 11 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate first the Black Caucus for coming up with a budget. Having been a freshman member of the Committee on the Budget. I know how hard it is to put a budget together. I hope their budget gets much more respect from their side of the aisle than our budget did.

Mr. Chairman, in my district in southwest Florida where we have a large number of retirees and small businesses, my constituents have said, "DAN, we are willing to make a sacrifice, we are willing to contribute, but we want to make sure the Government does their fair share first."

Mr. Chairman, that is the basic problem with this plan and the next plan we are going to be voting on. This plan asks for the people to give now and the Government is going to sacrifice some years in the future, maybe in the 104th Congress or the 105th Congress, when many of the Members in this room will not even be here. That is when they are going to sacrifice.

Mr. Chairman, that is the problem with this plan, that it does not have spending now and spending first.

The other problem is when we talk about jobs and the economy and stimulating the economy, I do know a little bit about that as a businessman and a former college professor in business school. What that tells me is I do not understand what economic theory tells you that more taxes generate jobs and stimulates an economy.

□ 1940

Basic Economics 101 tells us more taxes has that reverse effect. In fact, some studies have been out. DRI-McGraw Hill predicts in 1997–98 more than 700,000 jobs will be lost as a result of the fiscal drag due to the tax increases in the Clinton plan. And this plan is even worse. This plan raises taxes by $421 billion more than the Clinton plan. It increases spending by $141 billion more on the domestic side.

The Goldman Sachs report says the same thing. Taxing income reduces work effort and will yield less revenue than expected.

The people in Florida in my district are saying, "We need to cut the spending first." That is the best way to stimulate the economy, not by raising taxes now and spending at some future date.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget, with particular appreciation for the way they dealt with function 150.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the sponsors of the Congressional Black Caucus budget for what I view as innovative, farseeing approaches to a number of our national challenges.

Specific among these is the Caucus budget's proposal for international affairs—function 150. The CBC budget allows prudent but needed increases for the function, to fund critical national needs in peacekeeping and development aid.

In the development assistance area, the CBC budget includes much-needed increases for the Africa Development Fund. This is consistent with campaigns that I have participated in in years past to restore and maintain the ADF account at $1 billion.

In doing this, the CBC budget's authors have recognized the fundamental reality of our changing definition of national security. Foreign aid, which accounts for less than 1 per cent of our Federal budget, is a priceless investment providing huge returns to the American public.

Foreign aid is in our political interest. Economic security contributes to political stability and a world that is safer for our children. U.S. development assistance is a vital tool to help children escape disease, starvation, and the ravages of epidemics.

Foreign aid is also our economic interest. By the year 2000 four out of five consumers will reside in developing nations. These countries already provide markets for more than $128 billion, or 30 percent, of U.S. exports, supporting over a million American jobs. Without sustained economic growth, the purchasing power of the developing world will decline. Economic assistance increases the effective demand of foreign markets.

Bilateral foreign aid is cheap: less than one percent of the total Federal budget and a fraction of a percent of GNP. Foreign aid has also taken more than its share of budget cuts during the Gramm-Rudman years, slashed from a total of over $19 billion to $15.8 billion since fiscal year 1985.

I may have one or two problems with other areas of the CBC budget but, as I indicated, I commend its authors for their constructive approach on international affairs. I intend to vote for their substitute, and urge like-minded Members to join me.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget presented by the Black Caucus, a real investment for America's children and America's families and urge its passage.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAMBURG].

Mr. HAMBURG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the budget as presented by the Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the Virgin Islands [Mr. DE LUGO].

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the proposal of the Black Caucus and commend them for a proposal well thought out and a real investment in our country.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN].

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the Black Caucus for the tremendous job that he has done on this budget and rise in strong support of the budget.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, the rejection of the motion to strike all after the enacting clause was a very significant vote in that it showed a new attitude that now is sweeping through this Chamber with regard to this very important budget proposal, which follows a tradition of a dozen Congressional Black Caucus budgets that have been a part of this debate for as many years.

And I think that it is very appropriate that we notice that tonight this caucus is joined by yet another caucus in support.

We notice that the Members on the other side of the aisle have approached with the same conviction and seriousness and inquiry into the Congressional Black Caucus budget that the Members who put it together have, and I want to sincerely compliment those Members who have taken the time to examine our budget. I hope that they will join us in a vote.

In addition, we have a complementary staff report from the Committee on Government Operations that justifies the increased military reductions and the increased spending on the domestic side, because we have $310 billion of existing cuts that can be made due to inefficiency and waste. The Vice President of this Nation is heading the task force to reinvent Government in that respect.

I would urge that everyone consider this budget in as careful a way as they can, because it is my belief that this budget will soon be the budget that we will test the will of the American people to turn this Federal Government around.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my fellow freshman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand here a copy of a one-page pictorial essay from Reader's Digest, January 1993. What it does is to rate the moral and ethical standards of several groups of people in our country:

Small business owners, 64 percent; journalists, big surprise, 39 percent; business executives, 31 percent; lawyer, 25 percent; Member of Congress, 19 percent.

Nineteen percent of the people in the country think that Members of Congress have acceptable moral and ethnical standards. I ask a question relative to the two votes that we are shortly going to make. Do my colleagues really believe that those voters out there, only 19 percent of whom believe that Congress has acceptable moral and ethnical standards, really want this Congress to take their money and spend it for them?

I ask my colleagues to respect the intelligence, the wishes of the American people and please leave the money in the private sector where it will create jobs, real jobs and wealth. Honor their evaluation and the vote that they are making for what we ought to do in these next two votes.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Black Caucus values-based budget and compliment the gentleman for bringing this excellent product to the floor.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this is the first honest Presidential budget in 12 years. This amendment builds on that budget. It recognizes that while we must get the deficit under control, we must also get our economy in order.

We are investing in our public infrastructure at one-half the rate of our competitors. Private investment has decreased from 10 percent in the 1960's to 3 percent.

Our productivity is increasing at one-sixth the Japanese rate.

The President's budget starts us on the road to rebuilding our economy by investing in our country. This amendment recognizes that with the elimination of the Soviet military threat, we can do much more by shifting significant funding from defense to human infrastructure development.

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, first let me congratulate the Black Caucus and also my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for a job well done in presenting some alternatives to this body. I wish we could have more of these kinds of elaborate debates and have the House work its will on a lot of other issues.

The reason I am coming here is because this package is being called a lot of things.

We heard in the Committee on Ways and Means that the real problem here and the real problem for this change that we want in this bill is because this has been a jobless recovery. I cannot tell my colleagues the number of times I have heard the President and Members on this side of the aisle say that this has been a jobless recovery. We need to do something about creating jobs in America. We can have all this growth, as we did in the 1980's, but did not create job growth that we need.

□ 1950

This recovery is not a job growth kind of recovery. We are going to pass this package to create jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I want the Members to hear this. The administration's own numbers, their own numbers on unemployment over the next 5 years, look at them. We will be happy to give them to the Members.

By 1996, 1997, and 1998 and every year in between, the difference between their own projections, and Mr. Chairman, I agree that this is a bit of a laughing matter if we look at the difference between what will happen with the unemployment rate under the administration's own projections, between whether we pass this package and whether we do not.

In 1997, under the administration's own projections, the unemployment rate, if we do nothing today, if we do not change America, will be 5.8 percent. Under the plan, if the plan passes, do Members know what the unemployment rate will be, the dramatic growth of unemployment in America? Under their own projections, 5.7 percent, one-tenth of 1 percent.

This does not just apply to 1997. Look for every year in between, the same thing; 1-percent, one-tenth of 1 percent difference in growth of an employment. That, to me, to go and raise taxes a quarter of a trillion dollars over 5 years for one-tenth of 1 percent, is not a dramatic change in America.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I, like many of my colleagues, am very pleased that the President has submitted a budget that pays more than lip service to the needs of Americans, both poor and not so poor. I applaud his efforts, but I must say that the various budget proposals that have been debated on the floor of this body thus far have fallen short of the needs of my constituents who have been ignored by past administrations for far too long. The Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus alternative budget addresses these concerns.

For example, the CBC and Progressive Caucus budget increases the funding for several important programs including community development banks and the Community Reinvestment Act. Banks like Chicago's South Shore Bank and programs like the women's self employment project have shown the world that people can provide for themselves if given the opportunity through good lending programs. These initiatives provide entrepreneurial-

thinking low income citizens the ability to get capital to start businesses that will create for themselves and others a way out of poverty. I can think of no better way to invest in the future of America than to tap the potential that is dormant today among the poor of our country.

Further, the CBC budget puts a premium on education and training. It provides $2 billion more in funding for the Pell Grant Program, specifically to raise maximum grant awards from $2,300 to $3,000. This change brings this program a little closer to the reality of college costs in 1993 which, as any of you with children can appreciate, have grown dramatically. The importance of this program cannot be overstated. Pell grants are a major way that we ensure that the hope of a better life exists for children growing up poor in America.

This budget provides $2.4 billion in funding for substance abuse prevention and treatment. Drug-related crime is rampant in America in spite of what those of you who would end the Select Committee on Narcotics might think. Any budget we approve must provide for funds to tackle this very difficult problem. In some areas of the Seventh Congressional District there is the constant late night drug trafficking. Every recognized authority on the subject has pointed to the need for more treatment sources, and for the targeting of our resources on hard to reach and at risk populations as well as increased law enforcement. The CBC alternative provides for both.

Additional funds for transportation, community development block grants, and other infrastructure-building programs will shore up our physical communities while they provide needed jobs to fan the flames of the economic recovery which have only just begun to burn.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased today that the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus have offered this alternative. At some point we must focus on the social and economic disasters that our cities and communities have come to resemble. If not today, when? I urge my colleagues to support this reasoned and principled alternative budget proposal.

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

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER].

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I overwhelmingly and unequivocally rise in support of the alternative budget that has been propounded by the CBC, the Congressional Black Caucus, and the Progressive Caucus.

As a new Member of Congress, I am enlightened by the fact that in this year if the President's budget proposal passes, we will fully fund Head Start. However, it has been edifying to me to know that years ago the Congressional Black Caucus had the vision to fully fund Head Start through its alternative budget proposals.

It is enlightening to all of us to know that Members like the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] and the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] and many others have the vision that this country has needed for so long to do what is morally right.

When I hear people talk on the other side of the aisle about what is morally right, and then they talk about raising taxes, and when they raised taxes for 12 years but the taxes they raised never trickled down to the people who needed them, then I understand that they do not understand the meaning of morality.

Mr. Chairman, this budget may not pass tonight, but one day the fruits of its morality will be reaped.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman how many more speakers he has remaining.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I have two speakers remaining, but under the rule I reserve the right to close debate. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to conclude by saying that I congratulate the Black Caucus for bringing the issue up of this particular budget proposal. It brings up issues that are very important to us, of inner city problems and minority problems, and I think that need to be brought up.

In my district in Florida, which is mainly a retiree district, we have different issues and problems. I think it is important that we have had this dialog, and I congratulate them.

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

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REYNOLDS].

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus substitute.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I specifically rise to support the alternative budget, but also specifically to respond to the two gentlemen from California, one of whom was kind enough to remind us that there is a provision in the Constitution that requires us to provide for the common defense, and the other of whom was kind enough to tell us the reasons we had riots in Los Angeles.

I want to remind them that there is in the same sense in the Constitution a requirement that we ensure domestic tranquility and promote the general welfare. We will have difficulty doing that if the disparity between the rich and the poor continues to grow.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, to close debate, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] for his efforts, and thank him very much for giving me the privilege to close this debate.

Mr. Chairman, on more than one occasion I have stood either in the well of the House or in this place to suggest to all of my colleagues that the most important function in which we can engage is the business of establishing the national budget of this country, because the national budget in a very powerful and profound way reflects our values, our principles, and ultimately, our priorities.

It is thus against that backdrop, Mr. Chairman, that I rise with a great sense of pride and purpose to embrace and wholeheartedly support the budget articulated by my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus and the progressive caucus, because it speaks to the highest and the best in us. It is a budget based on courage, boldness, vision, dignity, and integrity.

It is rooted in two realities: on the one hand, the reality that the cold war is over, the Berlin Wall is down, and the Soviet Union has disintegrated; and the second reality, that our people are suffering in unprecedented terms, and we have a moral and intellectual, a political and economic obligation to address that human misery.

This budget is also rooted in the reality of conversion which ultimately, in the long term, will speak to the best of this Nation; fiscal conversion, on the one hand, allowing us to convert from spending billions and billions of dollars building a monument to military madness, on the one hand, to begin to address the myriad social problems of our fellow human beings on the other.

□ 2000

The military budget is capital intensive; the nonmilitary budget is labor intensive. Therefore, this budget has stated in clear and unequivocal terms that the extent to which you address the problems of the poor, the hungry, the malnourished, the underemployed, the undereducated, the infirm and the senior citizens of our society that you simultaneously, first, address social problems, and second, generate employment.

It is also rooted in the reality of structural conversion. How do we real-

ly convert from B-2 bombers to mass transit systems? How do we move from building weapons of destruction that we no longer need to enhance the quality of human life?

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus and the progressive caucus challenge each and every one of us here to the highest and the best that is in us. This moment is above politics. This moment should be beyond partisanship. This moment should be above parochialism. This moment should be rooted in principle, in dignity and integrity. And the extent to which you agree with me is the extent to which you will join my distinguished colleagues who have presented an extraordinary proposal to you to challenge us to our highest and our best.

I thank my colleague for this magnificent opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 87, noes 335, answered "present" 5, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

AYES—87

Abercrombie
Andrews (ME)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
de Lugo (VI)
DeFazio
Dellums
Dixon
Engel
Evans
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Furse
Grandy
Green
Gutierrez
Hamburg
Hastings
Hilliard
Hinchey
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kopetski
Lewis (GA)
Markey
McDermott
McKinney
Meek
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Nadler
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Olver
Owens
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Rahall
Rangel
Reynolds
Richardson
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanders
Schroeder
Scott
Serrano
Stark
Stokes
Torres
Towns
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Velazquez
Vento
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—335

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Fish
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inslee
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Royce
Sabo
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Valentine
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Bonilla
Gingrich
Herger
Inhofe
Menendez

NOT VOTING—8

Dingell
Edwards (CA)
Faleomavaega (AS)
Ford (TN)
Henry
Myers
Quillen
Romero-Barcelo (PR)

□ 2020

Mr. KYL, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Messrs. SAXTON, TAYLOR of North Carolina, BURTON of Indiana, KOLBE, and GOODLING changed their vote from "present" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to resume general debate on House Concurrent Resolution 64.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], will be recognized for 10 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, we have only one speaker, our concluding speaker. I understand the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has two, so I will defer to him.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, we have had 2 days of what I think has been particularly interesting, even at times scintillating debate between our two parties as we have contrasted two budget proposals representing the two contesting visions of public policy represented by our parties and the very substantial, real differences between our parties.

Now, the fact of the matter is the Democratic Party has control of the entire apparatus of Government.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States has submitted his proposal for a budget to govern the U.S. Government. It is a proposal that I disagree with as being either good Government, good public policy, deficit reduction or job creating.

As I see it, he has asked us to accept a proposal that gives us the single largest tax increase in the history of the country. At the same time we accept that tax increase now on virtually all Americans, he asks us to accept a Government spending program.

Drive this economy forward, the President says with one foot on the accelerator and the other on the brake. It

may work. I sincerely hope, for the American people, that the President's proposal works. But I doubt that it will. I think it is bad policy. I am obliged to say so out of respect to the President and out of duty to my constituents.

The fundamental problem that I have with the President's proposal is it will not work to achieve the desired ends of economic growth, job creation, revenue generation to the Federal Government, and then subsequently deficit reduction.

If I thought this program would work, I would ask you to vote for it. This program is based on the misguided idea that we can solve the problems of this country by growing the Government.

Let me just say I want to thank the Democrat majority; the old adage in politics is, "If you have the votes, vote; if you do not, debate." They have worked hard on their side of the aisle, the President has worked hard on their side of the aisle, and they have managed to get the votes on their side of the aisle to pass the President's program.

So, they did not have to allow us a debate, and yet they did. The feature of that debate was the Kasich Republican budget proposal. That proposal, in my judgment, won the debate. The hero of the 1993 budget debate is JOHN KASICH from Ohio because he met the challenge, he and his Budget Committee brought forth the detailed proposition to get an even greater deficit reduction by cutting the size of Government and allowing the private sector to grow. And when the private sector grows, as the 1980's have taught us, revenue accrues to the Government. And if we can grow the private sector and contain growth of the public sector, we can, as we put our children back to work in America, resolve the problem of the deficit.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and his proposal won the debate. You Democrats will win the vote, we know that. The President will be allowed to govern with his Democrat Party and the consequences will be felt and judged by the American people. But when that judgment is over and when those consequences are felt, if I am correct in my judgment of the vitality or the lack thereof of the President's proposal, if I am correct in my judgment of the correctness of the Kasich proposal and the vision represented by it, the American people will come back with a different conclusion some day at the polling place. If I am incorrect in my understanding, you Democrats will prosper as a party, as you should.

Mr. Chairman, I remain convinced that in the long run the American people will be governed by good public policy born out of correct, truthful understanding of our own history. They will get that from the Republican Party, if not tonight, later. But eventually they will again get it as they got it in the 1980's under Ronald Reagan.

For tonight, let me say to my colleagues: If you think you can move the American economy forward with one foot on the accelerator of growing Government spending and the other foot on the brake of increased taxation on the American people, if you think that is good public policy, if you think that the solution to the problems of your children's future lies in a growing Government, vote for the Democrat proposal.

If on the other hand you think the simple, obvious truth borne out by the history of the American economy is that our Nation's greatness is found in our people's industry or our people's entrepreneurial spirit, our people's industriousness and that private enterprise and freedom works, and private sector growth serves our children's future, vote "no" for the Democrat proposal and vote "yes" for the Kasich proposal.

□ 2030

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, to close the debate, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the distinguished minority whip.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, let me first commend the Chair. I think this entire House can be very proud of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] for the clear, fair, and responsible job he has done today in a long and difficult debate.

I hope that we are maybe tippy-toeing a little bit into a different era, maybe.

I have to comment for a second, though, on what I think was a very destructive rules procedure today for both this bill and the one that will follow. You know, it represents a strategy of smother, denial, and division.

On the one hand, in the following bill we apparently sent up scores of motions to cut spending, of which surely a few were worthy of being voted on, but that was smothered.

The moderate and more fiscally prudent Democrats wanted to offer some amendments on the next bill, but that was denied.

We just saw a vote where frankly we deliberately withheld our side for awhile, because the Black Caucus had been told, unlike the moderate Democrats, "Oh, you can be made in order, you just can't be allowed to win."

I want to make clear first that the defeat was not on our side.

Second, I kept my vote "present" because I will not join your leadership in defeating it.

Now we come to where we are. Finally we are down to the leadership budget.

I must say for just a moment, I think not just the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], who has gotten a lot of praise and has earned every bit of it, but the entire Republican Budget Committee membership did exemplary work. They got the highest vote any Republican budget has got in 5 years and they put together an 84-page detailed budget, scored by the Congressional Budget Office which met the President's standards as enunciated up here, not the President's standards as sent to the Budget Committee, because the truth is there is $112 billion in the budget you are about to vote on in additional defense cuts that are unspecified.

I have watched my friends from California, South Carolina, and across the country, talk about base closings under the Bush budgets, and now tonight you are being asked to cast a vote yes for $112 billion below the number that I just heard some people say was already killing the vitally needed bases. Not only is that bad from a back-home standpoint, but you are being asked to cast a $112 billion defense cut with North Korea in a crisis, Iraq, Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, and the current problems in Russia, a very strange time to be cutting $112 billion additional in defense.

Then you are asked, despite what the President said to us that night when he was here, you are asked for $63 billion in unspecified future domestic cuts.

Now, anyone who is serious about deficit cutting, who knows anything about the Congress, knows that $63 billion unspecified cuts, as compared to an 84-page detailed budget, is just simply a game.

Finally, you are asked to vote for the largest tax increase in history. By the way, that translates in the first year which is the only year which is real, into a $27 billion tax increase and a $4 billion spending cut.

Ross Perot today said he wants $2 in spending cuts for every dollar in tax increases. You are actually going to give the American people $7 in tax increases for every $1 in spending cuts; but of course, Ross Perot and his millions do not really matter to the Democratic majority.

Finally, about this tax increase which will kill jobs, remember, I stood here when the Republican President wanted to raise taxes and I said in 1990 that it will deepen the recession. It will increase unemployment. It will kill jobs.

Those of you who have a boat industry know what that tax bill did.

So what are you going to do this year? You are being asked to vote for an energy tax, not on the millionaires, on every American who uses energy, owns an electric lightbulb, heats a house, air conditions a house, drives a car, every rural American who drives a long distance, every person in agribusiness, every person who buys any

product delivered by a truck, probably the most inflationary tax you could invent.

Then you are being asked to punish every senior citizen who spent their working years saving. That is right. If you saved in America, the Democratic budget wants to punish you. Senior citizens are gong to pay a bigger tax on Social Security if you vote yes.

Finally, this is the most antiagriculture, anti-rural America budget ever offered by an American President. As Pat Roberts has proven in the material he sent out analyzing the combined cost.

Medicare in rural hospitals, energy tax on gasoline, a tax on people who drive, the impact of the subsidy cuts in terms of agriculture itself, all these things come together as the most anti-rural American budget ever offered, and you are being asked to vote yes.

Now, there was once a movie which cast the Sundance Kid, in which they had no choice, so they locked arms, they said some words that I cannot repeat on the House floor, and they jumped off a cliff. Cute in the movie, because they have stunt men. There are no stunt men here.

This budget is intellectually unfair. It is not accurate. It does not meet the standards the President of the United States himself proclaimed down here. It is not a good document. It should not be voted on and it is not worthy of a "yes" vote. I urge you to vote "no."

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, a few months ago, a few days ago in November, the first Tuesday, about 62 percent of the American people cast their vote for substantial change. They were upset primarily I think about the economy. They wanted change in the economy. They were upset not only about unemployment, they were upset about underemployment. They were upset about what they believe is the loss of our standard of living.

They also wanted action. I think they wanted movement. They wanted an end to the argument, the gridlock, the perception of lots of debate and lots of back and forth, but at the end we were not moving. We were not acting.

An older constituent of mine in St. Louis the other day after the President's speech said to me, "I don't know that I agree with everything that Clinton wants, but I think you all had better get it done."

Tonight we can take the first giant step in getting it done, and as we do it tonight it is one of the earliest times that I can remember we have been able to pass a budget resolution.

It is a good budget and it is a good economic program.

President Clinton, Leon Panetta, someone known to all of us, other members of the administration worked diligently and hard on it. In the short time they have had to put together this plan, much of it based on what President Clinton said in the election, much of it based on the facts and circumstances that they met as the came to office. What they met was a budget worse than they thought, worse than anyone thought. What they thought was about $260 billion turned out to be over $350 billion.

They did the best they could. They came up with what I think is a balanced program.

I think members of our caucus and the Budget Committee improved the program.

The President said here the other night that we live with the most conservative economic projections, and when the Congressional Budget Office came back with a re-estimate that said we were $60 billion or so short over 5 years, members of our caucus in the committee, off the committee, went to work made hard decisions, offered further cuts, and those cuts are real. They may not all be lined out line by line, but one of the things we did in 1990 in the budget summit that was productive was that we established caps on spending, and those caps have worked, sometimes to our consternation.

□ 2040

These caps in this budget are real. We will not appropriate above these caps. I think they are better caps because we do not have walls between defense and domestic. We can make those decisions, the tension will be in the process, and we will vote at the end of the day on reconciliation, and each year in appropriations, and we will decide in that time, in that year, where the economy should go and where the spending decisions should be made. But it is real deficit reduction.

As the President said, we will take it from what is now about 5½ percent of GNP a year to about 2½ percent, rather it be no deficit. But given the situation they were presented with, this is substantial and real progress.

Second, he, in the plan, does something to make our tax system more progressive. I think that is very important. One of the things that has made people lose faith in Government, lose faith in their tax system, is the perception and the reality that the people at the top have gotten the greatest tax cuts while their income has increased the most while people in the middle and at the bottom have had their taxes go up the most while their income has gone down the most. And this budget, and the tax bill that will follow, will remedy that, and that is important to the faith, and the hope, and the belief of people.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this budget and this program has investments. President Clinton believes that something fundamental is happening in our economy. He understands, and understood from the beginning, the start, of his campaign, that it would not be enough to simply get the deficit down, as important and as vital as that is. But he believes, and he told me the other day that he believes it strongly, and he talked about it from the beginning of his campaign, that we had to increase and change the role of government in aiding and abetting primarily what is a private effort in our economy, to create jobs, to create wealth, to create economic success.

Not everyone believes that, and I understand that. We would be in poor shape in this country if all of us believed exactly the same way to get to the goal.

But he believes, and I think most Democrats believe, that something fundamental is wrong with this economy.

We are in a new world. We face tough competition, not only from the Mexicos and the Chinas of the world, but from the Japans and Germanys of the world, and to face, and meet, and succeed with that competition we need a new economic program, a new way of trying to do things.

He believes in education; he believes that we have to better educate our people.

I often, in town hall meetings, have people say to me, "How can I compete against someone in Mexico or China who is earning $1 an hour when I want to earn $20 an hour?" It is the toughest question we face, and the only real answer is:

"It's not protectionism, it's not lowering our standard of living to meet theirs, both of which might work, but not for long. The only real answer is that that worker has to be as productive, as productive as the worker they're competing against in China or Mexico."

There is no other answer. President Clinton understands that. He makes investments over 5 years in the power of people with ultimately is the way we are going to be competitive and successful.

He invests in the infrastructure of our country. Japan will spend double what we will spend in the next 5 years on infrastructure, an island nation of 125 million people, a land mass the size of California, and they will be investing double what we will in infrastructure. What have they figured out that we have not figured out?

He invests in research. Not that government does most of the research, not that government even does a majority of the research, but frankly there are things that have to be done by government the private sector will never do. The space program was an example of that. What we do at the National Science Foundation, what we are doing at Semtech, is an example of a private-public partnership to keep us alive in

semiconductors, and 5 years ago we were dead in semiconductors. Today we are back in the game. We have got a majority again of the world market and a new way of addressing economic problems.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues tonight:

"I think we have a President who has a plan. You might not agree with it, but I think he deserves a chance. He deserves a chance. For 12 years the Republican Party has occupied the White House, and maybe you didn't feel that every year you got the program exactly the way you wanted it. But in 1981 I would submit to you that the basics of Reaganomics passed this body with many Democrats joining with many Republicans in voting for it. I was not in that group, but many here did, and the program was in place."

I want to quote what Dick Cheney said on this floor on May 7; I think it was 1981. He said, "We face a national problem. It is not a problem of the Republican Party or the Democrat Party. It is a problem of the United States of America. It is a problem that transcends partisan considerations, and the solution demands support from both sides of the aisle that separate this Chamber." He said, "The American people want to give President Reagan and his new programs a chance." He said, "They want to chart a new course, to try something new, something different, and they want the package that President Reagan has proposed." He concluded by saying, "The American people are watching what we do here today. They want us to act, and to act now."

My colleagues, I think the American people are watching tonight, and I think with all their heart and all their mind they want us to act on their behalf, and they want us to act now. The greatest thing that a President in a government can do, far beyond any program and far beyond any idea, is to give people hope and the feeling of faith that we are on the right track, that we are improving ourselves and that we have an idea of what we are trying to do to make the country succeed.

In the 1930's President Roosevelt came before this body and before the country, and he said, "All we have to fear is fear itself," and he changed people's attitudes. Bill Clinton in just 3 months changed dramatically people's outlook on where we were headed and where this country could go. People went from thinking we are on the wrong track to thinking we are, maybe, back on the right track. Confidence is up. Interest rates have gone down. The market has been up.

My colleagues, the one thing we need to do tonight to save the United States is to stand behind this young man. We want to give him a chance. We want our people to succeed. We want a new day for this country.

Tonight we have that chance, and I urge each of my colleagues, Republican and Democrat, to vote for this program, to give it a chance, and let us see if we can make this country great, and good, and strong again.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 64, the 1994 budget resolution and H.R. 1335, the 1993 Stimulus and Investment Supplemental Appropriations Act. As America looks to build a stronger economy, deficit reduction must be our top priority. I am pleased that the budget resolution and the stimulus package, together, represent a significant deficit reduction plan that will facilitate long-term economic growth and productivity. It is, in essence, President Bill Clinton's noble vision for the future, and it deserves our careful consideration and support.

The budget resolution, faces, straight on, the nearly $200 billion structural deficit which is strangling our economy, and systematically robbing our children of any hope for inheriting an America that is fiscally sound and capable of maintaining her position as the world's leader in today's economy.

The time has come for us to make the difficult decisions in order to make right what has been wrong for far too many years. I firmly believe that the resolution will facilitate this critical decisionmaking process. By holding domestic defense as well as international affairs discretionary spending below fiscal year 1993 levels for the next 5 years, the resolution will significantly reduce the deficit by $42.6 billion in fiscal year 1994 and by a total of $510 billion by 1998. Indeed, this is a strategic plan which appropriately reflects America's changing needs and realignment of spending priorities.

There is no greater long-term threat to the economic and social well-being of our Nation than the enormous budget deficit which grew out of the misplaced priorities of the 1980's. Today I am encouraged, for this resolution, overall, proposes a fair and balanced combination of real spending cuts, tax reforms and entitlement changes which, for the most part, shares the burden of reform as equally as possible, phases in deficit reduction over a number of years, and most importantly, reassures that we are all in this struggle together. Adoption of this measure will, hopefully, mark the beginning of the end of deficit spending and the beginning of the long-awaited comprehensive deficit reduction process, that makes that possible.

What is even more encouraging—if not refreshing—is that the phony economic assumptions and other irresponsible accounting gimmicks have been cast aside. Finally, we are presented with a set of real numbers with which to set fiscal policy and which will empower us to make educated, and responsible, albeit difficult, decisions. I appreciate having the opportunity, and welcome the challenge, to make these critically necessary decisions.

Although for purposes of deficit reduction cutting spending must be our initial step, cutting discretionary spending alone is not enough to achieve our goals. Therefore, in addition to such cuts this plan calls for establishing real control over the growth in direct spending levels. The resolution proposes strategic steps towards controlling entitlement spending which accounts for more than one-half of the national budget and is growing much faster than the economy as a whole. Similarly, the resolution reflects the need to undertake sweeping reforms of our medical system and anticipates a responsible strategy for controlling the escalating costs of health care, the fastest growing part of our Nation's budget.

Certainly, spending cuts alone are not going to solve our fiscal problems. H.R. 1335, the stimulus and investment package now before us is the final element of the overall economic recovery agenda.

The stimulus package will spur new growth and investment and allow the economy to expand on its own. The plan aims to invest in our country and its people by appropriating a greater commitment of funding to infrastructure improvements, job training and retraining and education to assure that we have the skilled work force we need to meet the changing demands of a global economy.

In addition, this stimulus package reflects a responsible industrial policy which provides our basic industries with financial assistance such as new sources of capital at reasonable rates, as well as tax incentives for research and development and investment. Further, progrowth, antipoverty tax initiatives such as the targeted jobs tax credit and the earned income tax credit and limited, targeted capital gains tax cut will be essential elements of the entire economic recovery process.

However, I want to be very clear about this plan. I do not agree with every detail of it. Indeed I have many concerns. First of all, it disturbs me that we are to consider appropriating additional funding for the initiatives outlined in the stimulus package before voting on and implementing the necessary budgetary cuts proposed in the budget resolution.

Moreover, we must find additional cuts in such programs as the $30 billion space station, the $10 billion superconducting super collider and many of our subsidy programs, which we just cannot afford. That should enable us to ease the pressure on the revenue side, which raises taxes on lower and middle income as well as high income Americans.

Additionally, I am troubled by the proposal to freeze the pay and COLA's of Federal workers. They have been on the short end for far too long. To the extent that Federal workers are singled out, the plan is taxing this group of Americans twice.

Also, I have strong reservations about the broad-based Btu tax which may result in hitting hard at the pocketbooks of working men and women. Similarly, I am concerned about the potential effect that tax may have on the competitiveness of certain American industries.

This plan is far from perfect but I do believe that overall this is a worthy plan which will put us on the right course for achieving our goals of deficit reduction and economic growth. Moreover, this is just the beginning of the budget process. I am hopeful that the Senate will include these additional spending cuts in its budget resolution. We must begin making the tough choices and lead our Nation through these difficult and challenging times. Today we have the opportunity to begin building an

America that is greater than ever, and second to none. Therefore I urge my colleagues to join me in accepting this challenge by supporting the 1994 budget resolution and H.R. 1335, the 1993 Simulus and Investment Appropriations Act.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, since the President presented his economic plan to the Nation last month, people at home in Missouri have told me, "I think we should give his program a chance, but I would like to see more cuts."

Tonight, we can do both of those things. The $63 billion in additional cuts proposed by several of us conservative Democrats, the freeze in discretionary spending, and more than $500 billion in deficit reduction over 5 years, contained in the budget resolution, are steps in the right direction. The President's stimulus package includes short-term investment in our Nation, including rural America.

But the budget blueprint is the beginning of a long-term process of reducing the deficit and making our Nation more competitive in the world. As we make spending decisions this year, we have the opportunity for further debate, and the obligation to make sure we implement the cuts approved here tonight. I'm from Missouri, and you're going to have to show me and the rest of America the cuts will be made.

Last November, America voted for change. We must give this administration, and this Congress the chance to work, because if we succeed, our country succeeds.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise as ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee to express my concerns about House Concurrent Resolution 64 and the direction the House seems to be headed with the veterans' portion of the budget. Just this morning the Veterans' Affairs Committee had a budget hearing at which it received from a number of veterans' service organizations their independent budget proposals for fiscal year 1994 and a candid assessment of the proposals from the administration and the Budget Committee to the extent they have been revealed. What I heard was alarming.

The independent budget for veterans affairs is a comprehensive budget alternative which has been formulated annually for the past seven years by the American Veterans of World War II, Korea and Vietnam, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America and Veterans of Foreign Wars. Their budget proposal uses their own financial and staff expertise to identify to Congress the VA's actual needs and funding requirements without reference to budget driven constraints. Each year it has been presented, it has grown in sophistication and credibility to the point that it is one of the Veterans' Affairs Committee's most important references in analyzing the VA's budget requests. I commend them for the important service they are performing for Congress on behalf of all veterans.

The analysis of the proposals from the Administration and the Budget Committee lead to the conclusion that, if they are adopted, the VA health care system would move from its current state of chronic underfunding into an acute financial crisis. Ultimately, the proposals are a prescription for the collapse of the VA health care system as we know it. If you believe I exaggerate, consider the testimony of the veterans' service organizations that testified before the Veterans Affairs' Committee this morning.

Here's what they said:

Disabled American Veterans—"(I)f VA's discretionary spending is frozen at fiscal year 1993 levels for the next 5 years, VA's ability to deliver quality healthcare in a timely fashion will be severely compromised. This spending freeze, coupled with the nearly 7,000 VA healthcare employee cut mentioned in President Clinton's Vision for Change document, quite simply, will deny critically needed healthcare to tens of thousands of entitled veterans. * * * (W)e view the Budget Committee's recommendations as neither fair nor equitable or in the best interest of our Nation's sick and disabled veterans and their families. This budget again singles out veterans to shoulder a disproportionate share of Federal deficit-reduction."

Paralyzed Veterans of America—"The economic stimulus package specifies that 9,000 full-time employees will fall off VA's payroll over the next 5 fiscal years. Seven thousand of these employees would come from medical care. * * * The number of VA staff assigned to each patient is much lower than the number assigned in comparable settings. VA does not have the staff to meet preventive care needs or to fully implement effective case management programs—both found to be cost effective in care delivery."

AMVETS—"(W)e must point out that spending (constant dollars) for all Federal social programs increased by 361 percent since 1965, while spending for veterans programs increased only 36 percent. * * * Having said that, AMVESTS questions billions in new spending while cutting a net $1.2 billion from VA accounts over the next 4 years. * * * At a time when the thrust of national healthcare reform policy is to broaden the coverage for our citizens, we do not understand and cannot accept a reduced level of services for veterans."

Non-Commissioned Officers Association—"(A) $1 billion management savings is a smoke and mirrors goal which will eventually result in a decline in services to veterans.

The detailed budget request from the Clinton administration for the VA will not arrive until later this month. Those already announced features of it have been incorporated into House Concurrent Resolution 64. I am very concerned about the $3.7 billion in cuts of mandatory spending being recommended for veterans' programs as part of budget reconciliation. Apparently, the money is simply being taken from veterans to finance enormous new Federal expenditures on social welfare programs.

My impression is that veterans are willing to sacrifice their fair share to reduce the deficit but not to finance more Federal spending elsewhere. House Concurrent Resolution 64 clearly passes veterans by as it distributes the peace dividend across the budget spectrum to nonveteran programs.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee receives many complaints from veterans about poor timeliness and quality of VA services. These problems are largely due to chronic underfunding of veterans' programs I have already alluded to.

It is going to be impossible for the VA to provide even its current level of services and benefits to veterans with $1 billion of reductions in discretionary spending achieved by claimed savings from administrative streamlining of veterans' health care, as well as a reduction of 9,000 FTEE.

Furthermore, the Budget Committee's fiscal year 1994 discretionary spending level for VA is $700 million below the CBO baseline. The Budget Committee's recommendation for fiscal years 1994 through 1998 approaches an incredible $7 billion less. Cuts this big will lead to an unacceptable quality of health care for veterans.

Making budget comparisons and precise judgments is not possible without a detailed administration proposal for all Federal departments and agencies, but this much is clear:

First, veterans' programs are not the cause of the explosion in domestic spending which has fueled the deficit;

Second, veterans have already sacrificed for their country and should not be asked to accept deep program cuts in the name of deficit reduction when the budget package claiming deficit reduction also contains significant spending on new programs;

Third, veterans would be required to sacrifice under the President's tax and nonveterans user fee increases just like the public at large while not sharing in the proposed spending increases;

Fourth, the total amount of the proposed VA cuts represents a sacrifice of substantial funding which could have been used for eligibility reform of VA health care or other urgently needed health care delivery improvements;

Fifth, veterans won the cold war and gave us that peace dividend, and they deserve to be first in line for any spending increases, but not at the expense of the defense budget; we need to support servicemembers on the front line as well as shorten the lines of veterans waiting for benefits and health care.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has mandated veterans' programs on behalf of a grateful Nation. These earned veterans' services and benefits should be the highest domestic priority. To their credit, veterans have for years stated their willingness to do their part in reducing the deficit, but the proposed cuts ask veterans to sacrifice far more than their fair share.

Veterans' advocates in Congress have their work cut out for them. The result in this body is nearly certain. But the other body likely will have some differences which must be worked out in conference. It is absolutely essential that by then Members clearly understand the disaster this budget proposal would be for veterans' benefits and services, particularly health care.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant support of the Budget Committee substitute.

I fully support the comprehensive deficit reduction proposal President Clinton made to us last month. Though I had some misgivings about elements of the Clinton plan, particularly the proposed energy tax, I believe our President did a fair and honest job of trying to balance the need to bring down the enormous budget deficit he inherited from George Bush and Ronald Reagan with the need to significantly expand our response to the equally deadly human deficits we face in educational and training opportunities and access to health, housing, and social services. I applaud

President Clinton for his progressive vision and his commitment to putting people first and I was prepared to fully support the enactment of his entire economic plan into law.

For that reason, I am angry and disappointed that a majority of the Democrats on the Budget Committee refused to support our President's plan and have instead given us a budget which mangles the domestic priorities President Clinton outlined to the Nation last month. The careful balance the President strived to achieve between bringing down the budget deficit and making the additional investments we need to improve our economic competitiveness and address unmet social needs has been destroyed. I fully agree that it is possible and desirable to make cuts in spending in many areas of the budget beyond those called for by the President. There are countless bloated, sacred cows strewn throughout the Federal budget which can and should be attacked, from the ludicrous $6 billion star wars boondoggle to the $30 billion we expend every year to support no less than nine fat-laden intelligence agencies to the absurd subsidies the Agriculture Department pays every year to the producers of wool and mohair. Yet the self-described deficit hawks on the Budget Committee did not target these sacred cows in their zeal for greater deficit reduction; instead, they set their sights on low-income housing, Head Start, education, and the other starving babies of the Federal budget that meet critical human needs in this Nation. Support for education, in particular, has been scraped to the bone by this budget, making it very difficult for the President to carry out the bold education and training initiatives he has sketched out. The maximum award under the Pell Grant Program for low-income college students will likely have to be reduced by $100 to $200 next year. The chapter 1 compensatory education and the individuals with Disabilities Education Act programs will be level funded. Some 60 programs within the Department of Education may be cut by one-third. What we face is the prospect of an education budget worse than anything sought by President George Bush.

Not content with disemboweling the President's long-term domestic initiatives and priorities, many of these same renegade Democrats are now going after his short-term economic stimulus package as well. Enough is enough. This cannot stand. Yes, we must have sensible budget deficit reduction; we cannot afford not to. But at the same time we must also now reverse the damage inflicted by 12 years of gross neglect of human needs; we cannot afford not to do that as well. If the President's economic stimulus and investment initiative does not survive or is gutted by either the House or the Senate, I cannot in good conscience support the Budget Committee's dramatic revision of the President's budget priorities. My constituents and men and women throughout America voted for Bill Clinton because they agreed with him that at long last it was time to put people first in the Nation's Capital again. Attacks on the President's effort to fulfill that commitment must cease.

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 64.

The House Budget Committee and Chairman SABO should be commended for drafting a resolution which sets forth a real plan to significantly reduce the Federal deficit over the next 5 years.

This is vital to long term economic recovery and growth.

Further, the budget resolution makes a commitment to carefully invest scarce public resources in our infrastructure and our people.

These investments will maximize the ability of U.S. companies—large and small—to compete in the global economy, thus creating good and lasting jobs for our citizens.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Your support will send a powerful and welcome signal to our constituents that we heard the message last November. The gridlock is gone and this Congress and this President are working together to reduce the deficit while investing in America's future.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the budget resolution.

Though I appreciate the efforts of President Clinton and the Budget Committee to tackle our budget crisis, we must go farther and do it in a way which does not jeopardize our national safety or unfairly burden our hard-working middle class.

We must go farther because, despite the deficit reduction contained in the budget resolution, the national debt would still increase by $1.2 trillion over the next 5 years. Stop and think about that for a moment; $1.2 trillion in deficits would be a new 5-year record in our country's history.

Add to that dubious distinction the fact that the budget resolution only looks good when we look 4 or 5 years down the road. Hiding around the corner are awesome deficits. The upward spiral begins again in 1998 and will reach the $400 billion mark in the first years of the next century. This plan does not adequately address that longer term picture.

It's true the deficit would be even higher without this program, but that argument approaches the issue from the wrong perspective. Just because we make a terrible situation a little more tolerable doesn't mean we have solved the problem. We haven't even come close.

Of course it's also true that it's not the fault of our new President that the budget crisis is so severe. Twelve years of Reaganomics gave him a clean-up job that few people would want. But even though he didn't create the problem, it's now his problem to fix. As the President's booklet, "A Vision of Change in America," explains so well, our long-term economic strength depends on it.

To move to my specific reservations about the plan, Mr. Chairman, let me first address the issue of tax increases versus spending cuts. I have always believed that serious deficit reduction requires a fair balance between these areas. To say, as some do, that we could balance the budget without any tax increases may be good politics, but it is pie-in-the-sky budget planning. I have looked over many of those plans and there is always a glaring lack of specifics when it comes to the half trillion dollars in spending cuts they would require. Again, that may be good politics, but it is fantasy budgeting.

The problem with the budget resolution is that it is unbalanced in the opposite direction. The budget resolution achieves its deficit reduction almost entirely through tax increases. When you factor in $145 billion of planned new spending and some very creative accounting, the ratio is nearly $2 of tax increases for every $1 of spending cuts. I don't oppose the bulk of the tax increases which are concentrated on the wealthy, but we need to beef up the spending cuts in order to whittle down the $1.2 trillion deficits.

The President made a very fair request for specific recommendations of additional cuts. For help in this area, as well as on the tax side, I turned to the people of the Third Congressional District of Illinois. I have always believed myself to be a representative of their views, so I sought their advice firsthand through townhall meetings and a budget worksheet I supplied them. I would like to share the results of their decisions with you.

For the 10 percent surtax on taxable income above $250,000, 3,374 were in favor, 1,129 were opposed, and 369 were undecided.

For increasing the top individual tax rate from 31 percent to 36 percent, 2,790 were in favor, 1,651 were opposed, and 423 were undecided.

For increasing the top corporate tax rate from 34 percent to 36 percent, 2,365 were in favor, 1,888 were opposed and 586 were undecided.

For increasing the taxable amount of Social Security benefits to 85 percent for individual incomes above $25,000 per year or couples over $32,000 per year, 937 were in favor, 3,672 were opposed and 307 were undecided.

For the Btu energy tax, 638 were in favor, 3,990 were opposed and 207 were undecided.

The top five additional spending cuts recommended by my constituents were eliminating the space station, eliminating the superconducting super collider, eliminating funding for the arts and humanities, closing or converting inefficient or underused facilities in veterans hospitals and reducing military reserve personnel by 16 percent to 920,000.

My constituents also strongly support an increase in the Federal cigarette tax by 24 cents per package and raising the alcohol tax by 50 cents per bottle of wine, spirits or six pack of beer.

The easiest additions we could make to the cuts recommended by my constituents would be in planned new spending. Not spending what we plan to is easier than cutting existing funding. All it takes is a swipe of the pen. The budget resolution includes $145 billion in new spending on what the President calls worthwhile investments. I have no doubt these investments are all worthwhile on their own merits. But it is unrealistic to plan a new spending package of this size while we're facing $1.2 trillion in new debt. We simply can't afford it. We need to go through this package program by program to determine what is essential investment and what we can postpone.

Another issue of concern for me, Mr. Chairman, is spending cuts I believe we perhaps cannot afford to make. These are cases of being "penny wise but pound-foolish," where the long-term cost of the cuts will be greater than the immediate savings. Several areas come immediately to mind.

First, the budget resolution calls for $110 billion in defense cuts above and beyond the

Bush administration's planned reductions. In light of the situation in Yugoslavia, the Middle East, and the possible "rebolshevikation" of Russia, cuts of this size are probably premature. We need to revisit this issue so that we do not jeopardize our national security.

Another important safety cut is the possible layoffs of air traffic controllers. The President's goal of cutting 100,000 jobs out of the Federal bureaucracy would proportionally require as many as 2,000 layoffs of air traffic controllers. As a member of the Aviation Subcommittee, I know first hand that aviation safety would be compromised by such layoffs. Safety should always be our top priority.

Other cuts of concern and reductions of Small Business Administration loans, prison construction, drug control staff, Medicare outpatient services and the strategic petroleum reserve. All of these are issues of national security or pressing social concerns like crime and health care. My constituents put these kind of cuts, especially crime-related cuts, at the very bottom of their lists.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I turn to the aspects of the budget resolution that most immediately impact the people I represent in the Third Congressional District of Illinois. After a decade of shrinking incomes, growing taxes, and decreasing services, the program asks our Nation's struggling middle class to shoulder even more burdens. I believe we should ask them last, not first.

Specifically, I am disappointed the plan resorts to yet more taxes on the middle class through the new Btu tax on energy. This tax will hit middle-class Americans wherever they turn: at the gas pump, on their electric and gas bills, and through the higher cost of many consumer products. The total tax for the average household will be anywhere from $118 to $460 per year depending on whose estimates you believe. Through any tax on middle class is too much, I would at least hope to see some agreement on the numbers before Congress proceeds. It's too important to go in blindly.

I also have serious concerns about the impact of higher Social Security taxes on our senior citizens. For seniors with incomes above $25,000 individually or $32,000 for couples, the President's plan increases the taxable portion of social security benefits from 50 percent to 85 percent. I do not know anyone who thinks that $25,000 or $32,000 is not middle class. Yet the President's plan asks the most from these middle-class Americans by raising their tax bills several hundred dollars per year in addition to the energy taxes.

Because a significant number of my constituents rely on mass transit to meet their transportation needs, I am also disappointed the program short changes mass transit. Over the last 5 years the plan will provide billions of dollars less than was authorized for those years in 1991 under a President who was considered hostile to mass transit. I also oppose the administration's proposal to provide new gas tax revenues entirely to highway programs, which would change a longstanding policy of providing 20 percent of those revenues to mass transit.

These transportation proposals overlook the fact that mass transit programs contribute to the economic development of our metropolitan areas by creating jobs and relieving traffic congestion. It is shortsighted to ignore our transit needs and deny our cities and counties the benefits they gain from transit programs.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, the people of the Third Congressional District of Illinois understand the deficit problem and want deficit reduction. But they want a serious and balanced plan which achieves long-term fiscal responsibility without unfairly burdening the middle class. As we finalize our economic program during the next several months, I will continue to consult with my constituents on the merits of the program and any proposed revisions. But at present I must vote "no".

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the resolution we are currently considering.

During the last election the American people made it clear that they want action from their Nation's leadership to solve a number of significant problems facing the United States. They also made it clear that our current economic quagmire is unacceptable.

By passing this blueprint for the budget for the next fiscal year we are letting the American public know that the Congress is also concerned about our national debt and that it is willing to take aggressive actions to try to resolve our problems, even if these actions are occasionally unpopular.

It is clear that something must be done to control the Federal deficit. Our national debt is now five times what it was in 1980. Left unchecked, the annual Federal deficit will hit $638 billion by the year 2003. The practical impact would be that living standards, which once doubled every 25 years in this Nation, would take nearly 100 years to double. This is unacceptable.

As many people are quick to point out, the resolution before us includes both spending cuts and tax increases to reduce the deficit. When reviewing the President's proposal, my primary concern is that any increase in taxes be apportioned in an equitable and rational manner. I am convinced that the package we are about to vote on meets the criteria.

The wealthy minority of the Nation, who for years have benefited from trickle down economics, must be required to pay their fair share. Furthermore, we must not put any more strain on families and individuals who are currently just making ends meet. These people, the working and middle classes and the senior citizens, are the backbone of our Nation.

Like most people who have taken the time to carefully review the President's proposal, there are items I disagree with. Nonetheless the overall package places a minority of the burden on the people and the corporations which are in the best position to make concessions.

Furthermore, I strongly support the portion of President Clinton's plan which calls for substantial spending cuts to help bring Federal spending back into line. I will join the President in reviewing every Federal program and making cuts wherever possible, and I would like to take this opportunity to urge the President and my colleagues to take an especially hard look at the increasing trend of academic and corporate welfare.

In addition to the specific cuts that the President has recommended I am committed to remaining an outspoken critic of Government programs that do not benefit the American public, that have a negligible return on their investments, or that are better suited for the private sector.

In my testimony to the House Budget Committee last week, I recommended to the President and my colleagues in the Congress more than $200 billion worth of additional cuts in spending that can be made over the next 5 years. These specific cuts were also detailed in the March 10 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It would be foolish for the President or Congress to ask Americans to make any sacrifices if we are not doing all we can to see that abuse, mismanagement, and unnecessary spending are eradicated.

Those of us who live in America have been the beneficiaries of nearly 200 years of responsible economic policies. However, for the last decade successive Presidents have used their veto power to pursue and impose an irresponsible course of fiscal policies that will deny future generations of Americans the quality of life and expectations that we have enjoyed. This should be unacceptable to all of us.

As a Member of Congress for the last 7 years I have been unduly frustrated by the inability of the leadership of this Nation to take seriously the threat posed by our overwhelming deficit. The U.S. deficit, if left unchecked, could very easily be the downfall of this Nation, and mere lip service will not make it go away. Fortunately, President Clinton has taken a leadership role in redirecting our ship of state. It is now incumbent for the Congress and the American people to support this difficult effort.

Mr. Chairman, colleagues, no solution will be easy, nor will any solution be immediate. Doing nothing, however, would be a crime against the future.

For this reason, I support the resolution currently before us and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I want to address for a moment the defense portion of the budget resolution.

I believe we can live with the figure for defense for fiscal year 1994 that is embodied in this resolution but it will not be easy, especially if additional budget factors come into play which I will discuss later.

By 1997, it is projected that we will have 1.4 million men and women in uniform, the lowest number since before Pearl Harbor.

By 1997, there will be 12 years of decline in defense except for the one-time spike for Desert Storm.

In a few years defense spending will be the lowest percent of GNP since before World War II.

Within a few years, over 600 overseas bases will be shut down, scaled back, or placed on standby.

We also have had, of course, a significant reduction in domestic bases.

NEW POLICY REQUIRED

Now we all recognize that because of the collapse of the former Soviet Union, significant decreases in defense spending have been warranted.

However, I'd like to make two observations on that issue:

First, as I've already pointed out, dramatic reductions have been made and are projected to be made in the future.

Second, the simple fact is that the new world order is: not orderly; and not very new.

As the former head of the Central Intelligence Agency recently stated: "With the breakdown of communism, age old ethnics, religious, political and regional conflicts have reemerged with a vengeance".

So we live in a very destabilized and volatile global geopolitical situation, and as the world's only superpower we need a robust military capability on that global stage.

North Korea continues to develop nuclear weapons.

Iran continues a vigorous military buildup.

Saddam Hussein is still around.

An unstable Russia currently has tens of thousands of nuclear warheads.

There is a potential of a spreading conflict in the Balkans.

We must develop a defense budget based on a new national security policy as opposed to budgetary numbers driving our decisions.

PERSONNEL ARE KEY

It is difficult to make a precise determination as to what level of force structure and defense spending is needed to deal with the world geopolitical situation.

But there is one constant in this debate that we know we need: well-trained, highly motivated, professional men and women serving in the Armed Forces.

We had that force in Desert Storm.

We have that force today.

However, I have observed long-lead indicators that show we may have quality problems in the future.

First, a poll which gauges the intention of young people to enlist the armed services has been on a downward curve.

Second, recently, the number of high school graduates entering the service is declining. It had been almost 100 percent and now its in the low 90 percent for most of the services.

Third, frequent deployments must be draining morale; one Marine unit I inspected in Somalia had been deployed abroad three straight Christmases.

We must be very careful over the next few years to ensure that a hollow force does not reemerge.

As I look at the defense budget I see some real funding problems we face:

We may very well want to restore the pay cut to at least some of the military.

Anticipated management savings may not materialize.

Inflation estimates may be too low.

If the Btu tax applies to the DOD, DOD will have an additional major bill to pay.

Economic conversion will be expensive.

Cleanup of nuclear and chemical weapon sites and conventional environmental cleanup will be very costly.

The price tag for all these are expanding at the very time the budget is declining.

If significant declines in defense continue in the outyears, we may very well have to decide between quality people versus expensive new hardware programs.

If it comes to that, I will be for retaining the quality force and reluctantly have to oppose various high-dollar hardware programs.

We need to maintain a quality force at all costs.

If a new national security policy is not developed and we abide by the current national security commitments, the outyear budget levels are too low.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, the Full Employment Act of 1946, as subsequently amended by Humphrey-Hawkins, sets out specific numerical goals for economic policy. As amended, there are three goals:

First, 4 percent unemployment;

Second, 3 percent inflation; and

Third, a 20 percent of gross national product [GNP] cap on Federal spending.

These have been official congressional policy since 1979. But, of course, Congress doesn't meet these goals, particularly the 20 percent of GNP spending limit.

The budget resolution before us today would set spending levels for fiscal year 1994 at about 25 percent of GNP, far above Congress' official established policy.

Like so many other attempts to constrain spending and balance the budget, Congress has simply ignored Humphrey-Hawkins' statutory spending limit goal, and that is why I believe a constitutional spending limit is needed.

With that in mind, I've introduced the balanced budget/spending limitation amendment, which would do three things: require a balanced Federal budget; establish a Federal spending limit, at 19 percent of GNP—a more accurate historical average than Humphrey-Hawkins' 20-percent limit—and, in order to help enforce the foregoing requirements, provides the President with line-item veto authority.

The balanced budget/spending limitation amendment is based upon two fundamental premises: First, the Federal Government must begin to live within its means; second, how the Government lives within its means is as important as the mere fact that it does live within its means.

When the American people say they want a balanced budget, they mean less Government spending, not an increase in their already heavy tax burden. Many of our offices have been flooded in recent weeks with calls, letters, and postcards demanding that Congress cut spending first.

The balanced budget/spending limitation amendment would protect against tax increases—particularly the magnitude of tax increases proposed by the President—by limiting spending to 19 percent of GNP, the average level of revenue the Government has been collecting for the last 25 years.

By tying Federal spending to GNP, the Kyl amendment also gives Congress the incentive to enact pro-growth economic policies. The more the economy grows, the more Congress can spend.

The need for a Federal spending limit is evidenced in two reports, one released by the General Accounting Office [GAO] last June. The GAO projected that, based on current trends, Federal spending could grow to 42.4 percent of GNP by the year 2020, from about 25 percent today, with a real per capita GNP in the year 2020 unchanged from the current level of $24,000 a year. In other words, if Federal spending isn't limited, there will be no improved standard of living for the next generation.

A report released in 1991 by Stephen Moore of the Institute for Policy Innovation came to similar conclusions about the proportion of GNP the Government will command if current trends are followed. The report concluded that:

> Meaningful, constitutional limits on the growth of Federal spending are needed to bring the size of government down to economically sustainable levels. One way to achieve this end would be to limit the percentage of GNP which the government can command from the private economy.

Moreover, according to Dr. James M. Buchanan, the 1986 Nobel laureate in economic sciences:

> Reducing government as a share of GNP from its current level of 25 percent to, say, 20 percent would generate roughly a two percent increase in the rate of growth in GNP. And back-of-the-envelope arithmetic suggests that by the early 2000s, and forever beyond, the real value of the programs financed by government would be larger than they would be under the regime that keeps government's share at 25 percent.

This is precisely what the Kyl amendment will do.

Mr. Chairman, the idea of a Federal spending limit is not new. It is set in law in Humphrey-Hawkins, under which we are debating today.

If this House is serious about deficit reduction, and about meeting the statutory goals it has set for itself, it should reject the budget resolution reported by the Budget Committee, pass the alternative Kasich budget, and then take up the balanced budget/spending limitation amendment.

Let's heed the people's call to cut spending first.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, the House will soon vote on the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994—House Concurrent Resolution 64. This congressional budget blueprint keeps the implementation schedule of the President's economic program on track, and is almost a month early in terms of the April 15 statutory deadline. We are serious about long-term investment, reduced Federal spending, and deficit reduction, and this plan shows it.

The budget resolution incorporates the long-term investment strategies put forth by President Clinton. It designates true budget priorities, recommending not only how much to fund, but where to fund it. The President targets scarce resources where they are best used—in human capital and physical capital—which comprise the job-creating, growth-producing sector of the economy.

The long-term investment priorities include education, infrastructure, retraining for displaced workers, Head Start, child immunizations against disease, health care research, development of civilian technologies, and community economic development.

The budget resolution also accommodates the President's proposed tax incentives for economic growth, which include incentives for investment in equipment and factory modernization, small business venture capital stock, low-income housing and mortgage revenue bonds, and expansion of the work-based earned income tax credit.

House Concurrent Resolution 64 follows through on the President's goals for deficit re-

duction, recommending some $510 billion in reduced deficits over 5 years. It would halve the deficit as a percentage of gross domestic product, and more than meet the President's 1997 goal for deficit reduction.

We have unequivocally responded to our constituents, who have called for higher levels of reduced spending. The resolution makes an additional $63 billion in spending cuts, and $11 billion in reduced interest payments.

The spending cuts are tough, and they are real. There will be $90 billion in entitlement savings, including $48.3 billion in reduced Medicare payments to providers. However, Medicare recipients are not hit with higher out-of-pocket expenses. Defense spending is further reduced, and annual discretionary spending is cut back below 1993 levels and then frozen at those levels for 5 years. These are true austerity measures on the part of the Federal Government.

This belt-tightening may not be pleasant for those affected, but the resulting overall economic improvement, such as continued reduction in long-term interest rates, is healthy for both consumers and business investment. A healthy economy will provide more opportunities for high wage jobs and growing incomes. That is what we are working toward with this plan.

Mr. Chairman, the budget resolution incorporates President Clinton's economic plan for investment, deficit reduction and budget priorities. The plan provides the bricks and mortar needed for an improved job market and higher standard of living. With our support for this legislation, we can use these materials to construct a solid economic structure.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering a budget resolution that mandates the most significant reduction in the budget deficit since I have been in Congress.

This budget reduces the deficit by $510 billion over the next 5 years and cuts spending $63 billion more than the President has proposed.

The economic effect is to cut the deficit as a percent of gross domestic product in half: from 4.9 percent in 1993 to 2.5 percent in 1998. This yields more savings and speeds private sector capital formation resulting in greater economic growth.

The economic assumptions used are conservative; as reported in the Wall Street Journal on Tuesday, many economists think we will, in fact, achieve greater deficit reduction and growth than this budget assumes.

This budget freezes discretionary spending below the 1993 level for the next 5 years and ensures that the 1997 deficit will be $144 billion less than under current spending.

Clearly, more difficult decisions lie ahead of us in the battle to balance the budget.

I hope that we can uncover additional spending cuts in the future and that we enact both a balanced budget amendment and an enhanced rescission process to bring the deficit to zero. But today's resolution moves us closer to a balanced budget than we have been at any time in the past decade.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill. We were elected by people who realize the days of reckless Federal spending must end. They expect us to come here and establish fiscal priorities and make difficult funding decisions between worthy programs.

The bill before us today does none of that. Instead it says; "call the mint and tell them to print up some new money, the Democrats have a new spending bill."

I agree with a number of the goals of this bill. We should give more money to the WIC Program, we should give more money to community development block grant assistance and we should fully fund the 1991 highway bill.

But that funding should come from establishing priorities, making tough choices and cutting other programs. That's governing, that's political courage. Adding to the deficit, as this bill does, is an act of political cowardice. And worse, it's a blatant attempt by President Clinton to attach his name to an economic recovery in which he played no part.

We have been told that this $16 billion emergency bill is both an economic stimulus package and a long-term investment in our people. I wonder how the American people are going to score some of the spending the Democrats have slipped into this bill. How do you think they will score the millions spent in this bill for migratory bird management and fisheries? Does that stimulate the economy or is that an investment in people? How about the millions spent over at the National Science Foundation to give bureaucrats raises? How many jobs will that create?

And no irresponsible spending bill would be complete without the District of Columbia. The District gets $28 million. The Democrats might call that investment or stimulus but in Iowa we call that another bailout of the Nation's most inefficient and bloated local government.

Every effort in committee to make this spending package more responsible or at least accountable was soundly rejected. I personally offered amendments at subcommittee to put this spending on budget, so we don't just borrow more and further exacerbate the deficit.

This bill proposes to stimulate an economy already on the move at a cost of $52,000 per job created. At that rate it won't be very long before the Democrats push us back into recession. But this time they will have no one to blame but themselves.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of our President and in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 64, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994. President Clinton told the American people last fall, that if he was entrusted with the responsibilities of executive governance, he would bring change—change from the human disregard of the past decade. He has already delivered on that promise because, like Martin Luther King, he believes that "what self-centered men have torn down, other centered men can build up."

The President and the Democrats in Congress have presented an economic package that will accomplish what no Republican even attempted in 12 years. We have before us an investment package that carefully balances the needs and ambitions of our country—for jobs, housing, education, and economic development—with the daunting reality of an out of control budget deficit. The budget package accomplishes this delicate balance by fairly placing the greatest burden on those that reaped the greatest returns in the hit-and-run 1980's.

Today, for the first time in more than a decade, the executive and legislative branches of Government come together to outline the future of this country. That future is paved by a plan that commits $2 out of every $3 saved from spending cuts and revenue increase for deficit reduction, while $1 out of every $3 saved is used for new investment. As a result, the budget achieves substantial deficit reduction while also making sizable new investments to improve long-term growth and address unmet needs.

I must state for the record that I would have preferred a package that went further in addressing the needs of our devastated communities, a package that would have contained more social investment. I was particularly concerned when $63 billion in cuts were added to the President's initial plan. These are real cuts in significant areas, some of which hurt. That is why I believe that the economic stimulus package cannot be trimmed, cannot be altered. We must hold the line on this cutting frenzy. That is also why I supported the alternative budget package offered by the Congressional Black Caucus and the congressional progressive caucus which mirrored the President's package in many ways but added to it in some areas. This alternative plan achieved added investments for social programs through increasing the top corporate tax rate from 36 to 38 percent and raising the top rate on capital gains income from 28 to 31 percent. The alternative budget also eliminated the two regressive provisions of the Democratic tax package—the energy tax and the increase in taxes on higher income Social Security recipients. But, unfortunately, I realize that we do not have the votes to make these changes to the budget, so I believe strongly that the Democratic budget is the best plan we can pass through the Congress.

To understand fully the need for social investment and economic parity in this country, we need to understand fully the present condition of this country and how we got here. We must realize that the disastrous economic decisions of the Reagan and Bush years have choked us with a long running economic recession, which has particularly affected low wage laborers and people of color, and damaged the prospects for long-term economic growth in this country.

The senseless military buildup of the last decade has been rendered useless by the spread of democracy and the end of the cold war. Money was stripped from housing and other social programs to fuel the missiles and tanks that now sit there and await the arrival of a military enemy, while the enemies of poverty, hopelessness, sickness, and inequality devour our human potential. As Bill Clinton and AL GORE articulated in their campaign literature, "during the 1980's, our Government betrayed the values that made America great: providing opportunity, taking responsibility, rewarding work."

As census data shows, there were 35.7 million poor Americans in 1991, numbers which had not been seen in this country since before the great society programs of the 1960's. It is

important to note that this statistic is based on the Government standard of poverty which lists the average poverty threshold for a family of four at under $14,000, which comes to approximately $67 per week to house, feed and clothe each person in that family—an inconceivable standard that requires careful review and revision.

This increase in poverty was particularly sharp among our youngest Americans, with now over 14 million children officially classified as poor. Like the overall number of poor people, this number of poor children is greater than at any time in the last two decades. Certainly, the recession has contributed harshly to these numbers but it is not the sole culprit. Even before the recession we saw many working class families less able to put their hands on the ladder of mobility, let alone attempt a climb. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities in Washington, the principal determinants of these statistics have been declining wages and a weakening of the safety net.

A 1992 census report illustrated that the proportion of full-time year round workers who are paid wages too low to lift a family of four out of poverty has grown sharply in recent years. In 1979, some 12.1 percent of workers were paid wages this low. By 1990, that figure grew to 18 percent. The census data also reveals a long-term increase in poverty rates among working families. The poverty rate for families with children in which the family head works climbed nearly one-fourth between 1980 and 1991.

But the declines in income have not been across the board. Changes to the U.S. Tax Code during the early 1980's robbed Pedro to pay Paul. Average working families paid $5.8 billion more in taxes between 1977 and 1992, while those families earning incomes over $168,000 received a $83.7 billion windfall. This redistribution of income is most starkly portrayed by the statistic that in 1983, the wealthiest 1 percent of the population controlled 31.3 percent of the wealth but by 1989, they controlled 37.1 percent of the wealth. To understand the impact of these numbers think of dividing $100 among 100 people. One person would get $37 and the other 99 people would each receive 68 cents. That is the state of income distribution in this country.

The poisons of racism and sexism have further aggravated wage disparities. While white male weekly incomes average $509, those of black and Hispanics average $374 and $328 respectively. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics also informs us that these same weekly wages were $374 for white women, $323 for black women, and $293 for Hispanic women, making us the lowest paid of all groups.

A second factor pushing poverty rates up over the past decade has been declines in Government assistance programs, especially those for the poor and the unemployed. Many of these Government cuts were directed where we could least afford them, our cities: General revenue sharing was eliminated, urban development action grants were eliminated, community development block grants were reduced by over $15 billion, assisted housing money was cut by over 68 percent and urban mass transit funding was cut by close to $8 billion.

These long-term trends have forcefully intensified the polarization of our society into those that have too much and those that have no chance. In my home state of New York, the 1980's saw a 10-percent decline in the incomes of the poorest fifth of families but an astounding 20-percent increase in the incomes of the richest fifth of families. I believe that this is not what the founding fathers—and mothers—of our nascent Government had in mind when they assembled "to form a more perfect union" and "promote the general welfare" of its citizens.

So it should come as no surprise that our country wanted change. There was a desire by the electorate for representation that was more in touch with them, the desire to vote for someone who had a genuine understanding of the every day hardships faced by American voters, the desire to vote for someone who would fight for their interests, and the desire to vote for someone who would make their lives more secure. So, this country elected a Democrat, Bill Clinton, to represent them in Washington.

We must now translate the political empowerment illustrated by this election, into economic empowerment for all Americans. We must have the vision to advance those initiatives that will help people contribute to the system in the long run, rather than drain from the system. The budget initiatives before us, some directly—others indirectly, will enable our people to produce for themselves.

The budget resolution assumes the major Clinton initiatives that put people first, protect our children and assist the most vulnerable in our society. The budget provides full funding for Head Start. By 1999, this essential proposal will help 1.4 million eligible, disadvantaged children get ready for school, stay healthy with immunizations and health checkups, and receive nutritious meals.

By providing full funding of the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for women, infants and children [WIC] by 1996, the budget proposal will add 1.9 million pregnant women, infants, and children to this vital program which addresses infant mortality.

To reduce hunger in America, the budget package increases food stamps by $7 billion over the next 5 years. The measure also makes a commitment to our youth by providing 2 million jobs in summer youth employment and training for economically disadvantaged youth aged 14 to 21 as well as funding to repair and maintain Job Corps centers and to begin building new ones.

The package also includes a substantial expansion in the earned income tax credit assistance for very low-income people. The credit would allow a minimum wage worker to at least bring his or her family up to the poverty line. The credit is tied to earnings so it rewards work.

To shelter our people and develop our neighborhoods, the budget package makes a substantial commitment to housing and community development. The package mirrors the President's proposal to increase rental assistance from 40,000 units to 100,000 units by 1998.

Although a comprehensive health care reform proposal will be presented to the Congress by the administration in the spring, the President and the Democrats in Congress did not ignore this issue in the budget proposal. The resolution includes full funding for Ryan White AIDS programs major increases for childhood immunizations, substantial increases in biomedical research for women's health and increases for more health clinics in low-income urban neighborhoods.

Mr. Chairman, this is a budget package that invests in our future and our people. I urge my colleagues to support this budget and then heed the call of Pericles to "wait for that wisest of counselors—time," for time will prove this package to be right for America.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, these last couple of weeks, I have been wading through the letters and listening to the flood of phone calls from my neighbors back home. They are worried about how the economic proposals are going to affect their pocketbooks.

My home State of New Jersey has not bounced back from the recession. It currently ranks 46th in job creation among the 50 States and February's unemployment rate was up from last month at an outrageous 7.8 percent. Our economy needs an extra kick in the pants and the stimulus package is just the boost we are looking for. It promises jobs and it will lay the groundwork for a stable and expanding economy in the future.

The stimulus package would provide $16.3 billion in supplemental appropriations requested by President Bill Clinton for investment in infrastructure; jobs and human resources; community development; and energy, environment, and technology programs. Included in the measure is $4 billion in mandatory spending to cover this year's costs of the recent extension in emergency unemployment benefits and $3 billion from the highway trust fund for road construction and maintenance.

I'm reluctantly voting for the budget resolution. But the fact remains that we need a vehicle to move the process of deficit reduction and economic growth forward. Even though this makes real and significant cuts in the budget deficit; this resolution will reduce the deficit by $510 billion in 5 years. Yet, I still feel that additional cuts are needed and can be found.

I am pleased that the House Budget Committee cut spending by an additional $63 billion and that the Senate is proposing even greater spending cuts. Even I, as a freshman in my first 2 months in office, was personally responsible for saving the Federal Government $70 million in one program. I plan to continue my search for spending cuts whenever and wherever I can find them.

The budget resolution consolidates President Clinton's 5-year economic plan and the $63 billion in spending cuts made by the House Budget Committee. It calls for deficit reduction and investments in programs to generate economic growth over the next 5 years.

The vote on the budget resolution was extremely difficult for me because I am not satisfied with the total package but we have to put a ceiling on the spending we do around here. Even though it is not perfect, it was the best plan offered to achieve my goals of job creation and long-term economic growth. The whole is greater than the sum of its parts. The resolution reported by the Budget Committee significantly reduces the deficit, invests in

America's future, and makes the structural changes that are desperately needed for a healthy, stable, and growing economy.

The real cuts in spending will come out of the Appropriations Committee and the real revenue provisions will come out of the Ways and Means Committee. If I am not satisfied with the results of these committees when they are presented, I simply will not vote for them. But something must be done. For now, the President deserves a change to have his plan move forward.

It is not set in stone. This is only a blueprint. If the spending cuts do not materialize and Congress does not make significant attempts to find additional cuts, then I reserve the right not to support it.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 64, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994.

Do I believe that this budget is perfect? No. Perfection is not an art we have mastered in Washington, DC.

I, for one, have long been an opponent of several of the cuts being proposed in this package. I am opposed to cuts in the cost of living adjustments to Federal retirees. I am opposed to cuts in Medicare reimbursement to hospitals and doctors in the absence of national health care reform. I am opposed to raising the percentage of Social Security benefits subject to the income tax.

For every single provision of this budget, I am confident we could find some group of Members in opposition.

But Mr. Chairman, the time has come to finally move forward on our budget crisis and I will not take part in derailing that effort. The future economic and social health of our Nation is at stake in this debate. If we allow ourselves to pick this budget apart piece by piece, it will collapse. This Nation cannot afford for that to happen.

This budget will make a frontal assault on our deficit crisis by producing $510 billion in real deficit reduction over the next 5 years.

It will be long last move America toward the kind of economy we must have in the post-cold-war world by using Federal investment to build a solid base for civilian high-technology industries.

It recognizes that meeting our commitment to infrastructure investment is crucial to stimulate the private sector growth which will create good jobs for our people.

It recognizes that our most precious resources—the American people—have too long been overlooked. By increasing investment in the Head Start Program, in worker retraining, in health care research and treatment, and in the economic viability of our cities, it finally reverses 12 years of neglect.

There is an old saying, Mr. Chairman, that what wears down a traveler is not the mountain in the distance—it is the grain of sand in his shoe. Will the first steps along this road to economic security be painful? Absolutely. But for the good of the Nation, we cannot afford to let that pain stop us from beginning the journey.

We have the opportunity today to place this country firmly on the path to economic prosperity and a brighter future for our children. We cannot let that chance pass us by.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the resolution.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 64, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994, and H.R. 1335 the stimulus and investment supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1993.

On February 17, 1993, President Clinton unveiled his economic and deficit reduction package and gave this country new direction and new hope for the future.

House Concurrent Resolution 64, and H.R. 1335, together largely embody President Clinton's bold economic proposals. I strongly support these measures, which will reverse the trends of the last 12 years that have created huge deficits and economic decline, and will put us on the path to long-term economic growth.

Under the Reagan and Bush administrations, most Americans experienced a decline in their real wages; their families increasingly had to rely on two-earner couples; they saw the gap between the rich and poor widen; they witnessed growing poverty and homelessness; and they felt the threat of a ballooning Federal deficit impeding economic recovery. Mr. Chairman, the American people have asked for change.

The budget resolution and supplemental appropriations, as a reflection of President Clinton's plan, offer major changes in economic policy necessary to create jobs, reinvigorate the economy, cut the Federal deficit and restore a measure of fairness to the system.

In a recovery that still lacks job growth, the plan will generate more and better jobs for millions of Americans who are out of work. The plan calls for increased funding for jobs programs and job training, mass transit, highway construction, research and development, defense conversion and a variety of other investment programs that will create an estimated 8 million jobs over the next 4 years.

The plan also increases investment in human capital by providing funding for programs such as Head Start, child immunization, education and training initiatives. Creating a more healthy and productive work force is a true investment in our future.

The plan also provides much needed funding for housing and community development to help rebuild and revitalize our cities.

The budget resolution includes a credible deficit-reduction plan, in which the Federal deficit will be reduced by $510 billion over the next 5 years. The resolution adds an additional $62 billion in discretionary spending cuts to the President's proposal. More than half of the deficit reduction plan is to be achieved through spending cuts. The remaining deficit reduction will come from revenue increases.

The budget resolution restores a measure of fairness to the system. The resolution calls for the revenue proposals included in the President's package. The wealthiest few who paid less taxes on higher incomes in the 1980's will be asked to pay their fair share. Those making over $100,000 a year, will pay 70 percent of the new taxes.

With the increased earned income tax credit and increased funding for food stamps, also recommended by the President, people making under $30,000 will pay virtually no increase in taxes and those making less than $10,000 will actually pay fewer taxes.

Mr. Chairman, we may not like all of the items in the President's package, however, it represents a break from the failed policies of the past and a step in the right direction. I urge all of my colleagues to support the President and vote for House Concurrent Resolution 64 and H.R. 1335.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, today we take a definitive step toward long-term deficit reduction. Long an issue of tremendous concern to Tennessee's Third Congressional District and myself, the national debt has paralyzed our efforts toward steady job growth and economic stability. Taming the national debt will free up critical resources needed for programs that have real promise and provide hope to the men, women, and children of this country.

The budget resolution before us is by no means perfect. It is representative of a compromise between dramatic spending cuts and revenue increases. House Concurrent Resolution 64 is an outline for our spending and revenue intake over the next fiscal year. It is a starting point in the budget process that, as it stands now, will yield $510 billion in deficit reduction over the next 5 years.

I want to applaud the Budget Committee for offering $63 billion more in budget cuts above what the President offered. I was one of several Members who encouraged the committee and the President to find greater savings. We are on the right track. But let's not stop cutting there. Now we should look for even more areas for reductions. Let us issue a challenge to our colleagues to weigh in below the discretionary budget caps for fiscal year 1994 and take an even bigger chunk out of the deficit.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of this budget resolution is not without some pain. While it does not target specific programs or types of tax increases, it does set limits which will undoubtedly have some impact on the public. Thousands of my constituents have called for a good faith effort by Congress to reduce spending before they consider raising any type of taxes. This resolution offers just that. I have heard from many who are willing to consider a fair, but limited tax increase if the spending cuts are there. The next couple of months will afford the Members time to judge the specifics of the package to see if it meets the test of fairness and achieves our objectives.

Failure to pass the fiscal year 1994 budget resolution will show the American people that gridlock and irresponsibility continue to prevail in Congress and the executive branch. Let us move forward with the resolution, begin the budget process, and get this country back on its feet. It is time to make the tough decisions, face our problems head on and launch an all out assault on wasteful Government spending and the national debt. Vote "yes" on House Concurrent Resolution 64.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

□ 2050

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT) having assumed the chair, Mr. SERRANO, Chairman 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. 64) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 183, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

AYES—243

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—183

Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Long
Machtley
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—4

Ford (TN)
Henry
Myers
Quillen

□ 2111

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF COSPONSORS FROM H.R. 1178

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the names of all of the cosponsors be removed from H.R. 1178.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was in a meeting and inadvertently missed rollcall vote No. 83, the motion offered by Mr. BURTON to strike the resolving clause. Since this motion would have killed House Concurrent Resolution 64, the budget resolution, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state for the RECORD that on rollcall vote number 79, I inadvertently voted "no" when I had intended to vote "yes."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material, in the RECORD on House Concurrent Resolution 64.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 1993, TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON H.R. 670, THE FAMILY PLANNING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1992

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight on the night of Tuesday, March 23, 1993, to file a privileged report with respect to H.R. 670, the Family Planning Amendments Act of 1993.

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

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1993

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 132 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 132

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider further in the House the bill (H.R. 1335) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes. All points of order against the bill are waived. It shall be in order to consider one amendment, if offered by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The amendment shall be consid-

ered as read, shall be debatable for ten minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against the amendment are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the amendment and on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, if offered by Representative Michel of Illinois or his designee. A motion to recommit with instructions shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 132 makes in order the further consideration of H.R. 1335, the President's economic stimulus bill, in the House. The resolution waives all points of order against the bill and makes in order one indivisible amendment if offered by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The amendment will be considered as read and debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The amendment will not be subject to further amendment and all points of order against the amendment will be waived.

Finally, under the resolution the previous question will be considered as ordered on the amendment and the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, if offered by Representative MICHEL or his designee. If the motion to recommit contains instructions, the motion will be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided by the proponent and an opponent.

Mr. Speaker, in the publication entitled "A Vision of Change for America," the President outlines a plan to begin the process of restoring the American dream for us and our children.

The President's plan has three key elements: economic stimulus, to create jobs now while laying the foundation for long-term economic growth; public investments to increase the productivity of our people and our businesses; and a serious, fair, and balanced deficit-reduction plan to stop the Government from draining the private investments that generate jobs and increase incomes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1335 embodies the first element of the President's three-part plan: the economic stimulus. The bill invests in the improvement of our infrastructure by financing improvements for our highways, airports, and mass transit systems. These improvements will put thousands of Americans back to work and help place our Nation on an equal footing with competitors who have already invested heavily in their infrastructures.

The bill invests in our people by providing additional resources for education and job training like summer youth employment, college loans and grants, and elementary and secondary school assistance. This will help all Americans, not just a privileged few, to acquire the skills it takes to succeed in today's competitive global environment.

The bill also invests in research and development by accelerating the development and use of science and technology through enhanced computer development and deployment, telecommunications network promotion, engineering, and scientific research. This type of investment will ensure our Nation remains a world leader in these fields.

Finally, for those who want to work but cannot find jobs, the bill provides $4 billion to fund extended unemployment benefits to the 1.9 million individuals who have exhausted their State unemployment benefits. The President signed this legislation earlier this month.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 132 will allow the House to complete expeditiously its consideration of this important legislation to boost a weak economy, create jobs, and begin to invest in our country's future. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my voice may not be strong, but there was no way in the world that I was going to miss the opportunity to rise here in strong opposition to this rule. This gag rule is a clear reflection of a Democratic leadership that opposes open debate, that scoffs at fiscal responsibility, and that pays nothing more than lipservice to the rights of the people's Representatives here in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the vote on this rule represents one of the clearest votes on fiscal responsibility that we will have this year. It presents a distinct choice upon which the American people can judge their elected representatives. The vote on this rule will separate the House of Representatives into two simple groups. On one hand, there are those who support change in Congress, responsibility for spending, and truth in government.

□ 2120

They will vote "no" on this rule; on the other hand, there are those who support business as usual, prolific spending, and want to hide responsibility from the American people—those Members will vote "yes" on this horrible rule.

Mr. Speaker, this closed rule strips every Member of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, of their right to offer an amendment to reduce spending on an appropriations bill. Historically, the vast majority of emergency appropriations bills come to the floor under a procedure that permits Members to call a vote on particular spending items.

Those urgent supplemental appropriations bills were considered under normal procedures because the spending really was urgent. Why does the Democratic leadership require an unprecedented complete gag rule on this $19.5 billion emergency spending bill? Because if amendments to strike spending are permitted, then the truth will come out that most of this spending has absolutely nothing to do with any emergency, will not stimulate any job creation, and is not urgent to anyone but the special interests and politicians.

The Democratic leadership, Mr. Speaker, may think they can hide the specifics of this spending bill from the American people, but they are dead wrong. The American taxpayers are taking the time to see through the smokescreen that is being put up here—and they are not about to be confused or deceived by the phoney leadership amendment that is nothing but an 11th hour attempt to cover up all the waste and pork in this bill.

The vote on this rule is a vote on important amendments to control wasteful spending. Don't just take my word on it—the National Taxpayers Union, the Citizens Against Government Waste, and the Citizens for a Sound Economy all recognize that the vote on this rule is not a procedural vote, it's a real vote for controlling runaway spending. Everyone should be aware that those groups are watching, and scoring, the vote on this rule.

I repeat, they are watching this vote. I know there are many Members in this Congress who could care less about that, but I believe that these organizations truly are a watchdog entity which will gauge this vote.

A "yes" vote on this rule means you oppose a number of bipartisan amendments which will cut nonemergency, nonstimulus spending from this $19.5 billion budget-busting bill.

Now, it must be made clear, just because a Member votes "no" on this rule, it doesn't mean they support every amendment submitted to the Rules Committee, but if someone does cast a "yes" vote, they cannot claim to support even one of the proposed amendments.

A "yes" vote on this rule is a "no" vote on the Stenholm amendment. The Stenholm amendment restricts the emergency designation from any of the spending that does not occur in 1993.

This very thoughtful amendment, which has bipartisan support, would require about $10 billion of this bill to go through the normal appropriation process, reducing the deficit impact of this so-called emergency bill. No member of this House can claim to support Mr. STENHOLM's amendment, or his efforts to control spending, and vote "yes" on this rule.

A "yes" vote on this rule is a vote for $28 million to forgive the debt of the District of Columbia. Is that an emergency? When the American taxpayers are paying higher taxes to reduce our national deficit, it certainly is no emergency, and it provides no stimulus, to the District of Columbia.

The Walsh amendment that was proposed upstairs in the Rules Committee would have allowed it, but of course it is denied, so we will not have an opportunity to delete that under this rule.

A "yes" vote on this rule is a vote for $1.55 million to the Fish and Wildlife Service for fish research and fish atlases which was in the committee's bill. These might be important programs, but they are certainly not emergencies, nor are they a job stimulus. They are more like aquatic pork, pig fish if you will, and if not, they should go through the normal appropriations process. If we had allowed the Hefley amendment we would have had an opportunity to delete that.

Mr. Speaker, a "yes" vote on this rule is a vote to spend all this money without paying for it. The American people want us to be accountable and responsible. They do not want higher deficits—they want us to pay for our programs. The Packard amendment on that would have allowed us to do just that.

A "yes" vote on this rule is a vote to add $2.5 billion to the Community Development Block Grant fund that is already backed up with $4 billion in unspent appropriations. There is no emergency there, Mr. Speaker, and this $2.5 billion will not create a job for years. The Johnson-Buyer amendment would let us vote on that proposal.

Finally, a "yes" vote on this rule is a vote for $148 million in laptop computers for the Internal Revenue Service, $845 million for EPA wastewater treatment programs that the Clinton budget plan said "Don't work," $1.4 million for historical preservation, $187 million for Amtrak, and $9.4 million for a medical library.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on, but none of that spending is for an emergency. None of that spending is stimulus. None of that spending is infrastructure investment. None of that spending is worth breaking the spending caps and adding to the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, this rule vote is a clear choice, a simple vote, and an extraordinarily important statement to American taxpayers. At a time when everyone claims, Democrat and Republican alike, to care about the deficit, the vote on this rule is a, put up or shut up vote. This rule blocks a number of amendments to strike spending that does not fit the President's stated goal of providing short-term economic stimulus to the economy, including the Stenholm amendment.

I urge every Member, Democrats and Republicans, to join me in opposing this rule. This is not a partisan issue, this is not a procedural issue, this is not a procedural vote, it's not an effort to obstruct the President—it's clearly a question of responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, be responsible to the American taxpayer and vote "no" on this terrible rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the rollcall votes in the Rules Committee on this proposed rule for the supplemental appropriation bill and other votes and data on proceedings in the Rules Committee, as follows:

ROLLCALL VOTES IN THE RULES COMMITTEE ON THE PROPOSED RULE FOR THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

1. Dreier motion—for an open rule plus Solomon line-item veto amendment #3 (see attached summary of amendments submitted). Rejected, 3-7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

2. Dreier motion—for an open rule. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

3. Goss motion—to make in order Packard amendment #1. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

4. Goss motion—to make in order Walsh amendment #2. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

5. Goss motion—to make in order Grandy amendment #13 and Kolbe amendment #15. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

6. Dreier motion—to make in order Collins amendment #16. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

7. Dreier motion—to make in order three amendments by Johnson (TX), #18, #19, and #21. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

8. Goss motion—to make in order Talent amendment #23. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

9. Dreier motion—to make in order Gingrich amendment #27. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

10. Dreier motion—to make in order Cox amendment #31. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

11. Dreier motion—to make in order Stenholm amendment #8. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

12. Dreier en bloc motion—to make in order the following amendments: Gallo #5, Grams #6, Gilchrest #7, Goodling #11, Hefley #12, and Kolbe/Packard #14. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

13. Goss en bloc motion—to make in order the following amendments: Lazio #24, Bentley #25, McHugh #26, Baker (CA) #28, Fawell #29, Boehner #30, Skeen #32, and Boehner #33. Rejected, 2-7. Yeas: Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter.

14. Derrick motion—to report rule. Adopted, 7-2. Yeas: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat and Slaughter. Nays: Dreier and Goss.

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1335—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1993

1. Packard: Prohibits obligation of any new spending, except for $4 billion provided to Advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund, until legislation is enacted to offset the cost.

2. Walsh: Strikes the $28 million payment to the District of Columbia.

3. Solomon: Provides enhanced rescission authority to the President on FY 1994 and FY 1995 appropriations bills.

4. Traficant: Prohibits use of funds unless the entity expending funds agrees to comply with the Buy American Act. Expresses sense of Congress that entities receiving funds should buy only American-made products. Requires head of each federal agency providing assistance with funds from the supplemental to provide notice of the sense of Congress.

5. Gallo: Requires head of each federal agency receiving funds to report quarterly on the number and type of full-time permanent new jobs created as a direct result of the funding.

6. Grams: Strikes $1.409 million for National Park Service, National Recreation and Preservation account. The money was appropriated for 28 projects in 23 states to produce measured drawings of significant structures and engineering achievements.

7. Gilchrist: Prohibits use of funds unless Labor Secretary certifies that GNP in the first quarter of 1993 grew at a rate of less than 2.5%.

8. Stenholm: Replaces emergency designation in the bill (section 202) with an emergency designation to permit adjustment of FY 1993 caps only.

9. Stenholm: Replaces emergency designation in the bill (section 202) with an emergency designation that applies only to funds spent out in FY 1993. Any outlays that flow in FY 1994 or after will be treated as budget authority provided in FY 1994 and will not be under the emergency designation.

10. Orton: Rescinds $400 million of unobligated appropriations for HOPE (Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere) grants—combined from FY 1992 and FY 1993 funds; transfers an additional $75 million from the same account to the HOME investment partnerships program.

11. Goodling: Prohibits use of "Summer of Service" funds for a closing summit conference described in the March 8, 1993 Federal Register.

12. Hefley: Reduces by $1.455 million the amount provided for Fish and Wildlife Service (Resource Management). The Committee report states that of the $87.3 million provided for that purpose, $1.455 million would be available for fisheries research.

13. Grandy: Strikes emergency spending designation in the bill.

14. Kolbe/Packard: Requires new budget authority in the bill to be obligated only after equal offsetting reductions are made.

15. Kolbe: Strikes emergency spending designation in the bill.

16. Collins (GA): Provides that none of the funds designated by this bill may be used for any individual who is not a citizen or a lawfully admitted alien of the U.S.

17. Johnson (TX): Strikes $4.696 million for additional salaries and expenses for the National Science Foundation. WITHDRAWN

18. Johnson (TX): Strikes $2.5 billion from the Community Planning and Development—Community Development Grants.

19. Johnson (TX): Strikes $187 million for National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

20. Johnson (TX): Strikes $4.7 million for retrofitting equipment for energy efficiency in Federal buildings. WITHDRAWN

21. Johnson (TX): Strikes $20.663 million for EPA for abatement, control, and compliance to encourage business conversion to more energy efficient equipment.

22. Johnson (TX): Strikes $37.8 million for items relating to "Forest Service—Construction". WITHDRAWN

23. Talent: Substitute—Economic Growth and Job Creation Act of 1993. Title I—Neutral Cost Recovery. Title II—lowers the maximum capital gains rate to 15% for taxpayers in the upper tax brackets and 7.5% for those in the lower tax brackets. Indexes capital gains to compensate for inflation. Title III—creates IRA plus accounts. Title IV—provides a $600 tax credit for families with children age 18 and under.

24. Lazio: Provides $10 million for a National Food Insurance program that permits FEMA to purchase flood-damaged property and relocate flood-insured homeowners to areas not prone to flooding. The funds would be available for the remainder of FY 1993 and FY 1994.

25. Bentley: Requires Federal agency heads to certify that funds spent under this act are used to purchase American produced materials and labor.

26. McHugh: Deletes $800 thousand for design and preliminary planning of the Ocoee River Olympic Venue for whitewater canoeing during the 1986 Olympics.

27. Gingrich: Strikes $1 billion for the summer youth employment program.

28. Baker (CA): Strike $4.7 million for undertaking energy efficiencies in federal buildings by retrofiting equipment.

29. Fawell: Adds a new title which contains a government-wide rescission list of 747 Federally funded projects.

30. Boehner: Strikes activities that are not authorized in law as appropriate uses of Chapter 1 funds.

31. Cox: Strikes $148 million for IRS tax systems modernization.

32. Skeen: Strikes the phrase "unless expressly so provided herein" which has the effect of making all funds appropriated in the bill lapse after September 30, 1993 unless obligated by that date.

33. Boehner: Strikes $9.4 million for National Institute of Health/National Library of Medicine.

34. DeLauro: Upon effective date, a State shall have the flexibility to transfer its FY 1993 apportionments from the Interstate Construction Program or the Interstate Substitution Program among the National Highway Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, Surface Transportation program, Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program and Interstate Maintenance Program, provided that the transfer shall not exceed 100 percent of a State's FY 1993 apportionment for that specific category.

35. DeLauro: Upon effective date, a State shall have the flexibility to transfer its FY 1993 apportionments among the Interstate Construction Program, the National Highway Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, Surface Transportation program, Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program and Interstate Maintenance Program, provided that the transfer shall not exceed 100 percent of a State's FY 1993 apportionment for that specific category.

36. Barrett (WI): Adds rehabilitation and construction of schools to the list of projects eligible for funding under the Community Development Block Grants (CDBG).

37. Barrett (WI): Federal Aid Highway—Requires that the State of Washington allocate funding to the largest metropolitan area which is proportional to the percentage of the state's population which resides in that area.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 95TH–103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted [1]	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [3]
95th (1977–78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979–80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981–82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983–84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985–86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987–88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989–90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991–92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993–94)	8	0	0	8	100

[1] Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

[2] Open rules are those which permit any member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

[3] Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rules, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Source: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th–102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Congress, through Mar. 17, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONG.

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D–5; R–25)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 246–176. A: 259–164. (Feb. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: Motor voter	9 (D–1; R–8)	1 (D–0; R–1)	PQ: 248–171. A: 249–170. (Feb. 4, 1993).
H. Res. 81, Feb. 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 6: Family planning	8 (D–0; R–8)	1 (D–0; R–1)	
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D–2; R–5)	0	PQ: 243–172. A: 237–178. (Feb. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D–1; R–8)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 248–166. A: 249–163. (Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (D–4; R–9)	8 (D–3; R–5)	PQ: 247–170. A: 248–170. (Mar. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental appropriations	37 (D–8; R–29)	1 (not submitted) (D–1; R–0).	
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D–2; R–12)	4 (1–D not submitted) (D–2; R–2).	

Note.—Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tonight, we must make a choice. It is not an easy choice, but it is a clear choice.

We either support the President's economic package with $500 billion in deficit savings and $16 billion in stimulus and investments, or we oppose it.

For many of us most concerned with reducing the deficit, it might be easy to vote "No" on the stimulus/investment package.

But the reality is this: If fiscal conservatives kill the investment package, liberals will kill the budget resolution and budget cuts. This Congress and our country could end up with budget gridlock—the worst of all worlds.

Sometimes, democracy demands compromise. The fact that we have a House and a Senate is itself a compromise of our Founding Fathers—one that has served our Nation well.

Today, we must compromise: not our principles, but our personal agendas. Personally, I would prefer fewer defense and agriculture cuts and a smaller investment package, but I also believe reducing our deficit by $500 billion over 5 years is a historic opportunity. It will create jobs, stimulate our economy and stop the mortgaging of our children's future.

□ 2130

In a democracy, no one has the right to demand "its either my way or no way at all." Not even the President has that right. That's why President Clinton agreed to put spending cuts before new programs and taxes. That's why he accepted $63 billion in extra spending cuts.

That is also why I hope fiscal conservatives will vote "yes" on the stimulus investment package.

For $16 billion in investment spending, we get $500 billion in deficit reduction, including $63 billion in extra spending cuts. That's not a bad deal even for the best of budget cutters.

To my fellow Democrats, for 12 years we have blamed the Republican White House for our deficits and they have blamed us. Republicans and Democrats could each vote "no" on the other's deficit plans and then say "don't blame me."

Today, the time for games and finger pointing and rationalizing "no" votes is over. We must act and act decisively to create jobs and lower the deficit.

I realize there are other options than the President's plan. The fact is any-

one with a computer and an imagination can develop a budget plan; that's easy. What's difficult is to develop a plan that can garner 218 votes in this House. Everyone in this House knows the only investment and deficit reduction plan that has any chance of passing today is the President's plan that was modified with input from this Congress.

Is it a perfect plan? No, but it is a solid plan and one that balances the competing interests of liberals, moderates and conservatives, and urban and rural areas.

To sink half of this plan is like shooting a hole in the bottom of a ship. To do so would sink the entire ship, not just the half you don't like. If fiscal conservatives sink the investment package, we also sink $500 billion in deficit reduction and what a tragedy that would be.

This package is well balanced. With it, we can move forward into the future, or we can sink back into the depths of gridlock and finger pointing.

If democracy is to work, we must all be willing to work together. If we wait for perfect, painless solutions our legacy will be a sad one of indecision, gridlock and higher deficits.

The time for negotiation is over. We have all done our best to make a better product. Now we must make a choice. It is a choice between gridlock and a delicate compromise. If we undo this compromise, and end up in chaos, there will not be enough cover in America behind which we can hide. Finger pointing and passing the buck won't work this time.

It is time for us to work together and to govern responsibly. It is time to get Government and America moving again. The choice is ours.

I urge Members to vote "yes" on this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very saddened that someone could call themselves a fiscal conservative and claim to support this rule and this stimulus package which is one of the most detrimental things that could possibly happen to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the hard-working ranking Republican on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my hoarse friend. I hope his voice is better.

Mr. Speaker, I really could not believe my ears a couple minutes ago when I heard, or I think I heard, the previous speaker, although I am not sure I heard right, say that if fiscal conservatives kill this porker, the liberals are going to kill the just-passed budget. Well, boy oh boy, let us kill them all and America will be much better off.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a long night, especially for me, and it is a bad time to bring up bad news. But I have some bad news for all 110 of you new Members that came to this Congress who thought that you had been elected to the first branch of the Government that has the control over the purse strings.

Now, that is what the House of Representatives is supposed to be. Here we are in a so-called emergency supplemental appropriations, so-called emergency, which is a euphemism for spending more of money that we do not have budgeted. Nothing is new around here.

Members, new Members, your leadership has given you virtually no power of the purse in amending this supplemental to reduce spending. They cut you off completely, all 110 of you, and not only do you not have your hands on the purse string, you are being asked to buy off on a bottomless silk purse made up of a sow's ear. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK], my friend, knows what a sow's ear is, a pretty worthless piece of pork. Nobody eats it. You throw it away.

Mr. Speaker, on well over 80 percent of the 61 supplemental appropriation bills that have been brought before this House from the 95th Congress to the 102d Congress, we have had an open amendment process with the ability to offer amendments to cut spending. Our good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], is the chairman of the subcommittee, and has always brought these bills to the floor with open amendment, open striking processes. We have had real power of the purse in the past. But that has been taken away in this rule.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that 37 amendments were filed with the Committee on Rules, Democrat and Republican, on this bill, only one amendment is made in order. Only one amendment was made in order, and it was not even filed. It still has not been filed, and nobody has any idea what is in it or where it is. Is it really only a technical amendment, as somebody told the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and myself the other Thursday night when we were closing up shop here? I would like to know where that amendment is. When are we going to get a chance to see it?

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes a mockery of democracy. The Democrat leadership should be ashamed of itself that it is force-feeding this bloated piece of pork down the throats of this House without any opportunity to carve out any of the worthless fat.

I really do not think the American people had in mind breaking gridlock with ham hock. My colleagues, this bill is a squealer if I ever heard one, oink, oink, oink, oink, oink.

Mr. Speaker, this is not economic-stimulus package. This is the same old spend-and-spend-and-spend Congress that has got ourselves into this problem over the last 20 years. We really tried to kid somebody.

Vote down this rule. Let us kill this pig before it gets out of the barn.

Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD documents concerning open versus restrictive rules, as follows:

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 95TH–103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted [1]	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [3]
95th (1977–78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979–80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981–82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983–84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985–86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987–88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989–90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991–92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993–94)	8	0	0	8	100

[1] Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

[2] Open rules are those which permit any member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

[3] Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rules, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Source: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th–102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103rd Congress, through Mar. 17, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONG.

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D–5; R–25)	3 (D–0 R–3)	PQ: (264–176. A: 259–164. Feb. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: Motor voter	9 (D–1; R–8)	1 (D–0; R–1)	PQ: (248–171. A: 249–170. Feb. 4, 1993).
H. Res. 81, Feb. 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 6: Family planning	8 (D–0; R–8)	1 (D–0; R–1)	
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D–2; R–5)	0	PQ: (243–172. A: 237–178. Feb. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D–1; R–8)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: (248–166. A: 249–163. Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (D–4; R–9)	8 (D–3; R–5)	PQ: (247–170. A: 248–170. Mar. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental appropriations	37 (D–8; R–29)	1 (not submitted) (D–1; R–0).	
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D–2; R–12)	4 (1–D not submitted) (D–2; R–2).	

Note.—Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

COMPARATIVE TABLE ON AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS: 95TH–102D CONGRESSES

Congress	Number of supplementals	Open amendment processes		Restrictive amendment processes	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
95th	13	13	100	0	0
96th	6	5	83	1	17
97th	11	10	91	1	9
98th	9	6	67	3	33
99th	7	6	86	1	14
100th	4	2	50	2	50
101st	4	3	75	1	25
102d	7	5	71	2	29
Total	61	50	82	11	18

Sources.—House Calendars, Rules Committee Calendars, & bound copies of "Rules Granted," Committee on Rules.

(Note.—When no rule was granted, it is assumed the Appropriations Committee called the supplementals up as privileged and they were considered in the Committee of the Whole under an open amendment process as required by the Rules of the House.)

Compiled by minority staff, House Committee on Rules.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished farmer and gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with great disappointment to oppose the rule to H.R. 1335, the supplemental appropriation for 1993. I had hoped to offer an amendment which I believe represented a reasonable compromise in the supplemental, balancing the goal of spending to invest in economic growth with the equally important goal of controlling the Federal deficit.

Because there seems to be some misunderstanding of what my amendment actually would have accomplished, I want to take this opportunity to make perfectly clear what I had proposed. Since my amendment was not made in order by this rule, some may think that my explanation constitutes closing the gate after the horses are out of the corral. The reason I take the time to do so, however, is both for final clarification here in the House and because I understand that the other body may have the opportunity to vote on an amendment such as I proposed. I would like to help further that debate.

I fully support the intent of the President's stimulus proposal, that being to strengthen our economy. However, I do not believe that the $17-plus billion of the stimulus spending should be added to the deficit. I felt that we should pass a stimulus package that includes spending which truly invests in economic growth and we should pay for it by finding rescissions in consumption spending to offset that spending.

If there is one point I would hope to express as clearly as possible it is this: My amendment would have allowed all spending included in the President's supplemental to go forward, without making any programmatic changes in his proposal. I would not have deleted a single program or a single dollar from the President's plan. Where I differed from the President is that I would require offsets in other appropriations for the approximately $10 billion in spending resulting from the bill in fiscal year 1994 and beyond. The amendment would not have impeded the ability to spend money for economic stimulus. It simply would have required that any stimulus coming from additional spending not add to the deficit after 1993. Frankly, my strong preference is that we pay for the entire supplemental, but in the spirit of compromise I was willing to accept not paying for the spending in the current fiscal year if we agreed to pay for all of the spending in future years.

The purpose of this amendment was simply to require that the spending provided for by H.R. 1335 be within the spending ceilings set in the budget resolution that the House has just approved. With my amendment, the spending provided under this act would have been held harmless under the budget authority and outlay caps for fiscal year 1993, but any outlays resulting from the bill in fiscal year 1994 and beyond would have been subject to the current outlay caps for those years. Under H.R. 1335, nearly 60 percent of the emergency economic stimulus spending will be in fiscal year 1994 and beyond. There will be nearly $600 million in emergency spending in 1997. One cannot argue reasonably for spending money on an emergency basis four years after the emergency declaration.

Tonight we have passed a budget resolution, which I supported, that will move us in the right direction in dealing with our fiscal problems by providing for $510 billion in deficit reduction and a hard freeze in discretionary outlays over the next 5 years. I worry about the message we are about to send to the public if we now pass a stimulus package that immediately exceeds the spending limits included in the budget resolution. In an era when congressional credibility is anything but high, we do ourselves yet greater damage, and we also risk squandering the current public willingness to sacrifice personally for the sake of deficit reduction.

In a recent speech to the National League of Cities, President Clinton argued that spending which invests in economic growth is more important than spending for consumption. That is the spirit in which I had hoped to offer this amendment. The amendment would have required that the spending in the supplemental intended to invest in economic growth be paid for by cutting spending that does not invest in economic growth. If this body decides that the spending included in the supplemental should be a priority, then we should be willing to find offsetting spending cuts to pay for it. We must set priorities in Government spending.

The election last year made it obvious that the public is demanding greater fiscal responsibility from us. The public recognizes that we cannot continue the practice of spending money on every good idea without considering how to pay for it. That is why I was not surprised that some of the strongest enthusiasm for my amendment came from freshman Members who were elected on a mandate of change and responsibility.

The economic cost of increasing the deficit could easily more than offset any benefit from spending intended for stimulus. In testimony before the House Budget Committee just a few weeks ago, Alan Greenspan could not have been clearer about the importance of immediate action on deficit reduction when he stated,

> Reducing the structural deficit is crucial. And action must be taken now. Postponing action would only extend the pattern of sluggish growth of the capital stock and, with incomes and living standards lagging, would ultimately make it even more difficult to engage in the programmatic actions that are necessary.

He continued by saying,

> I find misplaced the fear that deficit reduction would be overdone and create an undesirable degree of 'fiscal drag.' It seems to me highly unlikely that in the current political environment the Congress and the Administration would cut too much too soon from the deficit * * * Fiscal policymakers in turn, by taking difficult but necessary measures to reduce the structural deficit now, can enhance the growth of the economy and promote rising living standards for the American people for years to come.

Like the President, I care about economic stimulus. I believe that it can be achieved only through the pairing of careful investment and deficit reduction.

Based on the House being prevented from considering my amendment, I regrettably must oppose the rule tonight.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Sanibel, FL, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], a hard-working member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, ask average Americans what emergency means to them, and likely they will tell you a fire, a hurricane, somebody choking, the crash landing of an airplane, something you might call 911 about.

There is no emergency that is dictating the urgent need to go $19 billion-plus further into debt at this time when we are trying to reduce our debt and asking Americans to sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, the emergency before us is the budget deficit. We are broke. We are $4 trillion in the hole, and we are heading for $5 trillion. We have spent too much, and we should be cutting back today, not trying to pass more.

If we pass this so-called stimulus pork-filled package, perhaps somebody

had better call 911 and get some help for our national economy and the American people.

Some would have us believe that Congress owes the President an up-or-down vote on the stimulus package, that our votes today are the supreme test of some type of party loyalty, and I am truly saddened and somewhat amazed that the Democrat majority on the Committee on Rules, especially in today's climate for change, has charged down the path lockstep with a closed rule offering a take-it-or-leave-it option.

We are a separate branch of government by design, and we have a separate responsibility.

□ 2140

This is gridlock to lockstep. We had many legitimate, worthwhile and cost-saving amendments from dozens of Members on both sides of the aisle that fell by the wayside in the rules process. We do not work for the President. We work for the people, and we owe them more than a rubber stamp on a deficit spending bill whose merits have melted away faster than the snow outside. But we do work with the President—and we try to improve his proposals when we can—that is what this is about.

Amendments were offered from both sides of the aisle to remove the most egregious examples of the skewed priorities in this bill and you have heard some of them.

Members will vote for this closed rule and vote for this bill if they are satisfied with Congress' deficit reduction track record to date. But Members who recognize that change means more than a nifty campaign slogan will join me in opposing both the rule and the bill.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I can stand here, reel off numbers, and yet, not convince my colleagues of the need for this economic stimulus package. For many the hard numbers—lost jobs and closed plants—just aren't compelling. But today I heard of a worker from a company in my State, a man with 19 years seniority, a wife and 11 children, a mortgage, college tuition, who just lost his job. In Connecticut he joins almost 200,000 others laid off in the last 4 years. Real people, people who work hard, people who deserve better.

Today we can vote to give these people some hope. To show them gridlock is over and that we have listened to them. We have, through hard work, compromise, and conciliation, put together a blueprint for economic recovery.

To reach this point, we agreed to cut spending deeply; to raise taxes broadly and fairly, and to provide people with the aid they needed for jobs, for rebuilding the infrastructure, for taking care of badly neglected urban areas, and for seeing people through a very, very difficult economic time.

But now some of my colleagues are saying that we are on the way to recovery. That we don't need this bill. But, my friends, that doesn't square with the truth.

This so-called recovery has fallen far below previous recoveries on the basis of virtually every economic measure. Employment in manufacturing has actually continued to decline, and hourly wages are now about where they were in 1965.

Mr. Speaker, the case that we need this stimulus package is strong. But more than that, it is part of a package, an agreement under which we all share the sacrifices, endure the pain. Now we must pass this bill as part of this agreement—all of us bound to see both parts succeed, or the entire plan fail. It is your choice. I urge success, I urge a vote for this bill, I urge a vote that will break gridlock and bring hope.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the only hope that we can possibly bring is some sort of relief to the American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my very good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], who is the chief deputy minority whip.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is another in a series of Mussolini rules brought to the floor. This one is a no-spending cut rule, a pork protection rule. It allows one amendment, and it is illegitimate.

This particular amendment was never filed. In fact, it has not been filed to this date. We have no idea what is in it. You would think that an amendment concocted in secret and kept in secret would at least be read to the House of Representatives. But then you look at the rule, and you find out that this particular amendment shall be considered as read. We are not even going to hear what it is when they bring it to the floor.

We were told last night by the chairman of the Committee on Rules that it would be merely a technical amendment. Now we are to understand it is going to be a substantive amendment. What is going on here? Since when do the Members of Congress not have a right to understand what it is they are voting on? Since when do we have no right to strike out spending, which is pork, which is an absolutely outrageous spending?

Why can the minority not see a copy of the amendment that may be offered on the House floor here in a little while? Our leadership cannot even get a hold of the language of the amendment. It is being kept in secret.

It is absolutely wrong; this is Mussolini at his worst.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLEGATE].

Mr. APPLEGATE. I thank the chairman for yielding to me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the same people who are opposing the rule are the same people who say that the economy is good. They say that we do not need a stimulus.

Well, this might be all right in Palm Springs and Beverly Hills, but I say why don't you come to Ohio and find out about the real world?

My district is 14 percent unemployed and more underemployed, and most of Ohio is very heavily unemployed. You say there were 380,000 jobs created in February; 350,000 of them are part time, and they are minimum wage. You insult the people of Ohio, you insult the people of America when you say to them, "Let them eat cake."

I am sure you remember what happened to Marie Antoinette when she said that.

Many of you who oppose the stimulus package are the ones who helped to bring us to despair in the 1990's with your economic policies of the 1980's, not just Republicans alone, but by the Reagan boll weevil Democrats who voted with you. What were the results? Heavy deficit, bad trade policy where our jobs went out of the country, the disappearance of the middle-income category of people, those who pay the bills; more people in poverty and the refusal of you to take a look at smalltown and rural America, those who have lost their tax base and jobs and now cannot help themselves. What other proof do you need? America is in trouble, and they need us.

What kind of a nation are we if we do not help the very people that this country, as Abe Lincoln said, is by, of, and for? Remember, this is a nation of people, not for aristocrats, not for politicians.

So let us stop playing games, let us stop political grandstanding and do something right for a change. Let us win this one for the people.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 2½ minutes to my very hard-working friend and leader of the porkbuster coalition, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to express myself at this point about what we in the porkbuster group tried to do by coming before the Committee on Rules. I think that, in effect, we were testing the resolve of the Rules Committee and hence, of Congress, to really cut spending. And I think that Congress has, thus far, failed that test.

An awful lot of speakers today have blamed former Presidents for the Nation's $4-trillion debt. But I think we have to go no further than the looking-

glass to find out who the culprit really is.

Since there is no line-item veto power to weed out pork appropriations which never have gone through the legislative process, Congress itself must do, in effect, the line-item scrutiny of spending projects, ex post facto, after a session is concluded and vote for the repeal of such spending projects.

That's all that the porkbusters amendment presented to the Rules Committee, as an amendment to the stimulus bill, does. It identified 747 spending projects passed last year as a part of the fiscal year 1993 appropriation, totaling approximately $2 billion, that is, $2 billion of appropriation projects which never went through the established congressional process for spending projects. And it asked that these $2 billion of spending projects be repealed. By doing this, $2 billion of the $16.2 billion to be spent under the stimulus bill would be offset.

As usual, however, the Rules Committee said "no" to such an amendment. That is, the amendment could not even be debated upon the floor of this House to offset spending which will add $16.2 billion to the deficit for fiscal year 1993.

□ 2150

I would like to share with you an editorial from the Chicago Tribune. Just today they were talking about the porkbusters group, which of course is headed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] and myself. They say this:

> But it (the porkbusters bill) ought to attract substantial majorities from both sides of the aisles in both Chambers (of Congress). For if Congress can't agree to cut $2 billion for projects the sponsors wouldn't even submit to routine committee scrutiny, how can it be expected to take the ambitious actions needed to erase a $300 billion deficit.

That is my point. If we in Congress cannot put the axe to congressional pork which has been passed outside of the established Congressional rules for passing spending projects, what hope is there that this Congress can really ever be taken seriously about cutting spending after the taxes have been levied and the new spending spree completed? One of the visions for America should be for Congress to reform itself, for Congress to be challenged. Congress will not be challenged I think until we begin to act to clean up the mess right within your own body.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the rule and of the bill.

I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding time to me, I want to particularly commend the dean of the Kentucky delegation, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] whose bill we will be taking up. I salute my friend and my dean for the excellent work that he has put forth on the bill.

I do not believe that people who might be observing these proceedings really understand all the esoterica and the details of closed and open rules.

What I do think they fully understand is simply this. The President won the election last November. The President stood on this rostrum about a month ago and advanced his plan, both of investments and also of budget changes, to the Nation, and the Nation has adopted that plan and the Nation has weighed in by saying, "Give this fellow a chance to have his program enacted. Let him see if he can pull this off."

That is what we are really here tonight to do, to give the President a chance to achieve his two-part program. These parts are interrelated. They are I think inseparable.

One part is the budget which we earlier passed tonight puts us on a glide path down to lower deficits, it cuts about $500 billion out of the budget, to lower interest rates and lower unemployment rates, and to greater development, greater economic development.

The second part of the program is what we are about to adopt tonight, the stimulus-investment program.

Now, we have heard of capital investment, and it is very commonplace: bridges, highways, the so-called infrastructure, airports. But, we also have something new and different in the gentleman's bill, and that is human investment. We are investing now in education: in Head Start, chapter 1. We are investing in health: immunization programs. We are investing in job opportunities and training: the summer job program.

This is, Mr. Speaker, a strong and a unified and I think inseparable package. It ought to be passed as a package. Let us adopt the rule tonight. Let us pass the gentleman's bill. Let us give President Clinton a chance to have his program enacted.

I believe personally it will lead America to a better day.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my hard-working friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], who has been trying to adjourn the House all day long.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Let me just say that tonight the Democrat party raised taxes on the American people by $402 billion, but they were doing that, Mr. Speaker, because they wanted to solve our economic problems, and tonight after that they are going to pass a dire emergency supplemental that is so important to the economic well-being of America. Let us see what is in that.

Millions of dollars for beach parking garages, a cemetery, movie theaters, gym replacement, swimming pool renovation, computers that have not yet been purchased, they are going to prepay those, $8 million; $28 million to the District of Columbia; $560,000 for restroom repairs.

Restroom repairs? That is a dire emergency?

Omnibus fish and wildlife research, $3.2 million for large river populations of sickle fin chub, whatever that is.

Get this, the study of traditional and nontraditional forms of popular religion in Sicily. In Sicily, Mr. Speaker, we are going to spend millions of dollars in this dire emergency supplemental, it is so important to the economic well-being of America, right on the heels of a $402 billion tax increase. Baloney.

This is pork, pure and simple. You are at it again. The American people ought to know, these taxes are not going to go for deficit reduction, but for more padding of your congressional district so you can get reelected.—

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank the President of the United States for his leadership for sending this smart, well-targeted investment package to the Congress. I thank the leadership of the House, the Rules Committee, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, on which I serve, for giving us this rule, which gives us the opportunity to vote for the Clinton stimulus package free, clear, and unadulterated.

By voting for this package tonight we can send a clear message to the American people that the tide has turned in their favor at long last, that the spending priorities of this country really do put people first and that the promise of the Clinton campaign is being kept.

One of the previous speakers on the Republican side defined emergencies as fire, earthquake, and other disasters. My colleagues, I would add that 14 million Americans out of work is an emergency as well. In fact, it is 14 million emergencies in 14 million households across the country.

Because we have an unprecedented phenomenon, a jobless recovery, we need this emergency package which puts people to work in rebuilding America, and more importantly, in investing in our children, in their health with child immunization, with their education, with the summer school programs. As we do that, we will be putting women to work in these summer school programs and health programs for children.

So yes, some people have asked the question, is this stimulus an invest-

ment package? Yes, it is. It invests in our children, in their education, in their health care, and it is an investment in rebuilding the infrastructure of our country.

Another question is, can the money be spent? As a member of the Health and Human Services Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I can say that I commend this administration for sending a well-targeted smart bill which targets the amount of money that can be spent, the amount of money that the infrastructure for these programs can absorb in a short period to time, and truly put people to work.

My colleagues, I urge you to support the rule, support the stimulus package. Let us turn the tide for the American people. Let us support the Clinton program.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], a hard-working member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, a little earlier we heard a tremendous philosophical debate on the budget. Unfortunately, that debate occurred in a legal vacuum. What I mean is that the budget resolution, whatever is adopted, is not legally binding. The majority can, and do, regularly set it aside when it is convenient to do so, so it does not offer any controls.

For that reason, today, as in the past several years, I have not voted for any of the proposed budget resolutions; however, I do not want any misinterpretation of my view of budget deficit reduction.

I believe, as it has been said here many times, that reducing the budget deficit requires spending control.

Mr. Speaker, I think the proof of that is what are we doing here on the House floor right now? We are considering a proposal by the majority to spend more money.

Now, this is right after we adopted the majority budget resolution in which they claim they were interested in budget deficit containment.

Now Mr. Speaker, I would ask, does an economic plan that starts off with new spending, is it seriously interested in budget deficit reduction: In the words of a very young actor in a recent movie, "I don't think so."

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED].

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1335, the stimulus and investment supplemental for fiscal year 1993.

I think my colleagues who decry this investment package miss the point of the last election and the main concern of their constituents. Simply put, today's vote is a vote for jobs—jobs for laid-off defense workers, construction workers, and millions of other unemployed Americans—the first real jobs bill this body has acted on in years.

It is also a first step toward reversing the failed budget policies of the past 12 years. In combination with the deficit reduction included in the budget resolution, we will begin to once again productively invest in America.

Some of my colleagues may also object to this fiscal stimulus on the grounds that the economy is already recovering. Well, I would like them to know that there are many people back in my State of Rhode Island and in New England who would say otherwise.

Indeed, Rhode Island's unemployment rates remains about a point above the national average. Compared to past recoveries, the current recovery is just not generating enough jobs.

Finally, today's vote is important as a signal to the American people that we can, and we will, act with purpose to reinvigorate our economy. The inaction of the past must give way to action now to rebuild our economy, restore confidence to our people, and reaffirm our commitment to opportunities for all our citizens.

□ 2200

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my very dear friend and our California surfer, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, earlier I mentioned that for 12 years liberals ridiculed the conservative program of low taxes and spending controls as trickle-down economics. By the time the liberals get done with their taxing and spending spree, Mr. Speaker, working people will be taxed out of their jobs, and there will not be anything left to trickle down. But what can we expect from politicians who have the chutzpah to come up here and say they care, politicians who call for tax hikes and then call them contributions, who call for increased Federal spending and call it investment?

I say to my colleagues, "If you buy that double-speak, you'll buy that Bill Clinton never intended to tax the middle class. If you buy that, you'll buy that this is an emergency stimulus package, a stimulus, yes, to inflation, a stimulus to temporary jobs at the cost of permanent jobs. You can talk in double-speak if you want, but the American people realize you can't tax our people into prosperity, and you can't spend down the deficit."

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to indeed say we want to move forth the rule. We want to move forth the rule because we want to move to end gridlock. It allows us to get to the real emergency, and that is to respond to the declaration of the people.

Many people, I know, do not enjoy the progress of this recovery, and it is an emergency. It is an emergency when people are out of work, when people are hungry, when children do not have opportunities or families do not have opportunities. It is an emergency, my colleagues, when the summer jobs are not there and there is despair in our streets.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge that we move with a positive vote on the rule and move to approve the stimulus to move America forward.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], a hard-working freshman Member who had an amendment up in the Committee on Rules that was denied.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I come here to speak against this rule and to Republicans and Democrats alike. We all understand that it is the jobs that we want to address. But it is the manner in which and how we want to address it. There are those that want to create jobs. These are public works jobs, and they go to the urban centers.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to stand up for rural America. I was surprised just moments ago to hear from a colleague of mine who has a rural district who said she is for this package. I will share something with my colleagues about those in rural America:

They are honest, hard-working. They have a great deal of integrity. They have strong character because they have always done more with less.

This stimulus package does not stimulate real jobs. It creates public works jobs.

I have heard testimony by colleague after colleague saying, "Let's create jobs." Well, I want to create jobs, too, and, as my colleagues know, I also want to participate in the process like many of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike.

I heard very eloquent speeches here tonight by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]; by the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], who say, "Let's give our new President a chance." I agree. I want our President to succeed. But likewise the Republicans and Democrats alike want to be given a chance to be constructive in the process of government for which we were brought here to participate in, and that is not being allowed.

I testified before the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK]. I appreciated that. But 37 amendments were denied, and that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, we seek to be constructive in the process, and likewise we want to be given a chance to help this

President succeed so America can succeed.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the more recent report on unemployment told it all. We are creating more jobs in this country, but they continue to be part-time jobs without benefits.

We need a growth package, and this will help. It comes only after passage of the budget resolution, so it is linked with deficit reduction. So, these are twins.

I sit on the Committee on Ways and Means, and we are going to have the responsibility to carry out this budget resolution, most of the pieces of it, and I assure everybody, as far as I am concerned, and I think other members of the Committee on Ways and Means have spoken, we will pass a revenue package only after the deficit reduction and the budget cuts are assured. This President has linked deficit reduction and economic growth.

Tonight we go forth, Mr. Speaker, championing both of them.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS], another courageous new Member of Congress who came before the Committee on Rules and was denied the right to offer his amendment.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Speaker, we have a new President at the head table, and already he is asking Congress to please pass the pork.

Less than 1 hour after this body put its stamp of approval on the largest tax increase in American history, the Democrats are now turning right around and looking to borrow $16 billion for new spending.

That's $16 billion we are going to pass on to our kids, and make them pay interest on for as long as the eye can see.

And what are we borrowing that money for?

There is $3.2 million for research that includes compiling fish atlases on the sickelfin chub.

Borrowing $28 million to pay off the debt for the District of Columbia. That's right. The Federal Government is actually borrowing money to bail out Washington, DC.

And, $5 million for a beachside parking garage.

While most people call this pork, the Democrats call this spending an emergency.

And they view this pork as so sacred, that the Rules Committee prevented me from offering an amendment today to strike $1.4 million from the bill that will be used to hire people to draw pictures of Federal buildings.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of the new spending in the Democrat's bill is being sold on the notion that spending more now will somehow save us money later. This is their idea of investment. In other words, they believe we can actually spend our way out of the deficit.

Well, that's like using your credit card to buy something marked down 10 percent, then turning around and paying 20 percent in interest year after year after year. You may think you are saving money. But when you factor in years and years of interest, the savings disappear into a pool of red ink.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats are not simply writing a $16 billion check tonight, they're doing it on borrowed funds.

That means that this year, next year, and for every year until the national debt is paid off, we and our children will be paying for the emergency fish atlases, parking garages, and pictures of Federal buildings in this bill tonight.

That is not just wrong—it is crazy. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Democrats' pork bill.

□ 2210

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1335, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for 1993. While the American economy as a whole has begun to show optimistic signs of improvement and progression, unemployment remains high and job growth rates are meager. The national unemployment rate is currently at 7.1 percent and has exceeded 7 percent for the last 14 consecutive months. Numbers such as these can only be confronted by a comprehensive economic stimulus proposal, such as the bill before us today.

H.R. 1335 provides a total of $16.3 billion for the investment of Federal funds in our infrastructure, urban and rural community development, mass transit, energy, environment and technology initiative programs, all of which are warranted and essential for the far-reaching goal of revitalizing an ailing economy. This bill will create 200,000 jobs this year and 500,000 overall, and would provide insurance against the possibility of the economy slipping back into recession. It will foster greater job growth, fund the retraining of many of our displaced workers, extend unemployment benefits and initiate long-term investments in our country, as well as in our valued citizens.

We must make conscientious efforts to invest in our future.

Mr. Speaker, in some areas, such as my home State of California, economic improvement has not been realized, and is not forecasted to show significant recovery until the end of 1993. In the last year, California has lost 168,000 nonfarm jobs. Of the nine major industry groups, only the services sector has registered a job increase, while four other sectors—retail, manufacturing, mining, and transportation and public utilities—have all shed jobs. Currently, California has the second highest unemployment rate in the Nation, 9.8 percent.

More specifically, in Los Angeles County, the district which I represent, the rate of unemployed workers has soared to an astonishing 11.2 percent, more than 4 percentage points above the national average. The economic condition of my State not only warrants a stimulus package, but depends on it.

Los Angeles County, in particular, stands to benefit from the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for 1993. It would provide the city with $49 million in Federal grants for public works and parks projects, thus initiating a flurry of job creation.

Economic development funds have also been designated to help launch small businesses in parts of south Los Angeles affected by last year's civil disturbances.

This package will bring the State of California almost $100 million for summer youth jobs, Los Angeles will receive about $50 million for its summer program, which will employ 41,000 youth. California will also receive $336 million for community development block grants, nearly $47 million for Head Start, a total of $318 million in additional Federal highway and transit funds, and approximately $44 million for the Ryan White AIDS Program.

California could realize 50,000 jobs from this package through highway construction, summer youth employment programs, and other public works projects.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for 1993, and to help jump-start America back to prosperity.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we have heard a lot about pork on the floor tonight. I think it is important to point out that this bill went through the Committee on Appropriations without anyone adding any earmarking, without anyone adding any line item. We simply took these large aggregates of funding for purposes of growth and investment. We deleted some that we thought could be misinterpreted when we brought the bill to the floor. Not one amendment was added by one member of our committee to earmark or designate funding for anybody's district.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to do something here that I think the Republican Party has historically believed in. Through the CDBG Program, the Community Development Block Grant Program, we give authority to mayors, city councils, boards of supervisors, and county executives. We give them discretion.

Remember the old Republican philosophy, that the government that governs best is that that is closest to the people? We are not mandating any of these projects that we have heard discussed on the floor tonight or listed in letters to the President. We are willing to give our local leaders the authority to decide on their priorities. That is what this program is all about. So you can yell pork all you want, and it does

nothing but obfuscate, nothing but attempt to impose once again the gridlock which the American people have become so tired of. Let's let our local leaders create jobs and meet local needs.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker. I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Diamond Bar, CA, Mr. KIM.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, throughout the debate this week this resolution has been challenged by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as unacceptable.

Why, because it raises taxes dramatically on the middle class and falls miles short of sensible cuts to lower the deficit.

President Clinton has raised the hopes of the American people with false promises that will not be realized with this huge deficit spending.

Passage of this resolution will harm every taxpayer and every business in our country.

To add insult to injury, after we passed this flawed budget resolution, a so-called emergency spending bill. We are told that this is President Clinton's economic stimulus program. If so, I am dismayed. It is nothing but pure deficit spending.

Take the jobs proposal in this measure. Also this proposal will generate 310,000 jobs in 1993 at a cost of $16 billion. Remember, these are just part-time and temporary jobs with a $16 billion price tag that the taxpayer will pick up, that's $90,000 per job! Temporary jobs.

I find this proposal incredible. Private business created 365,000 new jobs just last month alone at no cost to the taxpayer. Repeat no cost to the taxpayer.

They are asking us to spend tax dollars:

To teach Fortune 500 companies about energy efficiency;

To compile fish atlases;

To study ultrasonic character of texture; and

To provide $148 million for the IRS tax system modernization that GAO has attacked.

And to provide an additional $28 million in emergency aid to the District of Columbia.

There are a lot of cities across America that badly need emergency help. But this resolution seeks only to help Washington, DC, even after we have already given them their full payment of $625 million.

All of these things and all of these tax dollars are supposed to be spent for economic stimulus.

What we have here are more examples of pork barrel spending.

This is my first year in Congress. I was elected and came here with the expectation that real lessons were learned in the campaigns of 1992.

Americans demanded a more responsive and responsible government that cut all the nonsense and inside trading out of America's legislative body.

Where is the outrage of the Democratic freshmen who were sent here with the mandate for reform?

I can't think of anybody in my congressional district who would support and vote for the supplemental spending bill.

It is not fair for taxpayers. It will harm small business. It will hang up the sign in the Congress that reads: "Business as usual."

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Waterbury, CT, Mr. FRANKS.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats have been talking about "change."

The American public should take that word change very, very seriously.

For the Democrats, the word "tax" has been changed. It is now called contributions.

For the Democrats, the word spending has been changed. It is now called investments.

For the Democrats, piling onto our deficit with a supplemental appropriations bill has been changed. It is now called emergency spending or should I say emergency investments.

For the Democrats, reversing one's position from a tax cut for the middle-class to the highest tax increase in the Nation's history, once known as reneging on a campaign promise, has been changed. It is now referred to as being bold and courageous.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, for the Democrats, it's the same old song with a different meaning since Jimmy Carter's been gone.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to defeat the motion on the rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to my friend, our distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished majority first, do they have a copy of the amendment which will be made in order by this rule? Does it exit? Can Members see it?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman directing his attention to me?

Mr. GINGRICH. The gentleman is the majority and controls the time. It is his rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of us over here in the majority. I did not realize the gentleman was referring to me.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have a copy of that amendment.

Mr. GINGRICH. So the Members are being asked to vote, having tried to follow the request of the Committee on Rules, having filed amendments to cut spending which were available earlier in the week, having put them all out in writing, and having had everything stopped which we revealed and were willing to do to cut spending, we are now asked to vote for a rule which has a secret amendment which will be made somehow available at an appropriate moment to rush through without any Members having seen it.

Second, the distinguished majority leader said in the last debate, "We will not appropriate above these caps," referring to the caps in the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask does this supplemental apply to the caps? We are now the same night taking up an appropriations bill. The majority leader promised us we would not appropriate beyond the caps. Does this bill apply to the caps, I would ask again of the distinguished member of the Committee on Rules representing his party. Are we keeping his leader's word?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, what was the question?

Mr. GINGRICH. I know it is hard to sometimes follow the debate when we get into actual details, but let me just say, the majority leader promised us less than an hour ago that you would not appropriate beyond the caps. Does this bill that is going to be brought to the floor apply to the caps?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it does not appropriate any additional funds, no.

Mr. GINGRICH. Does it apply to the caps?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, it does not appropriate any additional funds.

Mr. GINGRICH. It does not apply to the caps, is the honest answer?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the gentleman speak to our leader since he is relying on his statement.

Mr. GINGRICH. The gentleman is managing the floor for him.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues, if they want to know why the country wants term limitations, if they want to know why Ross Perot got 19 percent of the vote, if they want to know why people are infuriated with the way Democrats run this House, look at this rule, which breaks the majority leader's word 1 hour after it was given.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are not here tonight to talk about little matters and insignificant matters. We talk about pork; there is no pork in this bill. The other side knows that as well. These are decisions that are made by municipalities and other forms of government under block grants, which, as I recall, President Reagan advocated and had a lot to do with implementing, and leaving the local citizens the opportunity to make these decisions.

□ 2220

I will tell my colleagues that we have an opportunity here tonight to create a new and a hopeful vision for our country.

I grew up in a time when people believed that Government was their friend, that Government defended them, took care of them, when they were in need. Unfortunately, over the last several decades, many of us who have run for Congress, many who have run for our chief executive office, Democrats and Republicans, have run by running down, lambasting those very institutions in which they choose to serve.

The people in 1992, when they voted the present administration in, in my opinion, said once again, as they had said back over generations in this country, that they do want Government to do some things to help this country and that they believe that Government is capable of doing those things to help this country.

They believe that Government is capable of giving our citizens a better education than they received as of late. They believe that Government is able and has the opportunity to find jobs, to create jobs for many of our 9 million people who are unemployed and many of the 6 million people in this country who are underemployed.

They said that they believed that our Government had the ability to help the struggling small business community in this country that has suffered greater bankruptcies than at any time since 1927.

I represent a primarily rural district and, as I ride through my district and go through the small towns and look at the closed textile mills, as I ride through my small towns and I see the closed and vacant store fronts, as I ride through my towns and see the grass and the weeds growing up in the yards, I know, as the American people know, it is time for a Government to step in that is for the people, believes in the people, and is going to use its resources to help the people of this country. Not the very wealthy who gained so much during the 1980's, but the average guy, the average woman out there that has seen their income shrink for the first time in the history of this country.

For the first time in the history of this country, my children's generation, my grandchildren's generation, cannot look forward to having a higher standard of living than I did, for the first time in the 200 years of this country.

The voters of this country have said it is time for our Government to once again take charge and to do the things that are necessary to bring this country once again to full employment and to guarantee a reasonable standard of living for its citizens.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule that is fair, to vote for the previous question, and to vote for the investment package.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order, since we have not seen a copy of the amendment, would it be proper for us to recess at this time to try and find the amendment that has not been provided to any of us on this side of the aisle or the other?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for regular order, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is to proceed to ordering of the previous question on adoption of the resolution.

Mr. DREIER. So that would not be a proper thing for us to do then. My parliamentary inquiry is, would it be proper for us to recess, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has been searching for the past few minutes for the amendment and has yet to find it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The proper parliamentary procedure at this point is to proceed to adoption of the resolution.

Mr. DREIER. Even though we have not seen the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. DREIER. 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 240, nays 185, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—240

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—185

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg

Kolbe	Nussle	Slattery
Kyl	Oxley	Smith (MI)
Lambert	Packard	Smith (NJ)
Lancaster	Parker	Smith (OR)
Lazio	Paxon	Smith (TX)
Leach	Petri	Snowe
Levy	Pombo	Solomon
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Spence
Lewis (FL)	Pryce (OH)	Stearns
Lightfoot	Quinn	Stenholm
Linder	Ramstad	Stump
Livingston	Ravenel	Sundquist
Machtley	Regula	Talent
Manzullo	Ridge	Tauzin
McCandless	Roberts	Taylor (MS)
McCollum	Rogers	Taylor (NC)
McCrery	Rohrabacher	Thomas (CA)
McDade	Ros-Lehtinen	Thomas (WY)
McHugh	Roth	Torkildsen
McInnis	Roukema	Upton
McKeon	Royce	Vucanovich
McMillan	Santorum	Walker
Meyers	Saxton	Walsh
Mica	Schaefer	Weldon
Michel	Schiff	Wolf
Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
Molinari	Shaw	Young (FL)
Moorhead	Shays	Zeliff
Morella	Shuster	Zimmer
Murphy	Skeen	

NOT VOTING—5

Ford (TN)	Myers	Williams
Henry	Quillen	

□ 2246

Mr. EWING changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BISHOP changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 132, just adopted, I call up for further consideration the bill (H.R. 1335) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 1335 is as follows:

H.R. 1335

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Buildings and facilities", $37,569,000, to remain available until the end of fiscal year 1993.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $4,000,000.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Watershed and flood prevention operations", $46,961,000 for the costs of emergency watershed protection operations and for small watershed operations, to remain available until the end of fiscal year 1993.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for the "Rural housing insurance fund program account", for the costs of very low-income housing repair direct loans, $1,124,000 to subsidize additional gross obligations for the principal amount of loans not to exceed $2,818,000; and in addition, $4,297,000 for the cost of guaranteed unsubsidized section 502 loans, for total loan principal not to exceed $234,805,000.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

RURAL DEVELOPMENT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for the "Rural development insurance fund program account", for the costs of water and sewer direct loans, $66,821,000, to subsidize additional gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $470,000,000.

RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Rural water and waste disposal grants", $281,767,000, to remain available until the end of fiscal year 1993.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

VERY LOW-INCOME HOUSING REPAIR GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Very low-income housing repair grants", $5,635,000, to remain available until the end of fiscal year 1993.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Child nutrition programs" for the Child and Adult Care Food Program, $56,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 1994.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

For an additional amount for the special supplemental food program, $75,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 1994: *Provided*, That these funds shall be available for grants to States that maintain the standards for eligibility which were in use on January 1, 1993: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive regulations governing allocations as necessary to ensure funds are received by States most in need and able to spend additional funds.

THE EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (TEFAP)

For an additional amount for "The emergency food assistance program", $23,481,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 214(h) of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983, as amended, commodities purchased with these funds may be delivered to States through December 31, 1993.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Economic development assistance programs", $93,922,000.

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

For an additional amount for "Minority business development", $1,878,000 for program management.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Operations, research, and facilities", $80,773,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Scientific and technical research and services", $14,088,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $3,613,000 may be transferred to the "Working Capital Fund".

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Industrial technology services", $103,315,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $1,400,000 may be transferred to the "Working Capital Fund".

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES, PLANNING, AND CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Public telecommunications facilities, planning, and construction", $63,867,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $2,818,000 shall be available for program administration as authorized by section 391 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

RELATED AGENCIES

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $8,829,000.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for "Business loans program account" for the cost of guaranteed loans authorized by section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, $140,883,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That up to $2,000,000 of this amount may be made available for administrative expenses of the guaranteed loans program and may be transferred to and merged with appropriations made available under Public Law 102-395 for "Salaries and expenses", Small Business Administration.

CHAPTER IV

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia" to provide for essential jobs, public safety, health, and other municipal services in the face of its financial crisis, $28,177,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

CHAPTER V

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Construction, general", $3,900,000, to remain available through September 30, 1993, of which such

sums as are necessary pursuant to Public Law 99-662 shall be derived from the Inland Waterway Trust Fund, for one-half of the cost of construction and rehabilitation of inland waterways projects.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

For an additional amount for "Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee", $13,525,000, to remain available through September 30, 1993.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, general", $76,497,000, to remain available through September 30, 1993, of which such sums as become available in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99-662, may be derived from that fund.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Energy supply, research, and development activities", $46,961,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

For an additional amount for "Energy supply, research and development activities", $939,000, to remain available until expended for additional in-house energy management projects.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", $1,878,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For an additional amount for "Oregon and California grant lands", $15,027,547, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resource management", $87,348,000, to remain available through September 30, 1993.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

For an additional amount for "Operation of the national park system", $146,519,000.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

For an additional amount for "National recreation and preservation", $1,409,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

For an additional amount for "Historic preservation fund", $22,072,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993, of which $9,600,000 shall be for the National Trust for Historic Preservation: *Provided*, That any matching fund requirements in the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments shall not apply to this amount.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $83,591,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Operation of Indian programs", $92,044,000, of which $26,257,000 for school operations shall become available for obligation on July 1, 1993 and remain available for obligation until September 30, 1994; and $65,787,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1993.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $10,332,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For an additional amount for "National forest system", to be used for maintenance, repairs, rehabilitation, and natural resource conservation activities, $150,000,000, to remain available for obligation until the end of fiscal year 1993.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", to be used for recreation facility and trail construction, $37,844,000, to remain available for obligation until the end of fiscal year 1993.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY CONSERVATION

For enhanced "Energy conservation" activities, $100,778,000, to remain available until expended, of which $28,177,000 shall be for implementation of titles III, IV, and V of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-486), including no less than $25,677,000 for the acquisition of alternative-fuel vehicles for the Federal fleet and for the conversion of existing vehicles in the Federal fleet to alternative fuels: *Provided*, That such funds shall only be used to pay the cost differential between the alternative-fuel vehicle and the same model of vehicle in its conventional-fuel design, not to exceed $3,500 for any vehicle; and of which $18,784,000 shall be for full funding for a one-time special award of grants under the Institutional Conservation Program; and of which $46,961,000 shall be for grants to States for the Weatherization Assistance Program; and of which $5,635,000 shall be available to the Federal Energy Management Program for expanded training, site audit, and other support functions; and of which $1,221,000 shall be available to establish a fund administered by the Federal Energy Management Program to provide financial assistance for cost-effective energy efficiency improvements to facilities of any Federal agencies other than the Departments of Defense, Energy, and Veterans Affairs, and the General Services Administration.

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Training and Employment Services", $1,000,000,000, to carry into effect the Job Training Partnership Act, of which $10,500,000 is for activities under part D of title IV of such Act, and $989,500,000 for activities under part B of title II of such Act: *Provided*, That of the funds provided herein for part B of title II, $18,500,000 shall be for territories and entities specified by section 252(a) of the Act, which shall be allotted based on the allotment methodology made to such areas under Public Law 102-170, of which $6,000,000 must be used only to provide academic enrichment activities, as defined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided herein for part B of title II, each State and service delivery area shall be allotted an amount which, when added to its allotment from Public Law 102-170, results in a total amount which is 25 percent above the total of its allotments under Public Laws 101-517 and 102-302, except that such allotment to each State and service delivery area under this proviso shall be reduced by the amount of its unexpended carryover as of January 30, 1993: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided herein for part B of title II, $294,000,000 shall be for academic enrichment, as defined by the Secretary, and shall be allotted among States and allocated among service delivery areas on the basis of the relative number of economically disadvantaged youth, as defined in section 262 of the Act, in such areas as compared to the total number of economically disadvantaged youth in all States and service delivery areas within each State, respectively, and only to provide academic enrichment activities: *Provided further*, That funds made available herein for academic enrichment shall not be used to supplant other Federal funds for existing academic services or activities, and services shall be maintained at least at the level of funding used for these purposes during the summer of 1992: *Provided further*, That funds provided herein for part B of title II which are not allotted under the first three provisos under this heading shall be allotted to service delivery areas containing the 100 cities with the largest population of economically disadvantaged youth, as defined in section 262 of the Act, on the basis of the relative number of economically disadvantaged youth in each of the service delivery areas as compared to total economically disadvantaged youth in all such service delivery areas: *Provided further*, That data related to economically disadvantaged youth herein shall be based on 1990 Census data: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided herein, except for the $294,000,000 expressly allotted for academic enrichment activities, service delivery areas may transfer up to 10 percent to the program under part C of title II of the Act, if such transfer is approved by the Governor: *Provided further*, That up to 3 percent of each State's allotment for academic enrichment may be reserved for State administration, oversight, and support of a State practitioner's network.

Funds provided in Public Law 102-394 for part B of title III of such Act shall be available for obligation upon enactment of this Act.

COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS

For an additional amount for "Community service employment for older Americans", $32,131,000, of which $25,062,000 is for national grants or contracts with public agencies and public or private nonprofit organizations under section 506(a)(1)(A) of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended; and of which $7,069,000 is for grants to States under section 506(a)(3) of said Act.

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "State unemployment insurance and employment service operations", $14,300,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, to fund worker profiling activities and for oversight of employment programs: *Provided*, That of the funds provided

herein up to $2,700,000 may be transferred to the Program Administration account.

ADVANCES TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS

For an additional amount for "Advances to the unemployment trust fund and other funds", $4,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1994.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

For an additional amount to carry out title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, $200,000,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For an additional amount to carry out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to high-performance computing applications, $9,392,000.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the "Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health" for carrying out childhood immunization activities under title III and subtitle 1 of title XXI of the Public Health Service Act, $300,000,000, of which $282,800,000 shall be transferred to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, of which $4,200,000 shall be transferred to the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, and of which $7,000,000 shall be transferred to the Food and Drug Administration.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

PAYMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS

For an additional amount for "Payments to the Social Security Trust Funds" to reimburse the trust funds for administrative expenses to carry out sections 9704 and 9706 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME

For an additional amount for "Supplemental security income" for payment to the Social Security trust funds for administrative expenses, $150,000,000; and, in addition, to provide for making, after June 15 of the current fiscal year, benefits payments to individuals under title XVI of the Social Security Act, for unanticipated costs incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For an additional amount, $302,000,000, of which $142,000,000 shall be derived from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund; and of which $10,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be to carry out sections 9704 and 9706 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SERVICES PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for carrying out the Head Start Act, $500,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

For an additional amount for concentration grants under section 1006 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, $500,000,000, which shall become available upon enactment and shall remain available to local educational agencies through September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That the number of children counted for section 1006(a) shall be the same as counted for 1993 section 1005 basic grants: *Provided further*, That no State shall receive less than $250,000 of such funds: *Provided further*, That such funds shall only be made available by State educational agencies to local educational agencies upon assurance that at least 80 per centum of such funds shall be liquidated by such agencies by September 30, 1993: *Provided further*, That such funds shall be used for activities that benefit educationally deprived children as authorized under section 1011 and other related activities such as food services, school health services, arts education, and transportation, without regard to whether such activities are otherwise authorized under such section: *Provided further*, That a State educational agency may reallocate any portion of such funds that are not able to be used by local educational agencies in the State to other such agencies on the basis of their relative needs, as determined by the State educational agency, without regard to section 1403(b)(2) of such Act: *Provided further*, That such funds may be used only to supplement, and not to supplant any other funds, including other funds made available under chapter 1 of title I of such Act or under any other Federal program: *Provided further*, That such funds, and the activities carried out with such funds, shall not be subject to or considered in applying section 1006(a)(1)(B)–(D), 1019, 1020, 1021, or 1432(b) of such Act or to section 412(b) of the General Education Provisions Act: *Provided further*, That such funds shall not be treated as funds appropriated, allocated, or received under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the purpose of section 1403, 1404, 1405, or 1432(b)(1) of such Act: *Provided further*, That such funds shall not be taken into account for purposes of determining the allocation of funds for any fiscal year under any Federal program.

For an additional amount for grants to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, to carry out subpart 1 of part A of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, $234,805,000, which shall be allocated to such jurisdictions, notwithstanding any other provision of law, so that all counties that, under title III of Public Law 102–394, are allocated less than 92 per centum of the amount they were allocated under such subpart for fiscal year 1992 shall be allocated, under Public Law 102–394 plus this additional amount, 92 per centum of the amount such counties received under such subpart for fiscal year 1992: *Provided*, That such allocations to States shall be ratably reduced if necessary: *Provided further*, That each State shall distribute its portion of such funds to local educational agencies in the State so that all such agencies that, under title III of Public Law 102–394, are receiving less than 92 per centum of the amount they received under such subpart for fiscal year 1992 shall receive, under Public Law 102–394 plus this additional amount, an amount not to exceed 92 per centum of such fiscal year 1992 amount, which percentage shall be ratably reduced as necessary: *Provided further*, That such funds shall not be treated as funds appropriated, allocated, or received under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the purposes of sections 1403, 1404, and 1405 of such Act: *Provided further*, That such funds shall not be taken into account for purposes of determining the allocation of funds for any fiscal year under any Federal program.

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Student financial assistance" for payment of awards made under subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, $1,863,730,000, which shall be available through September 30, 1994, of which $493,000,000 shall be available for such awards made for award year 1993–1994, and $1,370,730,000 shall be available for such awards for the 1992–1993 and prior award years.

CHAPTER VIII

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

The language under this heading in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, is amended by—

(a) deleting "$2,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,250,000,000"; and

(b) deleting "$1,800,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,050,000,000";

Provided, That the increase in commitment authority made available by this Act shall be credited entirely to the discretionary fund established by section 507(c)(1) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2206(c)(1)), without regard to apportionment under sections 507(a) and 507(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. App. 2206(a) and 2206(b)), or minimum distributions required by sections 507(c)(2) through 507(c)(4) and 508(d) of such Act (49 U.S.C. App. 2206(c)(2)–2206(c)(4) and 2207(d)).

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

The language under this heading in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, is amended by deleting "$15,326,750,000" and inserting "$18,303,000,000": *Provided*, That section 310(c) of said Act is amended by renumbering existing subsection (2) as subsection (2)(B) and by adding a new subsection (2)(A) as follows:

"(2)(A) ninety days after distribution of any increase in the fiscal year 1993 obligation limitation, as enacted October 6, 1992, revise the distribution of such increased funds under subsection (a) if a State has not obligated and received bids on projects for the increased amount distributed, and redistribute amounts to all States able to obligate amounts on projects for which bids can be received no later than August 1, 1993;".

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

For an additional amount for "Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation", for capital improvements grants, $187,844,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FORMULA GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Formula grants" for capital grants, $466,490,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993, of which $17,423,000 shall be apportioned under section 16, $26,420,000 under section 18, and $422,647,000 under section 9 of the Federal

Transit Act, as amended: *Provided*, That, if any such funds are not obligated within 90 days of enactment of this Act, such funds shall be allocated for any eligible capital project under such Act, at the discretion of the Secretary.

The language under this heading in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, is amended by deleting "$1,700,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,182,340,000".

TRUST FUND SHARE OF TRANSIT PROGRAMS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

The language under this heading in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, is amended by deleting "$1,134,150,000" and inserting "$1,150,000,000" and by deleting "$1,049,025,000" and inserting "$1,064,875,000": *Provided*, That these additional funds shall be apportioned under section 9 of the Federal Transit Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That if any such funds are not obligated within 90 days of enactment of this Act, such funds shall be allocated for any eligible capital project under the Federal Transit Act, at the discretion of the Secretary.

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Discretionary grants", $270,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That none of the funds may be available for grants under section 3(k)(1)(A) or section 3(k)(1)(B) of the Federal Transit Act, as amended.

CHAPTER IX

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

INFORMATION SYSTEMS

For an additional amount for "Information systems", $148,397,000, to fund procurement of computer and telecommunications equipment and services.

INDEPENDENT AGENCY

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND

For an additional amount for the "Federal Buildings Fund", $4,696,000 for additional projects to improve energy efficiency at General Services Administration facilities.

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL CARE

For an additional amount for "Medical care", $201,933,000, for nonrecurring maintenance projects in Department of Veterans Affairs' health care facilities.

For an additional amount for "Medical care", $751,000, to remain available until expended, for additional projects to improve energy efficiency at Department of Veterans Affairs facilities.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

For an additional amount for "Construction, minor projects", $32,873,000, for miscellaneous projects and the National Cemetery Program.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE

TRANSITIONAL AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Transitional and supportive housing demonstration program", $423,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1994: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall fund approvable applications for such additional amount in the order submitted, in accordance with requirements established by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive, in whole or in any part, any requirement set forth in subtitle C of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, except a requirement relating to fair housing and nondiscrimination, if the Secretary finds that such waiver will further the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 426(a)(3) of that Act, the applicant shall own or control the site at the time of application: *Provided further*, That the total amount approved for any one applicant may not exceed $10,000,000: *Provided further*, That after December 31, 1994, any of the foregoing amount that is obligated, but which the grantee has not drawn down from its letter of credit, shall be deobligated by the Secretary and shall expire: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, by notice published in the Federal Register, establish such requirements as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this appropriation.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Community development grants", $2,536,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1994: *Provided*, That from the foregoing amount, $25,360,000 shall be available for grants to Indian tribes in compliance with section 106(a)(1) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, $4,000,000 shall be available for grants under section 107(b)(1) of such Act, and the remainder shall be for States and units of general local government that are eligible under section 106 of such Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive entirely, or in any part, any requirement set forth in title I of such Act, except a requirement relating to fair housing and nondiscrimination, the environment, and labor standards, if the Secretary finds that such waiver will further the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That after December 31, 1994, any of the foregoing amount that is obligated, but which the grantee has not drawn down from its letter of credit, shall be deobligated by the Secretary and shall expire.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

COMMISSION ON NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Programs and activities", $15,000,000.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

ABATEMENT, CONTROL, AND COMPLIANCE

For an additional amount for "Abatement, control, and compliance", $20,663,000.

PROGRAM AND RESEARCH OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Program and research operations", $2,818,000.

STATE REVOLVING FUNDS/CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

For an additional amount for "State revolving funds/construction grants", to make grants under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, $845,300,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 602(b)(2) of such Act, no State match shall be required for this additional amount: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 602(b)(3) of such Act, States shall enter into binding commitments to provide assistance in an amount equal to 100 percent of the amount of each grant payment within one year after receipt of such grant payment from this additional amount.

For an additional amount for "State revolving funds/construction grants", to make grants authorized under section 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, $46,961,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 319(h)(3) of such Act, no State match shall be required for this additional amount.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For an additional amount for "Research and development", $4,696,000.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Research and related activities", $197,230,000.

ACADEMIC RESEARCH FACILITIES AND INSTRUMENTATION

For an additional amount for "Academic research facilities and instrumentation", $4,696,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $4,696,000.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 202. All funds provided under this Act are hereby designated to be "emergency requirements" for all purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1993".

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1335, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support for the stimulus and investment supplemental appropriations bill but with some reservations.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1981 after the people voted in Ronald Reagan in hopes of a change, I voted for the Reagan budget plan that was widely hailed as critical to the future of this country. I gave it a chance. Unfortunately, it did not yield the results it claimed and today we are worse off as a result. During the past election cycle, the people of this country voted for a change and for Bill Clinton. I believe President Clinton and his plan at least deserve

that same chance. If we find over the next couple of years that the intended effects do not take, then we will work to make the needed changes. Supporting the stimulus package does not mean you are necessarily committed to the entire Clinton plan. There is room for improvement and that is where my efforts will be focused.

H.R. 1335, the stimulus and investment package, represents an infusion of resources into programs that will generate job growth in the near term. While the economy has shown limited signs of improvement, it is not up to the level of stability that any thriving economy maintains. A record number of people are still applying for unemployment benefits. The papers continue to regularly report on layoffs nationwide—Boeing, Sears Roebuck, McDonnel Douglas, IBM and others.

The merits of the programs contained in this stimulus and investment package are without question. The labor intensive programs that get a funding boost such as road and bridge construction, wastewater treatment and CDBG's will create jobs in the near term. There are projects in all our districts that will move forward with passage of this bill. Head Start, childhood immunization and Pell grants are all worthy investments. I believe the President has done a good job of choosing programs which are in the best interests of this country both in the short run and the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I must point out that this package of investments would be far more attractive if it were paid for rather than contributing to the national debt. There were a series of amendments that I would have liked to have voted on, but they were not allowed. I believe the package could be just as successful if we scaled back the appropriation. Hopefully, we will be able to find additional areas for reductions to offset the emergency spending in this bill.

However, the time to act is now, and to give Bill Clinton and his administration a chance to breath new life into our economy.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 1335, a bill also known as the Clinton economic stimulus package.

Mr. Speaker, my opposition to this legislation came only after serious reflection and study. I know from talking to my constituents that people want to give the President's economic proposals a chance to work. I, too, want the President's economic programs to succeed because this country, and particularly my home State of New Jersey, have been mired in recession for too long. The President's plan is well intentioned and certainly some of the spending provisions in this bill are needed. However, I have concluded that this bill is the wrong medicine at the wrong time for our Nation's economic ills. Just as a doctor would not prescribe cough medicine to a patient with a broken leg, this Congress should not prescribe more deficit spending to an economy already sick with a national debt exceeding $4 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would increase our swollen budget deficit by over $16 billion, because this spending has been labeled as an emergency. However, some of the so-called emergency spending contained in this bill is dubious indeed. For example, this bill contains $28 million to help the District of Columbia government balance its budget. How many jobs will that create? And how in good conscience can the bailing out of one of the most bloated and inefficient city governments in the Nation be considered a national emergency?

Another more egregious example of waste in this bill is the $800,000 that would be spent to begin preparing for whitewater canoeing at the 1996 Olympics. Putting aside considerations of whether this spending really constitutes an emergency, this expenditure raises a fundamental question: why is the Federal Government even involved in funding a program like this in the first place? Our Nation's deficit already exceeds $300 billion—when is this Congress going to draw the line on spending?

Mr. Speaker, these are only two examples of the misdirected priorities in this so-called stimulus package. Upon closer inspection, it is plain to see that this plan is riddled with nonstimulus, special interest spending. While this bill does contain some new spending for infrastructure, unfortunately it is only one-quarter of the new spending in the bill. The rest of the bill is merely a hodge-podge of new Government spending on programs that will have little to do with long-term job creation.

It is also doubtful that this bill will have much effect on lowering our Nation's unemployment rate. President Clinton's own Office of Management and Budget estimates that his economic program will produce only about 219,000 jobs—at a cost of $89,000 per job. Unfortunately, OMB only accounts for the jobs created by this new spending—it does not take into account how many hundreds of thousands of jobs will be lost because of the President's proposed tax hike, which will be the largest in our history. According to the Institute for Research on the Economics of Taxation, the President's proposed Btu tax alone would cost the economy 232,000 jobs. We can only speculate how many jobs will be lost because of the other tax increases President Clinton is advocating. Clearly, the job losses caused by the President's new taxes will be substantial, and will surely outstrip whatever limited job creation occurs because of this bill.

If the President is really interested in long-term job creation, he should begin by reducing the Government burden on the small business sector, which historically generates the bulk of new jobs in our economy. An unfettered climate where small business can thrive is the best medicine for a recovering economy, not make-work Government jobs bills.

Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose this legislation solely because my political party differs from that of the President. I have always, and will always, put the welfare of our Nation above partisan differences. I would have gladly worked to pass a stimulus package offered by the President if that package contained measures that would actually create long-term jobs. Unfortunately, this package is at odds with sustained economic growth.

I am sure my colleagues are aware that in a $6 trillion economy, the effects of $16 billion in new spending spread out over 5 years and 256 million people will have a negligible effect, if any. Certainly we in Congress need to address the persistent high unemployment still so pervasive in certain areas of the country. However, declaring an emergency and spending $16 billion now and worrying about how to pay for it later will not increase our competitiveness and will not give us long-term job creation.

Mr. Speaker, this package, in reality, is not an economic stimulus at all, it is a political stimulus, designed to have Congress and the American people swallow the largest tax hike in the history of the republic. Furthermore, it is irresponsible for this Congress to be voting on more spending without first voting on cutting Government or at least voting for the new taxes to finance this new spending. I urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1335.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for over a decade every year at this time the Congress has had to try to breathe life back into an economic proposal which was dead on arrival—one which was written as if American had no problems, as if there were no poor and the cities were clean and safe and young people all over America had the same opportunity to education and health. We all know that this was not the case then and it certainly is not the case today.

Finally, we have a President who has been to America, not just the America of the wealthy but the America of the poor and the middle class—the America of those urban and rural families who seek to raise their children to succeed in a country of opportunity—the America of those who have been left out during the past decade when our values of tolerance for differences and compassion for the underdog were thrown out and replaced with an emphasis on narcissism.

Mr. Speaker, I know that President Clinton has been to my America because his stimulus and investment proposal, reflects the realities that I myself know, and that my constituents have expressed to me. The President has not turned a blind eye to America's current need while simultaneously thinking about tomorrow.

While far from perfect this plan attempts to provide for the present and future needs of the country in an efficient and cost-effective manner. There are many examples of this: the increase in funding for the Head Start Program, a program which has shown itself to be a useful tool in combating poverty and preparing young children for successful school careers. $500 million in this bill will allow the Head Start Program to remain open during the summer months.

The $1.9 billion in funding for the Pell Grant Program, which is the primary source of Federal aid for low- and moderate-income students will make a difference as to whether or not some child on the west side of Chicago will be able to attend college. The fact that by passing this bill we may instill hope where it has died is cause enough for my support for this bill.

I am pleased that this package includes $1 billion for summer jobs which, while not enough to fully address the crises of unemployment and underemployment suffered by

our urban youth does serve as a symbol to our young people that we care what happens to them and that we are busy looking for long-term solutions that will address their needs. Last summer we saw first hand what happens when neglect is allowed to fester in our urban centers. We watched as frustrated youth rioted and burned Chicago, Los Angeles, and many other cities. We have to start addressing the root causes of this frustration. We have to provide hope for our youth.

This package provides $300 million for childhood immunizations. Finally we are learning what most developed countries and many underdeveloped countries have already learned—that systematic prevention of childhood diseases through an organized national immunization system is cheaper and more humane than the medical care that must be provided due to epidemics of these diseases.

The infrastructure investment programs that are funded in this package include $845 million for waste water treatment construction, $2.5 billion in community development grants, and $3.7 billion in funding for highways and mass transit. These programs alone will provide in excess of 150,000 new jobs. This is good news for cities like mine which have aging public facilities and large pockets of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I can't say that the President's investment package is perfect. It is nowhere near perfect, but in comparison to the lack of attention that we have grown accustomed to over the past 12 years there is no comparison. I urge my colleagues to pass this package so that we can cut through the neglect and bring America back to life.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I support President's Clinton request for an economic stimulus and investment supplemental appropriations because I share the concern of many Americans that continuation of the current economic recovery is not yet guaranteed.

No one wants to see the United States slip back into recession. Investment in business plants continues to lag behind levels existing in previous recoveries. No one wants to see finding a job made even more difficult. There are still 8.9 million unemployed Americans, with almost 1.9 million out of work for more than 6 months. These are dangers which still confront the U.S. economy.

The House can show its commitment to expanding the current recovery by voting for this economic stimulus and investment supplemental appropriations. This is a responsible package of targeted funding for programs that will create new jobs and provide a powerful ripple effect throughout the economy.

The Clinton administration's package, as approved by the House Appropriations Committee, is expected to create up to 1 million new jobs, including 675,000 summer jobs for disadvantaged young people. Funding for highways and mass transit and other capital investments will have an immediate stimulative effect for thousands of industrial producers.

This package provides $16.3 billion in supplemental appropriations for investment in infrastructure, jobs and human resources, community development, and energy, environment, and technology programs. It provides $4 billion to cover this year's cost of the recent extension in emergency unemployment benefits. It also authorizes the release of an additional $3 billion from the highway trust fund to bring funding for highways and mass transit up to authorized levels.

The President has provided the Congress with an effective plan for sustained economic growth. This plan depends on a triad approach to promoting job opportunities and prosperity. Economic stimulus, investment, and deficit reduction are all vital elements of this program to ensure continued and expanded economic recovery.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress should make clear that it shares President Clinton's vision of a robust economic recovery. I urge my colleagues to remember that the American people are watching our actions. They expect us to do our part to get this country moving again in the right direction.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1335, making emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1993. There are those who argue that we do not need a stimulus package. That the economy is in a recovery. That people are not still feeling the lingering sting of a painful recession.

Well, these misinformed Members have not been to my district in New York and seen the families lacking sanctuary. They have not spoken to the many unemployed that are still hunting for jobs. They have not traveled the crowded, but deteriorated, roads in our region.

There is no doubt that we need this $16.3 billion. In fact, there are still more people unemployed today, after months of so-called recovery, than at the worst point of every other post-war recession but one. We have recovered only 1 manufacturing job for every 20 manufacturing jobs lost since July 1990. This stimulus responds to those frightening numbers by creating 1 million jobs.

In the area of housing and community development, this stimulus package offers a true boost by providing $2.5 billion for community development block grant funds and over $423 million for the Supportive Housing Program to get our homeless off the streets and provide them employment assistance, outpatient health care, and other supportive services.

If you believe we do not need more jobs, if you believe we do not need more roofs to shelter our families, then, and only then, should you oppose this stimulus package.

Mr. Speaker, as Democrats, we understand the plight and daily struggles of most Americans. I urge my colleagues to pass this stimulus measure as is, without any cuts, without any modifications.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Stimulus and Investment Supplemental Appropriations Act and applaud President Clinton for this aggressive initiative to meet the needs of millions of Americans who are unemployed or under employed as a result of the Bush recession.

This legislation promises to both create needed jobs in central Brooklyn and to address some serious unmet social and educational needs in our community. I am particularly pleased by the $1 billion increase this bill provides for the JTPA Summer Youth Employment Program. This will increase funds available in New York City for summer employment opportunities for disadvantaged youth by 40 percent, enabling the city to employ more than 65,000 young men and women in meaningful jobs this summer. Our community now has one of the highest youth unemployment rates in the nation and these jobs are urgently needed. The Department of Labor has also beefed up the educational services that these young people will be offered, ensuring that they maintain or upgrade their skills while they work in service to their community.

The Clinton stimulus initiative will also provide New York City with an additional $15 million to provide Head Start services to disadvantaged preschoolers this summer. Since all of the city's Head Start programs now already do offer services during the summer, these funds will enable the city to serve many more additional eligible children, to expand full-day services, and to improve the quality of the educational and other services provided to children enrolled in the program. Significant numbers of new employment opportunities will be created in our community as a result of this Head Start expansion, particularly for the parents of children enrolled in the program.

This legislation will also provide the New York City school system with an additional $33 million for chapter 1 remedial educational services for disadvantaged children this summer. This will enable the city to provide summer services to more children than ever before. At the same time, the stimulus initiative will help to cushion the severe blow the city will take as a result of the shift to the use of 1990 census data in allocating funds for the regular Chapter 1 Program. The city's schools were slated to lose fully 15 percent of its chapter 1 funding as a result of this shift, jeopardizing services to thousands of youngsters throughout the city. This legislation, however, provides supplemental funding which will reduce our loss to an 8-percent cut. Our programs will still suffer, but thanks to the leadership of President Clinton and Education Secretary Riley, the reductions will be far more manageable and less destructive than they might otherwise have been.

There are a number of other provisions of this legislation which are important to the people of central Brooklyn. Our women's, infants, and children's [WIC] nutritional assistance programs will receive an additional $3 million. An additional $137 million be made available for low-income housing rehabilitation through the community development block grant. The city will receive an additional $103 million for road resurfacing and rehabilitation and $47 million for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities. New York City HIV prevention services funded through the Ryan White Act will receive an additional $10 million.

This initiative represents an important downpayment on the massive effort which is needed to address and reverse the immense deficit in human needs wrought by the Reagan and Bush administrations. It will create jobs, it will provide essential services to our people, and it signals an end to the disastrous era of trickle-down economics and malign neglect of human needs. President Clinton campaigned last fall as the Man from hope. I congratulate him for demonstrating such committed, early leadership to beginning to deliver on that promise to the people of central Brooklyn and throughout the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 132, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MCDADE

Mr. McDADE. I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman the designee of the minority leader and opposed to the bill?

Mr. McDADE. The Chair is correct in indicating that I am, Mr. Speaker, and I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky reserves a point of order.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McDADE moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1335, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike everything under Title I with the exception of page 16, lines 13 through 17, "Advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund and Other Funds";

and further to report as promptly as possible a separate bill containing the funding stricken from title I of H.R. 1335 with instructions to bring the spending levels contained in the bill into compliance with the discretionary spending ceilings established by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-508) so as not to increase the deficit further than the estimated deficit of $319 billion that is already forecast for this fiscal year.

□ 2250

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] insist on his point of order?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky withdraws his point of order.

Pursuant to House Resolution 132, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE].

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

Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit is not complex. It does two things. The first thing it does is free up the $4 billion for extended unemployment benefits that are needed in the Nation in the next couple of weeks. And, second, it takes the rest of the bill, all of it, all of the spending in this bill, and sends it back to the committee with instructions to find offsets to pay for it, requiring that a new bill come back as promptly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the instructions to the Committee on Appropriations are to report the bill back as promptly as possible on a deficit-neutral basis, in short, without increasing the deficit by another $15.5 billion. Mr. Speaker, a record $319 billion deficit is big enough. If these programs are so important, then I say let us find the offsets that we can find to pay for them.

Just moments ago this body adopted a plan that promises to reduce the deficit by some $450 billion over 5 years. Mr. Speaker, it makes promises, but no reductions. It promises reductions in the future. It is a nonbinding promise that is structured to provide cover to allow Members to vote for the 19.5 billion dollars' worth of additional deficit spending. Spend now, save later. That does not sound like change to me, and I have been here for 31 years, and it does not sound like very good cover, either.

It does not sound like good cover, because, Mr. Speaker, aside from the unemployment benefits that we are putting into the bill to be spent immediately, this spending simply will not stand up to scrutiny.

We spent an hour yesterday going over the dubious spending in the bill, be it golf courses or reducing the deficit of the District of Columbia by $28 million. We laid out the problems, Mr. Speaker, and those problems are not contradicted: minimal jobs, 219,000 jobs, according to the Office of Management and Budget, at a cost of nearly $90,000 a job; minimal, minimal stimulus with only 19 percent of all the money in this deficit-reduction bill outlaying in this fiscal year; investment spending for programs like a modernization program at the Internal Revenue Service which our own auditing agency, the General Accounting Office, says is obsolete before it is even put in place. And we are going to appropriate the money tonight under the stimulus package to do that? What a stimulus.

And minimal insurance for any recovery, because everybody that has looked at this, including Ross Perot as late as today, has said that $19 billion in a $6 trillion economy will have no impact at all.

But there will be additional costs, about $1 billion a year in additional interest costs, from now to eternity for funding this legislation.

There is simply no getting around the fact that the most immediate effect of this bill will be to increase an already record deficit of $319 billion, and add $19 billion to the Federal debt that now totals $4.1 trillion, or, Mr. Speaker, just about $17,000 for every man, woman, and child in the Nation.

Just a while back, we had the head of the Congressional Budget Office, Robert Reischauer, testify on the Hill, and listen to what he said, and I am quoting him: "Reducing the deficit is the most direct and reliable way to increase national saving and long-run, long-term economic growth." That is the man who is our man, the economist on the Hill. He says that is the way to do it. That is the most direct way. That is the most reliable way.

Mr. Speaker, there is one place to start doing what Mr. Reischauer recommends in reducing the deficit, and that is right here, and that is right now, and not some promise for tomorrow. If you want to spend more money on the programs in this bill, let us pay for it and find the offsets. We can do that.

Mr. Speaker, I have enough faith in this body that I am privileged to have been a Member of for all of these years to know that we can find the offsets and we can find the savings, not with promises, not with some time in the distant future, but right here and now we can do it quickly. If you are for increasing the deficit, Mr. Speaker, then, of course, vote against my motion. But if you believe, like the American people believe in poll after poll after poll, like most economists believe, that enough is enough and that spending money we do not have has got to stop, then vote for this motion to send this bill back with instructions to the committee.

It is the right vote for the right kind of change.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, when the President sent up his message that requested this emergency supplemental bill, we decided in our Committee on Appropriations to do it right. We held hearings on this bill—all 10 subcommittees. We talked to the subcommittee chairmen and all of the members on the committee, and we said to them, "This bill calls for $16,262,994,547, and it is from our new President. It will help as far as the jobs are concerned in this country now."

We held our hearings. We marked this bill up. Mr. Speaker, the bill was reduced just a little over $5 million by directing the Department of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects using available funding. Because of a scoring mistake downtown we also reduced Pell grants and directed the source of funding for Social Security Administration expenses.

Mr. Speaker, in this bill, as you well know, we have funding for infrastructure amounting to $1.3 billion. Some more of the items in here are: additional money for the summer youth employment program of $1 billion; additional summer Head Start money of $500 million; additional education assistance in the form of Pell grants of

approximately $2 billion; additional compensatory education funding of $735 million; additional unemployment assistance of $4 billion. There is additional nutrition assistance under the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Subcommittee chaired by my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] of $154 million; and additional health care funding, Mr. Speaker, of $500 million.

□ 2300

These are only some of the items in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask Members on both sides of the aisle: How would you like to be President of the United States of America, serving 58 days, counting today, 58 days only and say to the Congress of the United States, "I need your help, and I want you to help me"? Fifty-eight days, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have served with nine Presidents. When President Eisenhower was here, he said to us, "I want to reform the Internal Revenue Code. I want to establish the interstate highway system. I want to set up a Department of Health, Education and Welfare." We stayed with him.

Ronald Reagan became President of the United States after election in 1980, and at the beginning of 1981 he said, "I want your help. I want to implement a $750 billion tax reduction over a 3-year period with indexing into the future, and we helped him.

Jimmy Carter came along and said he wanted a Department of Education. We stayed with these Presidents and helped them.

Mr. Speaker, I can carry you through nine Presidents.

You know, after they are elected, they are our Presidents; President Clinton is our President, and this is our country. I say this to you, we ought to help President Clinton. He is a bright man. He has had the lights on in the White House working late into the night down there for 58 long days.

How would you like to be confronted, as a new President, with a national debt of $4,353,000,000,000? How would you like to be confronted with interest on the national debt of $202 billion?

Mr. Speaker, how would you like to be confronted with the matters that are underway now in Russia, in the republics of the former Yugoslavia, the Haitian matter, North Korea? How would you like to be confronted with these, serving your 58th day as President, and you said to the Congress of the United States, "I want you to help me"? And I say to you—I say to you frankly—we should help him.

You talk about an increase, as far as gross domestic product increase is concerned, of 4.8 percent. Go back to your districts and say to your people, "Why, don't you know, everything is better?" And they will say, "Where is it better?" Not in Kentucky, not in my district. So where is it better? Where is that 4.8 percent increase?

We have 10 million people who want jobs, who are seeking jobs in this country. They are unemployed.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, we ought to help this President. This is the time to do it. Every Member in this House on both sides of the aisle ought to vote for this bill. You ought to vote for it. Some of you have come in here and picked and clawed at some of these programs in the bill. You do this after all the support we have given you over the years. Why, I stood with you time after time, time after time, and you know it.

And I say to you tonight, Mr. Speaker, this is a time to say to President Clinton, "We are proud of you. You are serving your 58th day, and we are going to help you."

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit should be turned down.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

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

Mr. Speaker, the chairman was eloquent, but I believe that the responsibility of this body is to examine all programs, to amend them, and work our will. Under the separation-of-powers doctrine, it is not our responsibility to rubberstamp the bill of any President. We are the legislative body, we have to answer to the people. This is the people's House.

And I want to say that we should all support this motion to recommit because what we have before us in the bill is a classic example of spend-now-and-pay-later-and-later.

Every dime is borrowed from future generations. We are putting them in hock, and they will pay interest and they will pay and pay and pay. We have heard the ranking Republican tell us what it will cost per job; $90,000 per job. But I point out also that this body, in the 1993 appropriations bills, still has $20 billion of appropriated and unobligated balances. Why don't we use the money that has already been put in place to stimulate the economy?

These unobligated balances have been reviewed and approved by both Houses, and signed by the President. We have examined them. We have done the job that is our constitutional responsibility. We have put the legislative process to the test.

This is also $16 billion out of the capital pool. It substitutes the judgment of this body of Government for that of the people. It is their money. Government does not create any wealth. The wealth that is out there in the capital pool is created by the people of this Nation.

Let them use the money, to borrow the money instead of us, to buy a home, start a business, modernize a plant, buy a tractor for a farm, finance an education for a young man or woman coming out of high school.

In the long-term, the greatest economic stimulus would be low interest rates and low inflation. Yet this bill goes in the opposite direction, because, as borrowing puts pressure on the credit markets, it drives up interest rates and, ultimately the temptation will be to monetize the debt and thereby create inflation.

Let us keep interest rates low, low inflation and this will make a healthy economy for the long-term. Leave the $16 billion in the capital pool, let the people who create the wealth create the jobs, jobs that are permanent, jobs that add to the economic growth of this Nation, jobs that will make the United States more competitive in the global economy. Letting the people make the economic decisions would be far better than the band-aid that we are proposing to pass tonight. I urge all of you to vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, you are going to hear a lot of figures. They say, "Oh, this bill provides such a small amount of money, $31 billion," that it is not important to the economy.

The important thing is what does the amount in this bill drive? I would just give you one example: There is $141 million, in the bill for the Small Business Administration. But that drives $2.6 billion in loan guarantees. Banks are out of loan guarantee authority, or will be out in May. They are already using the authority for the next quarter but are going to be out for the entire year in May. They need more guarantee authority for the rest of the fiscal year. We depend on small businesses to bring us out of recessions and a relatively small amount of loan guarantees produces thousands of jobs. So, you are not talking about $141 million; we are talking about driving $2.6 billion in loan guarantees.

The same thing applies to EDA. There is a small amount of money in the bill for EDA, but it is very important to get some of these grants out there right now so they can help jump-start the economy.

Also, there is some money for high tech programs. We need to get started on high technology, let us not wait 8 months. We know we are in need of becoming more competitive in this world economy. We need to get an 8-months' gain on that.

Now, we hear a list of projects batted around here; those are projects which local government could start with—block grants. We have all, including especially on the Republican side, said we want local governments to make

their own decisions. They might spend it for some of the things they are talking about, or they might not. That is the block grant approach, and it is the right approach.

In addition to that, I just want to point this out: Whether you consider the amount of money in this bill a small amount of money or not, this initiative has raised optimism and hope in this country. We do not want to kill hope. It would be bad for the economy psychologically. Hope is so important at the present time.

We have had a turnaround from pessimism last December and November, and now people have hope. Let us keep hope alive. Vote against this motion to recommit, vote for the bill.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

□ 2310

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to recommit.

To pass this bill is like seeing a person who is on a diet then goes out and buys a big chocolate cake with money that they do not even have and they go on a binge before they go on a diet.

In the Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee, we had seven economists who came before the committee. Every economist who came before the committee said it would be a mistake to pass this bill.

Also, this bill has a use or lose provision in it which the Inspector General says can help bring about fraud and waste, because what it means is that the highway people will just shove these things out.

Senator Bentsen when he was chairman of the Joint Economic Committee signed a report that said:

> Such programs like this are not timely enough to even take effect before the end of the recession.

Senator Bentsen went on to say:

> The duration of employment for Public Works jobs is too short to provide meaningful relief for the hard-core unemployed.

Senator Bentsen went on to say:

> Net job creation is quite low leading to a very high cost per job.

At least one member of the Clinton administration knows better.

I strongly support the motion to recommit and urge defeat of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that this legislation will be passed. But can we at least be honest enough to the American people to call it what it is: too little, too late.

We have had a parade of economists before the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, on which I serve as the ranking member. Although it is very rare indeed for economists, they have been nearly unanimous in their opinion. This so-called economic stimulus package is not needed, since all the economic indicators are headed in the right direction. And furthermore, according to these economists, not only will this additional spending not stimulate the economy, it could hurt by reigniting inflation and raising interest rates. One of these economists summed this up in an op-ed piece in the Wall Street Journal titled, "If It Ain't Broke, Don't Fix It."

And the response from the new administration? Yes, but this economic recovery is different from previous cycles because the unemployment rate is not going down fast enough nationwide, and remains high in some areas. Therefore, we need to stimulate job creation.

Well, if you buy that argument, then how do we explain the fact that the majority has squelched amendments designed to ensure that any jobs created by this supplemental would go to unemployed workers displaced by the economic downturn?

If you are a highway construction business owner, you probably are not going to run out and hire new people based on the size of infrastructure spending included in this supplemental. What you are going to do is simply give existing workers overtime. Now I ask the majority, how does that help create new jobs and bring down the unemployment rate?

At both the subcommittee and full committee level, I tried to amend this bill to mandate that at least 50 percent of the spending would go to economically displaced workers. The amendment was rejected. I then tried to amend this bill to place a cap on overtime which can be funded through the supplemental. That was rejected, too.

It is obvious that the only thing this spending bill will stimulate is a higher deficit.

And, there is one other thing this bill could stimulate: corruption. The inspector general of the U.S. Department of Transportation testified before our subcommittee concerning longstanding investigations into misused funds and collusive bid-rigging in transit and highway contracts. Concern was expressed that the use-or-lose provisions included in the supplemental spending bill could exacerbate this problem.

It should be noted that the minority also tried to amend this bill by removing the use-or-lose provisions. Even if all preliminary engineering is completed and the right-of-way is acquired, it is nearly impossible to bring a highway project to contract in 90 days.

The economists who appeared before the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee agreed that instead of throwing more money at our Nation's infrastructure, we should allocate more wisely the money that has already been authorized. As one economist put it, "We cannot continue building 'Field of Dreams' infrastructure projects on the premise that riders will come." It seems to me that use-or-lose provisions encourage precisely that.

Let's expose this legislation for what it is. The economy is on the right track, and unless the new administration does something, former President George Bush is going to get the credit for it. That is not a good reason for passing more deficit spending.

Mr. Chairman, history speaks unequivocally about whether or not countercyclical spending measures work after a recession. They do not.

And that is not just the opinion of the minority in this body.

Following a June 1980 hearing on this subject, the Joint Economic Committee issued a report with the same conclusion. That report was signed by all members of the committee, including the committee's chairman, Senator Lloyd Bentsen, now the Secretary of the Treasury. The report found the following:

Such programs are not timely enough to even take effect before the end of the recession;

The duration of employment for public works jobs is too short to provide meaningful relief for the hard-core unemployed;

Federal public works programs often displace State and local programs, meaning that Federal jobs may simply substitute for State and local jobs. As a consequence, net job creation is quite low, leading to a very high cost per job, ranging from $70,000 to $198,000—and those are 1980 dollars.

If I may quote from this report issued by the Joint Economic Committee:

> A review of the business cycles in the past 35 years shows that government attempts to shorten the duration or reduce the intensity of recessions through countercyclical programs initiated during specific downturns have been ineffective. In a number of instances, the effects of such efforts have been quite different from what was intended. Programs designed to reverse downward economic trends during recessions have frequently accelerated upward trends during the periods of recovery, sometimes with unfortunate results.

To say that this bill will stimulate the economy and help bring down the unemployment rate is a false claim, and a cruel one to any unemployed worker who might pin his or her hopes on it.

And at least one member of the Clinton cabinet knows better.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a moment to respond to some of the red herrings that have been used to attack this bill all throughout the day.

The majority leader told me that he talked to Leon Panetta, the OMB Director, tonight, and he informed him, for instance, that this so-called list of projects in the Interior Department, which is being used to attack this bill, is, in fact, not a list of projects that is in the bill. It is simply a list that was provided to the Secretary of the Interior of possible usages of money, but no decisions have been made about the actual final funding of any of those projects. Mr. Panetta has given flat assurance that projects such as the so-called fish atlas will simply not be funded.

Second, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has already dealt with the fact that for years people on the Republican side of the aisle said, "My God, quit passing those narrow categorical programs. Give the mayors a chance to operate their own programs through the Community Development Block Grant programs," and so we have done it.

In fact, Gramm-Rudman eliminated the Federal veto we used to have on

Community Development Block Grant programs.

All through the eighties the Republican Party did not blink an eye when Government used billions of taxpayer dollars to finance leveraged buyouts or to finance corporate takeovers that had absolutely no economic value.

Now they are having a collective heart attack because we are taking the money which we cut out of military spending and foreign aid last year and using it to attack our own problems here at home.

We are not spending one dime above the total level of spending previously approved by this Congress for this fiscal year, and they know it and you do, too.

It is about time that we dedicate these revenues to transportation needs, to highway needs, to education needs, to community development needs.

The public knows that most of the opposition to the President's plan is political. For 12 years you have had it your way. It is time for you to get out of the way and let us change America and bring America back to prosperity.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit embodies an amendment that I offered in committee. I went before the Rules Committee to try and get my amendment made in order but they refused.

So I am particularly grateful to my ranking member, Congressman MCDADE, and to the Republican leader, Mr. MICHEL, for making my amendment part of this motion.

At a time when the American people are calling for us to reduce the deficit, this stimulus package will add directly $16 billion to the deficit. If one considers the additional interest on that increased debt, that figure reaches nearly $27 billion.

That is what we are talking about here today. Should we burden the American people with additional $27 billion of debt?

This recommittal strikes none of the funding in the President's stimulus package. Not one dime.

This recommittal simply withholds funds for the programs—except for unemployment compensation—until cuts are made elsewhere to pay for these programs. That is exactly what the bipartisan budget agreement of 1990 required.

As the bill stands now, all the funding is designated as emergency and thus is not required to have offsets. However, before my subcommittee, not a single witness from the administration could adequately explain why this spending is an emergency.

In summary, my amendment, which is embodied in this motion to recommit, simply reconfirms what this Congress agreed to 2 years ago; that is, no increased spending without equal cuts or increased revenue. That is the only responsible way to prevent a runaway deficit.

I ask my colleagues to support this motion to recommit and to prevent $27 billion of additional deficit spending. The time is now for fiscal restraint.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, to listen to our friends in the minority, the country is on the road back. If we just keep our hands off the economy, everything will be all right. They have overlooked the fact that we still have, today, 9 million unemployed people looking for work and millions more who have been discouraged and given up and stopped looking for work.

We have 6½ million Americans who are working part-time, who cannot find the kind of work that will really allow them to take care of their families, part-time people who are not covered by health benefits in almost all cases.

In fact, of the 300,000 jobs we have heard so much about that were just created, 82 percent were part-time jobs. They are not real jobs that are going to put bread on the table of the average American family.

In fact, we have recovered only 1 out of 20 manufacturing jobs that we lost during this recession. Only 30 percent of all the jobs lost in this recession have been recovered. Where is the rest? Where are the other 70 percent?

This country continues to hurt. My State of California has a 9.8-percent rate of unemployment.

I do not see any turnaround unless we are willing to go with this President, his vision of the future and his plan for economic recovery.

It is not acceptable simply to sit here and say "keep your hands off the economy." It will heal itself. We have done that, Mr. Speaker. We did that for the last 4 years in the last administration and we are still picking up the pieces.

We have an opportunity tonight to give hope to the American people, to show them we have figured out that a new approach is needed.

I hope we do not sit here and pretend that everything is all right in America. The majority knows it is not. We are ready to act.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the able gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, uniquely I rise not to condemn the President's economic stimulus package. In fact, I will agree with you that I will support the economic stimulus portion of his package. That is not what we are arguing tonight.

We are not saying that we oppose an economic stimulus program, although some of us may question the need at this point about whether we need an economic stimulus. Maybe we do, and if we do, then let us create one. Let us create a highway program as our new President wants. Let us give the unemployment moneys necessary to provide for the unemployed as he wants. That might be an economic stimulus, but let us not try to fool the American people.

We grew up in the spoils system of Government and it worked great for 200 years in this country, and I do not know of a better system and I accept that.

I recognize the responsibility of the President to fulfill his commitments to those who supported him.

□ 2320

But for the life of me, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how bailing the District of Columbia out with $28 million to lessen their deficit, when cities like Mobile need money, too, is an emergency. That is not an emergency appropriation necessity, and neither is it an economic stimulus. It's a campaign promise being paid.

I agree with the President, possibly, that we need to give more money to AIDS research, and I know he is fulfilling a commitment to the entertainment industry that so broadly supported him, and maybe we do need this $200 billion, but how about the Arthritis Foundation? They need research moneys, too. And how about the poor lady in my district who has a daughter with Rhets syndrome who tells me that if we could just get $3 or $4 million appropriated to Baylor University that we could possibly find a cure for Rhet syndrome? And how about the other diseases that need the same attention that AIDS needs?

Sure, Mr. Speaker, we need to do those things, and I admire the President for fulfilling the commitment to those who supported him. I just find it wrong that the President of the United States and the Democrat leadership in this body is trying to disguise this measure to the American people by insinuating it's something in the form of an economic stimulus and is a dire emergency appropriation when most of it is not.

I cannot for the life of me understand how the President, or anybody else, can go before the American people and say, "Let's give a $9 million appropriation to Fish and Wildlife," and expect that to stimulate the economy. Ask the people up in the Northwest if putting more species on the endangered list is going to stimulate the economy, and the gentleman in the chair, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT], is from that great area of our country.

Mr. Speaker, let us not disguise it. Let us send it back. Let us correct it. Let us support the President's economic stimulus, but the only way we can do it is by revising it to make it a

true economic stimulus. I urge you to vote to recommit this package.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, 1 month ago almost to the day the President came, and he spoke not only to us, but he spoke to the American public, and he said to the American public, "You have asked to come here and do a job. I don't have all the answers. But I do have a commitment."

Mr. Speaker, he has shown the courage to place before us a program, a program of action, a program to end gridlock, a program to respond to the problems confronting America.

Is there an emergency? We have argued this before; in fact, yesterday. I suggest to my colleagues that every American who cannot get a job, every parent who sees their child without opportunity, every person who is without health care, says, yes, there is an emergency in my life.

On November 3, as the majority leader said, 62 percent of America said, "We need to move in a different direction." Did they have one single idea? No. Do we in this room have one single idea? No.

But this is an historic day because on this day the House of Representatives accepts the President's challenge to respond and to act. Are we acting perfectly? We will not know that for weeks, months and, perhaps, years to come, but we are taking action. We are not saying "veto."

Mr. Speaker, we took action about a year ago almost to the day and sent to the President a bill that would have, we believed, economically stimulated this country, and the President vetoed that bill. My colleagues will recall he vetoed it because it placed a tax on millionaires, and he said, "No."

Today we are saying yes. We said yes on a budget plan. There were other alternatives. They did not do very well on either side of the aisle, I noticed.

The fact of the matter is, we have adopted a budget that cuts $63 billion above and beyond what the President asked us to cut because this House wanted to be real and honest with the American public. Yes, we have talked about $27 billion additional, but we have cut $63 billion in the budget that we have proposed that will be realized, that will be realized in reconciliation in a few short days, and now on this bill we say, yes, we are going to cut; yes, we are going to discipline the Federal finances; and, yes, we are also going to do what the President told the American public he was going to do, and they responded affirmatively. He said, "We're going to invest in people short term," as we have in this bill, "and long term" as we have in this bill.

It is time for us to act. It is time to respond to the courage of the American people. It is time to say yes to solving problems in America.

Mr. Speaker, tonight we will pass President Clinton's economic package. Before I address the merits of his budget and investment proposals, I would like to commend the leadership of our new President for bringing this day forward. And I would like to thank Chairman SABO for being willing to work with Chairmen CLAY and FAZIO, Congresswoman NORTON, and me to consider alternative methods for achieving savings from Federal workers. I look forward to continuing our work together.

This vote marks a turning point in America's economic destiny. In the last election the American people voted for change.

They rejected the shortsighted borrow-and-spend policies of the status quo that limited our economic competitiveness and would leave our children with enormous bills to pay. They called for a bold plan to end a 25-year pattern of rising budget deficits. A plan that rewards hard work and invests in our future. A strategy that creates high-wage jobs, increases productivity, and improves our standard of living. They asked for a government that reflects their priorities and is on their side.

President Clinton responded to their call. He spoke to the American people clearly and honestly about the challenges we face as a nation and a people.

He presented a concrete strategy to get America back on track. He outlined the tough choices that must be made if America is to live up to her potential. He put our children's interest before our self-interest; the national interest before the special interest. And over the past few weeks, the American people have responded with overwhelming approval of his bold plan.

With Presidential leadership and public support, the House will enthusiastically pass the President's economic strategy.

This budget resolution lays the groundwork for long-term economic growth by redirecting our Nation's spending priorities from consumption to investment.

It funds programs that work and cuts spending on programs that have outlived their usefulness or reward consumption.

The President proposed 150 spending cuts totaling $247 billion over the next 5 years. He challenged us to cut more and be specific—and we cut an additional $63 billion in Government spending. Two of every three dollars saved from spending cuts and revenue increases will be used to cut the deficit.

Since 1980, the Federal deficit jumped from 23 to 90 percent as a percentage of net private savings, and our saving rate has plunged from 6 percent to 2 percent. The Federal debt has quadrupled. It is no wonder that our economy can't grow.

This budget resolution will cut the deficit in real terms by $510 billion over the next 5 years.

It meets the President's challenge of $140 billion of deficit reduction in 1997. Cutting the deficit also saves $16.4 billion in reduced debt management costs and $10 billion in interest savings on the debt.

Why is that important? Because the Federal debt is like a giant sponge, soaking up capital that could be used for investment.

Deficit reduction will serve to keep interest rates down and foster private investment, the prime building block of sustained economic growth and a higher standard of living for all Americans. If we do not cut the deficit, our economic recovery, fragile as it is, will soon top out.

President Clinton has led us out of gridlock. He has focused us on the future and the tough choices that must be made if the 21st century is to be the American century.

He has put our children's interest before our self interest; the national interest before the special interest. He has moved us from thinking about each of us to thinking about all of us. He has made us believe, again, that tomorrow can be better than today, which was better than yesterday. And that is one of America's most profound pillars of strength.

This is the plan that America called for. These are the goals that Americans share. I ask all of my colleagues—Democratic, Republican, and Independent—to join with our President in this sharp break from the failed policies of the past.

Put aside partisan differences for this moment. Listen to your constituents who voted for change. Our new President deserves a chance to succeed. Let us join together as the American team to put the country we love back on the right track.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide for the RECORD this list and note that every single speaker on the other side, save one, is on the big spender list of the National Taxpayers Union, and I would like to submit that for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues from the other side have said that we all need to suffer a little to balance the budget, and I think all of us would agree that we could all suffer a little to improve the economy and to reduce the national deficit.

But in 1986 we were asked to do the same thing, and that proved disastrous to small business, and the 1990 tax bill in which our then President moved his lips the deal was for every tax dollar we bring in that we will cut spending by three. But in that we actually increased spending, and at the same time we cut defense by over 30 percent, and think about what a billion dollars is.

Mr. Speaker, my State of California has got an $8 billion debt. We are not talking about thousands, or millions, or billions here, but $4 trillion. That is $17,000 for every resident in the United States, and that is important.

But what is important tonight and even into the future? Take a look, and I think when the public views the proceedings that are going on, if my colleagues take a look at a future vote, if those on the other side really mean what they are saying, they are going to say that when a balanced budget amendment comes up they will support it. If they do not support a balanced budget amendment to balance the budget after raising taxes and not cutting spending, then they should be fired.

And I think the American people ought to take a look, and the only answer is through term limitations of this body. Every economic growth package in this 102d Congress was turned down, and I have an answer for my friend from Mobile, AL: If you want help and save $28 million, then maybe you ought to shift Marion Barry there, and he'll smoke it.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, and Members, I take the well tonight to once again defend the District of Columbia which has traditionally been the whipping post of the Congress, and I guess I should have expected it tonight.

The Mayor of the District of Columbia came to our committee and indicated something that we all knew, and that was that they were having a serious problem in the District with youth and crime. She had initiated a youth and crime initiative, and she asked us to provide $30 million for it. Bush in his short sightedness indicated that he would veto any bill that provided that $30 million.

President Clinton came to Washington and with understanding provided $28.2 million.

Is it an economic stimulus? It is an economic stimulus to 300 people that are going to get paid that would have otherwise been laid off.

Is it an economic stimulus to the District of Columbia who was short of funds, and they keep young men and women out of jail and, thereby, put more money to other projects? That is certainly an economic stimulus.

Will it be an economic stimulus to people who come here and may not be attacked? I think they would think it is an economic stimulus.

□ 2330

To pit the District of Columbia against your city or your State is perfectly ridiculous. This committee, the District of Columbia Appropriations Committee, has fought hard to make sure that the obligations and moneys that are rightfully owed this District are paid; $28.2 million is certainly a cheap price to pay for the mayor and city council to get a grip on the youth and crime programs in this District.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I will put in the whole list of what is not stimulus in this so-called stimulus package.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague who has the district just to the south of me, my access to the sea, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], made an offer here in good faith. I asked him if he was deadly serious, and he said absolutely.

Mr. Speaker, rather than have the gentleman out there alone, I figure as his partner from Orange County that I should back him up with an equal challenge and add this stimulus package to it:

If this stimulus package creates more jobs than job destruction, I will also resign my seat, scrape up $100,000, and I will be more specific, I promise you I will write the check to Ron Brown. He is one of the 12 out of 14 millionaires in the President's Cabinet, so he must know something about entrepreneurship. I am not going to take the time to write 100 times an apology. I have got a ninth grandchild due in 6 weeks, so I will have plenty of things to do after writing the check and resigning Congress.

I am quite serious. My good friend, who I have the honor of sitting in for occasionally, Rush Limbaugh, has seriously put $1 million cash on the table against the Democratic National Committee as a challenge if anything works in that ugly package that we just passed on in this bill. So it is time for you, to quote Mr. Clinton, to put up or shut up. Give me a matching grant, somebody on this side of the aisle. Any comers?

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues not to commit a grave error as we consider economic policy this year. That error would be in misreading the current economic indicators and acting upon an ill-timed and misconceived economic stimulus plan.

For months now, the Democrats have seized upon the supposed need for economic stimulus to bring us out of a recession. And their argument once had a constituency even among some Republicans. But now, the situation has changed. Every indication is that the recession has ended, and our economy is well on its way to a healthy recovery. Any economic stimulus at this time through some Government spending scheme would only hurt the recovery and add to the budget deficit at a time when we are trying to reduce it.

Mr. Clinton and the Democrats simply have to let go of this one. Stimulus without a compelling need isn't smart. The only thing this stimulus package would stimulate is the funding of pork out of the taxpayers' coffers. A key indication of this, Mr. Speaker, is the list of who still supports the economic stimulus package, which reads like a who's who of liberal big spenders in Congress. This type of spending is both unnecessary and a betrayal of the mandate of the previous election.

Let's look at some of what all the spending would stimulate:

Pell grant shortfalls, $1.8 billion.

Immunization programs, $300 million.

AIDS prevention programs, $200 million.

EEOC backlog reduction, $9 million.

For CDBG grants, for projects contained in the Conference of Mayors "Ready to Go" projects—such as a golf course, $500,000; a beach parking garage, $5 million; a cemetery, $1 million; historic preservation of a theater, $3.5 million; gym replacement, $4.5 million; and a pool renovation, $3.25 million—$2.54 billion.

To prepay bills that aren't due until fiscal years 1994 and 1995 for a super computer that will not be purchased until 1994, $8 million.

For drawings of 28 significant structures and engineering achievements, $1.4 million.

To begin preparing for whitewater canoeing at the 1996 Olympics, a $10 million program that no one knows who will pay for yet, $800,000.

For EPA green programs to encourage Fortune 500 companies to convert to more energy efficient equipment, including industrial motors, heat pumps, and clothes washers and dryers, $23 million.

To accelerate IRS tax systems modernization despite GAO's major problems with this program, $148 million.

To expand educational opportunity with the $500 million for an expanded title I remedial summer program? Include arts education as an eligible activity.

For air circuit breakers and rest room repairs, $560,000; now that's an emergency.

RESEARCH FUNDS? FOR JOB CREATION?

Throughout the bill, over $450 million in research funds are included which are least likely to provide a quick payout and jobs for the unemployed. Examples of these projects include:

Omnibus Fish and Wildlife Service Research—$3.2 million for such things as compiling two fish atlases and studies on large river populations of sicklefin chub.

Energy research and development—$47 million for such projects as human reliability-assessment and enhancement; materials for a new generation of contact lenses; and nondestructive evaluation instrumentation/ultrasonic characterization of texture.

National Science Foundation research and development—to restore cuts made by Congress in response to grants funded previously, such as a study of traditional and nontraditional forms of popular religion in Sicily—$197 million.

High-performance computing—NIST, NSF, NIH, and NASA—$33.6 million downpayment on a $798 million 5-year program Congress has yet to see or approve.

Equipment for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—come on—$81 million.

Funding for the Commerce Department's information highways plan—apparently AT&T and MCI aren't laying fiber-optic cable fast enough—$64 million on a $645 million 5-year program not yet authorized.

IRS equipment upgrades, $148 million.

Homeless programs, $423 million—almost half a billion—that's a lot of money. I question what it stimulates.

Balancing the District of Columbia budget, $28 billion. That's billions.

This last item in particular is especially telling. Congress appropriates Federal funds for the District of Columbia every year, and has made a habit of funding a dire emergency supplemental appropriation bill for District of Columbia, as well. Including money for the D.C. budget shortfall in an economic stimulus package is cynical, my colleagues.

There simply is no need for this package at this time. The President wishes to spend $30 billion on a plan to create 500,000 jobs. But last month, the unemployment rate fell to 7 percent and 365,000 jobs were created. This

should dissuade us from any notion of need for a stimulus.

As well, the Clinton stimulus package would be ineffective, overall. Government spending like this just does not lead to significant job creation. Only $5 billion will be spent over the next 6 months, according to the OMB, and even the $9 billion Emergency Jobs Act of 1983 created a mere 35,000 very short-term jobs at its peak.

And even if the plan did create 500,000 jobs, it would be at a price of $60,000 per employee, a vast difference from the $40,000 it takes per employee in the private sector. What is more, taking $30 billion out of the private sector in increased taxes could kill as many as 750,000 jobs. Clearly, this would be counterproductive and contrary to Clinton's stated objectives.

Mr. Speaker, all of the political talking heads on the Sunday morning news shows agree. The reason Mr. Clinton must pass this stimulus package is that it is the sugar that helps the tougher, hard-to-swallow budget medicine go down. But Clinton cannot dodge this issue. He should be bold and admit that there is no longer a compelling need for the sweetener.

The President should stop chasing shadows. Increasing spending and paying for it with higher taxes will bring us back to the politics of stagflation, the hallmark of 1970's economics. In any case, Mr. Speaker, we in Congress should not be urging him along this dangerous path. We should recognize the obvious and defeat this untimely so-called fix before we fix ourselves for good.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, the beauty of this body is that so many of us can come together and disagree so completely, as the previous speaker and I do disagree.

Earlier this evening we voted on a budget resolution. Every one of us who ran this fall, with the President or with our former President, Mr. Bush, knows that we had to reduce the deficit. Then the rest of the budget resolution was our new President's, Mr. Clinton's, hand on the new budget, in the direction and the investment, as he calls it, and the improvement in what we will do down the line.

But also what happens when a President wins is he becomes a shepherd, Mr. Speaker, This shepherd said, "I don't have much that I can do, but I can hear the cities that were ignored. I can hear the mayors and the selectmen who say we need help not to raise the property tax. I can hear the children. I can hear the children say that we need some help, that we have to have summer jobs, that we have to have Head Start," which does work.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support the President, very glad, because this is his special touch to the budget.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I just spent the last weekend at a bunch of town meetings back in my district. The question that came out of my people back home time and time again was do you really think that those people believe what they are saying when they talk about what they are doing in Washington?

My response was basically, well, I don't know, but I guess they really do believe that taxes are contributions, and maybe they really do believe that more government is investment, and I guess they really do believe that deficit spending is stimulus and job creation. I guess they really do believe that, as the gentleman from Wisconsin said, the Republicans have been in control of the Government for 12 years.

That is unbelievable. And the American people will believe it when they see what you are doing to their future, when they also see the hole in their wallets of what you are doing to their children.

During this debate on the rule the gentleman from South Carolina said for the first time in the history of this country his children and his grandchildren have nothing to look forward to. Well, I am telling you, after today they have a lot to look forward to. They have got a lot of debt to look forward to, less opportunity to look forward to and that is what you are putting on your children and your grandchildren. You are so cynical that you refused to allow an amendment to pay for this deficit spending you are doing. Unbelievable. And that is all we are asking you to do, is vote for the motion to recommit, so that we can pay for this, so that your children and grandchildren will not have to pay for it in the future. If you will not think about yourselves, if you do not care about this country, at least think about your children and your grandchildren. What are you doing to them? You are just throwing away their future.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are talking about here, the future, because this will come home later on. When the American people see in the next few months and the next couple of years what you have done because you do control and you do control, because you have the White House, you have the Senate, and you have the House, and you are being irresponsible in what you have.

You are going to pass this. We understand that. But what we are trying to tell the American people is we did not do it, the Democrats did.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, this is no time to recommit; it is a time to commit. It is a time to commit to the American people.

This country is in trouble. Joblessness is at an all time high. Many of our plants have closed, jobs have been exported to Third World countries, and families are in despair and hopelessness. Young people are on American streets without jobs, without job training.

This is not a time for posturing; this is a time to stop the games. This is a time to make sure we do not end this evening with the American public pointing to us and talking about gridlock.

We finally, after 12 long years, have a President who is willing to provide some leadership. He knew he was going to take some knocks. He knew that there would be those who would posture and use this as a time to divide us and to polarize us. But he has courage, and he moved forward and brought an investment package to the Congress of the United States. He said, "Members of Congress, stop the foolishness. Support investing in the American people."

Mr. Speaker, this is his agenda, to put the people first. It is time for us to get on with the business of moving America forward. Let us not recommit; let us commit and do something for the very people who have sent us here to take care of the business of this country.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY].

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if this makes me an authority on this particular matter tonight, but I think I am the only person in this chamber that voted for both the Kasich budget and the Black Caucus budget, which either shows a tremendous foresight on my part or a complete lack of judgment.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell why I did that: because both of those documents, in this Member's view, were real pieces of paper, with real cuts, real taxes, real solutions, some of them horrifying, but nonetheless honest attempts with no quick fixes in the Tax Code, no unspecified cuts, and I thought they deserved my support.

□ 2340

The reason the supplemental does not deserve my support or, I think, any of ours is that it is not real. It is imagined. It is working on a supposition that there is an emergency before us. Not a gulf war, not an earthquake, not a hurricane, but an imagined emergency.

It may be real to some of my colleagues, but let me just try and put this in a perspective that questions nobody's courage but tries to assess the judgment behind that decision.

There is a definition of emergency in our budget law and it reads as follows, and it was agreed to, by the way, by the previous Budget Director, Richard Darman, and the present one, Leon Panetta.

It reads as follows: "A necessary expenditure that is sudden, urgent, and unforeseen and is not permanent and depends on commonsense judgment made on a case-by-case basis."

This is a letter that Leon Panetta sent to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] in which he also said this package is needed to prevent the reoccurrence of a recession.

I put that question to the Budget Director, Robert Reischauer, who is the person that we not only use to prepare numbers to make these of arguments but the one the President uses now.

He said, "No. There is no recurring recession. And if there were, this stimulus package would only be good for perhaps two-tenths of a percent."

So that begged the question, "Well, then, Mr. Director, what is an emergency?"

And he said, and I think this is the wisest thing I have heard this year, "It is defined by whatever the political leadership on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue think it is."

Now, is that the definition of the end of gridlock? I think not.

I do not think that is what we are here to do tonight.

Mr. Reischauer said, after he answered that question, he said, "Can I go home now?"

I said to him, "If that is really your answer, we should all go home now," because it is a crime to take our voting cards and put them in these machines and operate under a guise of an emergency, when we know that this is only what the political leadership at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue have decided it is.

If that is true, if that is really what we are going to do, then why even have a Committee on the Budget? Why not simply say, let us underfund all of our appropriations and then, when we run out of dough, we declare an emergency for whatever purpose. That is a discredit to the Black Caucus. That is a discredit to the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, and I think it is a discredit to every Member of this House.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to talk a little bit about some of the discussion we have had about things not really being for stimulus. I have heard a list read that, as I would hear them, seem to be complaining because of things that the recipients of community development block grant funding would spend.

We have heard people criticize particular items that had to do with municipal government. Yes, this bill does provide for funds for community development block grants.

We ought to understand, thanks to the Republican Party, we have no control over how that is spent. It used to be that when community development block grant funding was made available to smaller cities, they came to HUD for approval. But in Gramm-Latta, of blessed memory, the Reagan bill of 1981, we gave that power over to the States. So there is now no legal power in the Federal Government to disallow community development block grant selections.

So much of what we have been hearing from our friends on the other side denouncing what Congress is doing is, in fact, living up to the Reagan theory of letting the States decide for themselves. It is a little late for that reconsideration. I welcome it.

I would only say that if we want to confess error by Gramm-Latta, there are some other points we ought to begin with first.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, yes, in answer to that last argument, if the various cities are going to spend their money that way, we should not be giving them the money at this time.

Let me note that we started talking about spending caps earlier. I was afraid that the Democrats could not find their spending caps. I found the Democrats spending cap. Here it is.

I will have my colleagues know that down at the White House they do not know whether to play "Hail to the Chief" or "Santa Claus Is Coming to Town," when we hear about where some of this money is going to be spent.

A total of $1.5 million for fish atlases. Hey, $187 million for a great train set for the kids, that is Amtrak; $148 million for laptop computers; $560,000 for restroom repair and $28 million for the District of Columbia from each and every city around the United States. Next year, if they are really good, we are going to give them two U.S. Senators.

Well, if my colleagues believe in Santa Claus, they believe that this is a deficit reduction package. If they believe in Santa Claus, they can believe Government in Washington, DC, can give you something for nothing.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SARPALIUS].

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, there are those over there who call this package pork. Let me tell my colleagues, I am wearing what is called a pork tie. So when my colleagues want to know what pork looks like, that is what one looks like. Not all hogs are this pink.

But if we think that pork is an investment in our children who are behind in school and we have an opportunity in the summer to let them improve their skills, their reading skills, mathematical skills and to make productive citizens out of them, when today out of our inmates are people who never finished high school, a high percentage of our people on welfare are people who never finished school, now we have an opportunity to give those young people a second chance.

If we talk about immunizing our children, today under this program we can now do that. For every dollar we spend, it pays $14 down the road. That is an investment.

When we talk about Head Start, where we have children today who are beginning school who cannot even speak English. These are investments in the future. They are not pork.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 weeks, I have heard some of my colleagues suggest that an investment package is not necessary—that growth rates are up and unemployment numbers down. I say to my friends such is not the case in the Third Congressional District of Florida. The current unemployment rate of 7 percent is still higher than it was when our most recent recession ended 24 months ago. Even more startling is the fact that as the Secretary of Labor said, "The economy is still about 3 million jobs behind where we would be in a normal recovery."

It is time to help the economy create those jobs. How do we do that? By following the President's blueprint for recovery.

Each week, in my district, I am touched by those who cannot find work to support their families, single mothers stretching every penny to make ends meet and part-time laborers looking for full-time jobs. The answer to their prayers will not come in rosy rhetoric, but in quality American jobs.

The President's package will create those jobs and I urge my colleagues to pass it.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], distinguished whip of our party.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time to me.

In some ways, as we applaud back and forth and cheer back and forth, this debate would be funny. But I would suggest to my colleagues in some ways it is truly tragic.

We score debating points off each other, but we are all chipping away at the authority of our system of congressional representation.

In the future, historians can look at today as a case study in the decay of American Government.

As Americans lose trust and authority decays, people rebel in a lot of odd

ways. In Italy, the Lombard League and its allies are shaking the entire party structure. In Japan, the dominant party is being shaken to its foundations, and it may split for the first time since its founding after World War II.

In America, 2 weeks ago in the Washington Post, hardly a right-wing publication, only 21 percent of the American people trusted Government to do the right thing.

□ 2350

According to the Washington Post, that trust number of 21 percent is lower than Nixon's during the last week before he resigned in Watergate. That 21-percent trust number is lower than 4 years of Jimmy Carter's Presidency with 13-percent inflation and 21-percent interest rates and 441 days of the hostage crisis.

I would say to all of my colleagues on a nonpartisan basis, why do 79 percent of the American people refuse to trust Washington? I would suggest to the Members that today's House behavior is a case study. Two hours ago on this floor we were promised, promised, that we would not appropriate beyond the caps. Two hours ago, not a lifetime, 2 hours. This bill is deliberately written to be outside the caps, 2 hours later.

Term limitations are driven by distrust of Congress. They are averaging about 77 percent, in every State where they can get to the ballot. Ross Perot's voters say, "Cut spending and cut the deficit."

The "lead or leave" wants us all to sign on, and if we do not cut it in half in 4 years, get out of here. They all say, "Cut spending and cut the deficit".

I heard one of my friends tell us how government can be loved, and it is wonderful. The fact is, last year the most powerful single phrase by any candidate in the Presidential campaign was the following words: "The American people believe government is too big and spends too much." The Washington Post in that same poll reported that by 76 to 9, 76 to 9, people thought the President had not cut spending enough, 76 to 9.

Ross Perot is saying in his new poll, a $2 spending cut for every $1 of tax increase. It should make my more moderate friends happy. At least he is willing to have tax increases. But for that standard of $2 for every $1 tax increase, we ought to have a $34 billion tax cut attached to this bill, because that is how the math works. Since we are raising spending, we ought to be giving the American people back money, because we are failing them. We are not giving them any kind of spending cut in this bill.

Two hours ago the following words were said: "We will not appropriate above these caps." This bill clearly violates that definition. They can come up with sophistry, they can explain how that is for next year, not this year.

The objective fact is, in a country that no longer trusts the U.S. Congress, tonight if the Members vote against this motion to recommit, they are voting for a bigger deficit, for more real borrowing, they are voting to spend money they are not willing to pay for. They are going to increase the amount of money.

By the way, over 5 years that $31 billion is around $37 billion, by the time we add in the interest rate. I ask the Members to please vote for the motion to recommit to keep the Congress' faith.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

A country doctor was called to the outreaches of his county to treat an injured, poor black sharecropper who had an infected leg, on the verge of gangrene. He had a young boy who rode out with him, and after the treatment was completed and the leg saved, but the doctor unpaid, the little boy on the way back to town asked the doctor why he would spend all day riding out to treat a patient yet be unpaid, when he could have stayed in his office and earned many fees from treating patients.

The doctor looked at the young boy and he said, "Son, today we had an opportunity to help somebody."

I say to the Members of the House, today we have an opportunity to help somebody. We have an opportunity to help our ailing country, to help our sick economy, to help our courageous President try to jump start this economy.

We have an opportunity to help somebody: to help our youth, to help the expanding youth projects with Head Start, Chapter 1, childhood immunizations. We have an opportunity to help senior citizens with our service employment for older Americans, our urban areas with housing and economic development, minority business programs, our rural areas, our jobs for small business.

Today, we have an opportunity to help somebody. I urge the Members to pass this economic stimulus package and let us help America.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I would ask, is there 1 more minute remaining on my side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, may I say to my colleagues, I will not use even the entire minute. I simply want to remind the House what we are doing here now. The motion to recommit says the $4 billion for unemployment compensation is immediately released. It does not stop any of the other programs. It simply says if we want them, we have to offset them. Just do not add it to the deficit.

Do what the American people are asking us to do. Do the responsible thing. If we are going to have this stimulus program, offset it, and do not add it to the deficit.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time, which I believe is 4 minutes, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing some words here: Ross Perot. I keep hearing other words. It is like Tennessee Williams would call mendacity. That is what I have heard tonight, mendacious statements, telling that this particular stimulus package will not get this country going. It will get this country going.

I am sure that each of the Members, regardless of their party, wants to go home and tell the people they represent, "We did something to help you. We didn't do something to stifle you." That is what this budget is all about.

What the Members need to do now is stand up and be counted. Don't worry about your party. People back home don't care what party you are in. You can be an I-ate-a-tater. They don't care. What they want us to bring back to them is something they can use to improve their quality of life.

Vote for this stimulus package tonight. It is an investment in America.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, to those who oppose the President's package tonight I want to pose just one question: Where are the jobs?

Where are the jobs for the 16 million people who can't find full-time work? Tonight, 16 million Americans. That's five times as much as the work force in all of New York City.

It's larger than the population of 47 States. For 4 years we've heard that we should not worry about this problem. I remember that Boston Globe headline from a year ago: "Do nothing on Economy, Bush advises." And I remember the administration comments throughout the year.

"No recession." "Mild recession." "The recession has ended." "It's no big deal." Well, finally we have a President who knows it's a big deal. A President who has a plan to get the economy moving. A President who has the broad support of the American people.

The President's plan does many things. But it does one thing above all. It creates jobs. Let me repeat that. It creates jobs, right now—with immediate investment, and in the future, because it invests in the future. Invests in our communities. Invests in edu-

cation. Invests in training. Invests in health. Invests in affordable housing. Invests in small business. All that will create jobs and growth for America not just next year but into the next century.

That's why three University of Michigan economists said the other day, that if we just stick to the President's plan we'll have an even greater decrease in the deficit than the administration predicts, and even more growth.

There are those in this Chamber tonight who say we shouldn't pass this bill because it's not really an emergency, that we shouldn't be investing $16 billion now. Let me remind them: The level of funding in this bill is $5.5 million below the spending caps set forth in the 1990 budget agreement.

But even more important, we need to invest now if our economy is to grow this year—and next year—and the year after that—so we can finally get our deficit under control.

Some say we are in a recovery. You think it sounded like a recovery to the people at Northwest Airlines last month when they announced they were laying off another 1,000 people? Or McDonnell Douglas when they cut 8,700 jobs? Or Sears—50,000 jobs? Or Boeing: 20,000 jobs? Or General Motors, or IBM or Kodak, or the 80 other large firms who announced big job cuts since January 1.

Some recovery. The personnel experts have great names for it. Downsizing. Restructuring.

Mr. Speaker, it's a pink slip. And it devastates families. In the 23 months of this so-called recovery, job growth has been about one-fifth of the usual recovery.

There are still 3 million more Americans out of work than there were before the recession began. Three million. Let's start putting these people back to work.

Finally, let me say this to my colleagues. Bill Clinton was elected President for a simple reason. Change. People were tired of the status quo. They wanted a President who would act. Who had a plan. This is his plan. Give him the chance to make it work. Listen to the voices all around America. From labor, from business. From private sector and public sector. From farmers and teachers. From assembly line workers and white collar workers. From people in the suites and people on the streets. They are voices for change. They want action. Let's pass the bill right now. Defeat the motion to recommit.

Stand up to the guardians of gridlock just as we've stood up all day to those who want only to delay, to deny, to derail, to deadlock.

Let's send the whole economic package to the President. Let's give him the chance to do what voters want him to do. Let's give the millions who need work and need hope the courage to keep looking. And let them see that we're doing our job to help Americans find theirs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 244, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

AYES—181

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Valentine
Vucanovich
Walker
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—244

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—5

Barton
Ford (TN)
Henry
Myers
Quillen

□ 0018

Mr. REED changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GREENWOOD and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 0020

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. NATCHER. 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 235, nays 190, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—235

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—190

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Billirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Brewster
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Coppersmith
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Mann
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Valentine
Vucanovich
Walker
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—5

Barton
Ford (TN)
Henry
Myers
Quillen

□ 0036

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of trying to engage the majority whip in a little colloquy about the schedule for the remainder of the week and perhaps next week.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the schedule is that we will meet on next Tuesday, March 23, at noon and have 7 suspensions. Recorded votes on the suspensions will be postponed until Wednesday, the 24th of March.

Those bills are:

H.R. 904, to establish a National Commission to Ensure a Competitive Airline Industry, concur in Senate amendment.

House Joint Resolution 102, appointment of Barber B. Conable as a Citizen Regent of the Smithsonian Institution.

House Joint Resolution 104, appointment of Wesley S. Williams as a Citizen Regent of the Smithsonian Institution.

House Joint Resolution 105, appointment of Hanna Holburn Gray as a Citizen Regent of the Smithsonian Institution.

House Concurrent Resolution 41, use of rotunda to commemorate victims of the Holocaust.

H.R. 235, Idaho Land Exchange Act.

H.R. 720, Custer National Forest.

□ 0040

On Wednesday, March 24, and the balance of the week, Mr. Speaker, we will meet at 2 p.m. on Wednesday and at 11 a.m. on Thursday. We do not know about Friday as of yet.

Our schedule for Wednesday tentatively is to do H.R. 670, the Family Planning Amendments Act of 1993, subject to a rule.

We will let Members know about Friday as soon as we know, and, hopefully, that will be soon.

I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is interested in committee funding.

Mr. SOLOMON. Yes.

Mr. BONIOR. We have to do that, as the gentleman knows, by March 23, and we are not expected to do it next week at this time. We will probably do it the following week.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] says we will not expect to do the committee funding next week?

Mr. BONIOR. That is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. Then just to clarify again, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said the pending bills on Tuesday, if there were votes called for, they would be rolled over until Wednesday?

Mr. BONIOR. That is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. And we will take up the Family Planning Act amendments on Wednesday, and does the gentleman think in his opinion that there might be votes on Thursday on that bill as well?

Mr. BONIOR. We are anticipating votes at this point, yes.

Mr. SOLOMON. We are?

Mr. BONIOR. At this point.

Mr. SOLOMON. We are anticipating votes?

Mr. BONIOR. That could change, but right now we anticipate that Members should be aware that we will probably vote on Thursday.

Mr. SOLOMON. And does the gentleman have any idea about when we might be considering the debt limit which is reaching a critical period?

Mr. BONIOR. Well, we have to do it before the end of the month, and I suspect it would be the following week, not this coming week, but the following week.

Mr. SOLOMON. I see.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for enlightening the membership, and I hope he has a nice weekend.

Mr. BONIOR. The same to my friend from New York.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MARCH 19, 1993, TO TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 1993

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, Friday, March 19, 1993, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, March 23, 1993.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Hon. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, January 5, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to advise you that, pursuant to sec. 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code, the following Members of the Committee on Ways and Means have been designated to serve on the Joint Committee on Taxation during the 103rd Congress: Dan Rostenkowski (D., IL), Sam M. Gibbons (D., FL), J.J. Pickle (D., TX), Bill Archer (R., TX), Philip M. Crane (R., IL).

Sincerely yours,

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
Chairman.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TALENT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. REGULA, for 60 minutes, on March 30.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. LAMBERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. LOWEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SYNAR, for 60 minutes, on March 23.

Mr. OLVER, for 60 minutes, on March 23.

Mr. OWENS for 60 minutes each day, on April 1, 2, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TALENT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BLILEY in two instances.
Mr. COMBEST in two instances.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. GINGRICH in two instances.
Mr. HENRY.
Mrs. MORELLA.
Mr. LEACH in two instances.
Mr. KYL.
Ms. DUNN.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. HYDE.
Mr. ROGERS in two instances.
Mr. PACKARD.
Mr. SCHAEFER.
Mr. SANTORUM.
Mr. MOORHEAD.
Mr. OXLEY.
Mr. LIGHTFOOT.
Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.
Mr. BEREUTER.
Mr. PORTER.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. LAMBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MALONEY.
Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.
Mrs. CLAYTON in two instances.
Ms. PELOSI.
Mr. SKELTON.
Mrs. KENNELLY.
Mr. MARKEY.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mrs. MEEK.
Mr. NADLER.
Mr. BROWN of California in two instances.
Mr. BARCIA.
Mr. SPRATT.
Mr. MORAN.
Mr. GIBBONS in two instances.
Mrs. THURMAN.
Mr. BORSKI.
Mr. JACOBS.
Mr. RICHARDSON in two instances.
Mr. TORRICELLI.
Mr. KANJORSKI.
Mr. STUDDS in two instances.

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. 80. An act to increase the size of the Big Thicket National Preserve in the State of Texas by adding the Village Creek corridor unit, the Big Sandy corridor unit, and the Canyonlands unit; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 214. An act to authorize the construction of a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II and to commemorate United States participation in that conflict; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. 275. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the town of Taos, New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 326. An act to revise the boundaries of the George Washington Birthplace National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 328. An act to provide for the rehabilitation of historic structures within the Sandy Hook Unit of Gateway National Recreation Area in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 344. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Fox and Lower Wisconsin River corridors in the State of Wisconsin as a National Heritage Corridor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S.J. Res. 22. Joint resolution designating March 25, 1993, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy".

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution to proclaim March 20, 1993, as "National Agriculture Day".

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. LAMBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 23, 1993, at 12 noon.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Report and amended report of House committees concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the third and fourth quarter of 1992, in connection with foreign travel pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1992

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Debbie Gebhardt	8/24	8/26	Japan		484.00		(3)				484.00
	8/26	9/4	China		1,752.00		(3)				1,752.00
	9/5	9/6	Thailand		213.00		(3)				213.00
	9/6	9/7	Hong Kong		516.00		(3)				516.00
Committee total											2,965.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Air transportation provided by USAF.

NORMAN Y. MINETA, Chairman, Mar. 11, 1993.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1992

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Hon. Mike Synar	12/20	12/27	South Africa		1,418.50						1,418.50
	12/28	12/30	Belgium		542.00						542.00
Commercial transportation							6,423.44				6,423.44
Committee total					1,960.50		6,423.44				8,383.94

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JACK BROOKS, Chairman, Mar. 1, 1993.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

918. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's 1992 report on the Supportive Housing Demonstration Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 11387; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

919. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to Mexico, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

920. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's semiannual report of activities and efforts relating to utilization of the private sector, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1827; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

921. A letter from the President and CEO, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting a report entitled "Progress of Investigations of Professional Conduct through December 31, 1992", pursuant to Public Law 101-647, section 2540 (104 Stat. 4885); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

922. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a notice of Final Funding Priorities for the Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

923. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting Final Regulations—Institutional Eligibility under the Higher Education Act of 1965, As Amended; Student Assistance General Provisions, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

924. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting a notice of meeting related to the International Energy Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

925. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Operations.

926. A letter from the President, Inter-Americans Foundation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

927. A letter from the Acting Senior Deputy Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

928. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative and Public Affairs, National Science Foundation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

929. A letter from the Executive Director, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

930. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

931. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

932. A letter from the Secretary, Naval Sea Cadet Corps, transmitting the Annual Audit Report to the Corps for the year ended December 31, 1992, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(39), 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

933. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting a report on assessment of threats in domestic airport security, pursuant to Public Law 101-604, section 106(d) (104 Stat. 3075); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACCHUS of Florida (for himself, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. PAXON, Mr. CAMP, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. KLUG,

Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GENE GREEN, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 1395. A bill to amend section 207 of title 18, United States Code, to tighten restrictions on former executive and legislative branch officials and employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEILENSON (for himself and Mr. LEACH):

H.R. 1396. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for a voluntary system of spending limits and partial public financing for House of Representatives election campaigns, to prohibit contributions by multicandidate political committees, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Post Office and Civil Service, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 1397. A bill to prohibit the importation of goods produced abroad with child labor and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARDIN:

H.R. 1398. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Social Security Act to provide for health insurance coverage for workers and the public in a manner that contains the costs of health care in the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. KLUG, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. TORKILDSEN):

H.R. 1399. A bill to provide that certain new Federal programs shall terminate no later than 5 years after the date of enactment of the law that establishes the programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 1400. A bill to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the purchase of broadcasting time by candidates for public office; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 1401. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove U.S. tax barriers inhibiting competitiveness of U.S. owned businesses operating in the European Community; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. GENE GREEN, Mr. TAUZIN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FILNER, Ms. THURMAN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. REED, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. TORRICELLI):

H.R. 1402. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide effective trade remedies under the countervailing and antidumping duty laws against foreign-built ships that are subsidized or dumped and to provide otherwise for fair trade for the U.S. shipbuilding and repair industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 1403. A bill to ensure that the Caribbean Basin Initiative is not adversely affected by the implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement and to apply "fast track" approval procedures to free trade agreements entered into between the United States and certain Caribbean Basin countries; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Rules.

By Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER:

H.R. 1404. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that amounts received by a veteran in a legal settlement with the Department of Veterans Affairs for injuries arising from the negligence of the Department shall be excluded from determinations with respect to annual income for purposes of programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that are income-based; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1405. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the formula for payments to States for care furnished to veterans in State homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KENNELLY (for herself, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. GEPHARDT):

H.R. 1406. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of the rehabilitation credit under the passive activity limitations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MALONEY:

H.R. 1407. A bill to prohibit government-to-government and commercial arms sales to any country that is participating in or cooperating with the boycott of Israel by Arab countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Ms. LOWEY, Mrs. MINK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. FROST, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. LLOYD, and Ms. MALONEY):

H.R. 1408. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address gender equity in mathematics and science education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMAS of California:

H.R. 1409. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce compliance costs and administrative burdens in connection with foreign taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1410. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the deduction for States and local income and franchise taxes shall not be allocated to foreign source income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1411. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to double the maximum benefit under the special estate tax valuation rules for certain farm, and so forth, real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. UNSOELD:

H.R. 1412. A bill to establish a National Shellfish Safety Program; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DREIER:

H.R. 1413. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the penalty imposed on wage income earned by individuals who have attained retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. ZELIFF):

H.R. 1414. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide for making determinations of whether a species is an endangered species or a threatened species other than solely on the basis of the best scientific and commercial data available, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER:

H.R. 1415. A bill to provide veterans benefits to certain individuals serving in the U.S. merchant marine in a combat zone during a period of war, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 1416. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include liability to pay compensation under workmen's compensation acts within the rules relating to certain personal liability assignments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida:

H.R. 1417. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to restore the leave rights of certain employees; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. LOWEY:

H.R. 1418. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the treatment of tenant-stockholders in cooperative housing corporations also shall apply to stockholders of corporations that only own the land on which the residences are located; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself and Mr. LEWIS of Florida):

H.R. 1419. A bill to authorize research and evaluation programs for monitoring, detecting, and abating lead based paint and other lead exposure hazards in housing, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 1420. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require ingredient labeling for malt beverages, wine, and distilled spirits and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SABO, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. YATES, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WHEAT):

H.R. 1421. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation and

the manufacture of firearms designed to accept a silencer, bayonet, grenade launcher, flash suppressor, or folding stock, of certain ammunition feeding devices, and of related devices, and to provide for the imposition of enhanced penalties for the possession or the use of any such item in a crime of violence or in a drug trafficking crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 1422. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny any deduction for expenses in connection with the cutting of old-growth redwood timber and certain other redwood timber and to impose an excise tax on the cutting of such timber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STENHOLM (for himself, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. EWING, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. KYL, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Ms. LONG, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WILSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H.R. 1423. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow licensed veterinarians to order the extra-label use of drugs in animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1424. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 5-month waiting period required in order for an individual to be eligible for benefits based on disability or for the disability freeze and to eliminate the 24-month waiting period for disabled individuals to become eligible for Medicare benefits; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 1425. A bill to improve the management, productivity, and use of Indian agricultural lands and resources; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 1426. A bill to provide for the maintenance of dams located on Indian lands by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or through contracts with Indian tribes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 1427. A bill to extend the existing suspension of duty on tetraamino biphenyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAMS (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. EWING, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. MINGE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 1428. A bill to rescind funds appropriated for the Select Committee on Aging, the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, the Select Committee on Hunger, and the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, effective April 1, 1993; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself, Mrs. KENNELLY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut):

H.J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to designate the month of November in 1993 and 1994 as "National Hospice Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. LAUGHLIN):

H. Res. 134. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to cause the publication of Members signing a discharge motion; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H. Res. 135. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission take certain action; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DUNN:

H. Res. 136. Resolution requiring that unexpended balances in the official allowances of Members of the House of Representatives be returned to the Treasury for deficit reduction; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

59. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of New± Mexico, relative to placing conditional human rights provisions on the "Most Favored Nation" trade status of China; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BLILEY introduced a bill (H.R. 1429) for the relief of Charlotte S. Neal; 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. 3: Mr. FORD of Michigan and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 5: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. REED, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. STUDDS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BEVILL, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 58: Mr. HORN.

H.R. 59: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. LINDER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 112: Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 115: Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WATT, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. TUCKER, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 140: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 142: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 146: Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 147: Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 159: Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 167: Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 171: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 212: Mr. REGULA.

H.R. 359: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 425: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 426: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 449: Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 496: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 498: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H.R. 513: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. EWING, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. KIM, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 535: Mr. MINETA, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARR, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. GENE GREEN, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. LLOYD, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SWETT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 539: Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GINGRICH, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 558: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. DORNAN, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. HUTTO, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 561: Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. PARKER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 640: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana.

H.R. 649: Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 667: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 676: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. COX, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 684: Mr. EWING.

H.R. 692: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 700: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 739: Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 749: Mr. ORTON, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Ms. THURMAN.

H.R. 771: Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 796: Mr. EVANS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. STARK, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. SCHENK, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 799: Mr. ALLARD and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 826: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 887: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 894: Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 895: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. EWING.

H.R. 896: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. EWING, and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 930: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PENNY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. BREWSTER, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 947: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 962: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. EWING, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. LAUGHLIN.

H.R. 967: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. GILLMOR, MR. KANJORSKI, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KYL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, and Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 1013: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. MCHALE, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1025: Mr. MCHALE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HAMBURG, Ms. MEEK, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1026: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LINDER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CANADY, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1048: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina and Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 1067: Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 1085: Mr. MCCOLLUM and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1086: Mr. DORNAN and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 1087: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 1099: Mr. MACHTLEY and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 1121: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. BREWSTER.

H.R. 1131: Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 1135: Mr. LAZIO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1141: Mr. THOMAS of California and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1142: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ORTON, and Mr. EWING.

H.R. 1145: Mr. LEVY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1152: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1153: Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FROST, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 1157: Mr. BLUTE, Mr. LAZIO, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 1164: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1169: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 1195: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. SPENCE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1200: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SABO, and Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 1208: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1222: Mr. WOLF, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EWING, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1251: Mr. SARPALIUS and Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 1276: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

H.R. 1285: Mr. STARK, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. LEWIS OF FLORIDA.

H.R. 1301: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.J. Res. 38: Mr. BARCIA.

H.J. Res. 78: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ORTON, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.J. Res. 84: Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MANN, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. KLINK, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN, Ms. SNOWE, and Mrs. MINK.

H.J. Res. 92: Mr. STUDDS, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FISH, Mr. LANCASTER, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SABO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. FLAKE.

H.J. Res. 94: Mr. SPRATT and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.J. Res. 103: Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. DERRICK, and Ms. LONG.

H.J. Res. 111: Mr. UPTON, Mr. MANTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.J. Res. 130: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mrs. BENTLEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, and Mr. FROST.

H.J. Res. 149: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. WALSH.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. GENE GREEN, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. BARNETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H. Con. Res. 46: Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H. Con. Res. 52: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. MCCURDY.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. THOMAS of California,

H. Res. 41: Mr. ISTOOK.

H. Res. 53: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. KIM, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KING, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. ISTOOK.

H. Res. 86: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHENK, and Ms. WATERS.

H. Res. 108: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. ARMEY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BALLENGER, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. DANNER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. KIM.

H. Res. 118: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. LEVY, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. LAUGHLIN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

19. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Washington State Bar Association, relative to funding for the Legal Services Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRODUCTION OF THE SPENDING PRIORITIES REFORM ACT OF 1993

HON. HARRIS W. FAWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1993

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, today, Congressman TIM PENNY of Minnesota, and I will be introducing the Spending Priorities Reform Act of 1993, also known as Porkbusters III. The measure will repeal the unobligated balances for 747 projects, worth $1.96 billion which were funded in the fiscal year 1993 appropriation bills.

The bill is the result of extensive research of fiscal year 1993 appropriation bills by the pooled staff of the porkbusters coalition, a bipartisan group of 64 Members of the House, 5 Members of the Senate, and 11 national taxpayer groups. Porkbusters seeks the repeal of only procedural pork, that is, spending projects which bypass Congress' established procedures for authorizing and spending taxpayers' money.

The porkbusters group has developed a list of seven tests to identify spending which basically bypasses Congress' own rules. Spending projects which trip at least three evidences of wasteful spending are included in the bill.

We are aware of course that repeal of these projects would not balance the budget. Yet if Congress cannot cut these most egregious projects, we shall never be taken seriously about more substantial cuts in spending.

Why do I say this?

First, because the results of our annual deficits, the national debt, now $4.1 trillion, is so serious. In fiscal year 1993, $300 billion of interest will be incurred by the Federal Government because of the national debt. Congress has not balanced a budget in 23 years—only once in the last 32 years. The share of the debt for each man, woman, and child in America is now $16,000. CBO reports that our national debt is now 51 percent of our Nation's GDP and will climb to 57.9 percent in 4 years.

Second, even if Congress were to pass all the new taxes, new spending and spending cuts suggested by President Clinton, CBO estimates added debt of $1.584 trillion during the next 4 years. In 6 years the new debt will be $2.489 trillion. And there is no balanced budget in sight. Perhaps sometime in the next century?

America is the richest Nation on Earth. Just think what we could do with the $300 billion we spend on interest to meet such challenges as health care and Head Start. Yet, because of the profligate overspending of Congress, we find ourselves borrowing from our children and grandchildren to meet these challenges.

Third, the public has no faith in the collective will of Congress to control their profligate overspending. New national taxes and spending are forever; real spending cuts are rare. Congress, more than the people, has to be challenged and that challenge has to begin with cuts in spending—not more taxes and more spending. I came to Congress in 1985, the first year of the heralded spending limits of Gramm-Rudman. Those limits were avoided, waived, repealed, scuttled, rewritten, bypassed, and ignored by Congress each time serious spending cuts were required. I also saw the 1990 budget-deficit law passed with its massive new taxes and promised spending cuts and likewise saw it manipulated, avoided, waived, abused, and bypassed while deficits and the national debt continued to climb to all-time heights. Indeed, the stimulus package of $16.2 billion for fiscal year 1993 represents an avoidance of the firewalls and spending limits of the 1990 Budget Deficit Act.

Since there is no line-item veto to weed out procedural pork, Congress itself must therefore do so. Cutting procedural pork spending represents the first toddling steps of congressional spending reform. America is looking for a signal that Congress is willing to begin serious cutting of spending. If Congress cannot lay the axe to one of the main roots of pork spending, that is, procedural pork, its resolve to be serious about cutting spending under the President's tax and spend and cut proposals is hollow indeed.

Perhaps, the only way to control congressional overspending is to chain Congress to the Constitution and require Congress to do so. I know it is theoretically true that Congress should be able to cut out pork and guarantee the balancing of the national budget without being constitutionally required to do so. It is also theoretically possible for Congress to guarantee freedom of the press or freedom of religion without having those rights inculcated in our Bill of Rights. But most of us are thankful that those guarantees are in the Constitution and not subject to the whims of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must stop financially abusing future generations of Americans. Our children and grandchildren have a right to expect Congress to act responsibly. A first step would be the passage of the Spending Priorities Reform Act of 1992.

HONORING MICHAEL J. RILEY AS THE TEAMSTERS' HISPANIC CAUCUS MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1993

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Michael J. Riley, president, Joint Council of Teamsters No. 42 and chairman, Western Conference of Teamsters, on being named as the Teamsters' Hispanic Caucus Man of the Year.

Born in San Francisco, Brother Riley was initiated into the Teamsters in 1948, as a member of local No. 860. While maintaining his membership, Mike graduated from Riordon High School and later attended San Francisco City College.

For 2 years, 1953–54, Mike served in the U.S. Army, attaining the rank of sergeant. After returning from Korea, Mike transferred his union membership to Teamsters local No. 256. At local No. 256, Mike became increasingly active in union affairs. Over the next few years, Mike earned a reputation as a hard worker and visionary leader. In 1956, Mike was hired as an organizer and business representative for the Western Conference of Teamsters. As such, he transferred his membership to Los Angeles teamster local No. 986. At that time, local No. 986 had a membership of less than 500 Teamsters. Over the next three years, Mike's fellow brothers and sisters at local No. 986 took note of his dedicated efforts and, in 1959, elected him vice president.

In 1962, Mike became coordinator for local No. 986 and in 1968 he was elected the local's president and executive administrator. Since 1974, Mike has served as local No. 986's secretary-treasurer. According to Mike's colleagues, under his capable leadership, local No. 986 has steadily grown in size and stature. Today, local No. 986 boasts a membership of more than 18,000 Teamsters.

In addition to his distinguished service to the members of local No. 986, in 1978, Mike was elected president of Teamsters Joint Council No. 42. As president, Mike's responsibilities cover southern California and southern Nevada. In 1981, Mike was appointed an international union representative and in 1985 he was appointed vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. He held that post until 1992. Mike also serves as a trustee of the Western Conference of Teamsters Pension Trust and he has served several times as a member of the board of directors of the International Foundation of Employee Benefit Plans.

Mike is also active in civic and charitable organizations. He serves as a member of the board of directors of Big Brothers of Greater Los Angeles and the board of directors of Hollywood Canteen. Mike also is vice president of the California Labor Federation AFL–CIO.

Mr. Speaker, Michael J. Riley, for over 40 years, has been a strong advocate for our Nation's working men and women. He has been at the forefront of ensuring that the rights of the thousands of Teamsters throughout the Greater Los Angeles area are protected. This Friday, March 19, 1993, the Teamsters' Hispanic Caucus will honor Michael J. Riley as their Man of the Year. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mike and to thank him for his years of dedicated service to the causes of organized labor.

J. EDGAR HOOVER—SLANDER FOR PROFIT

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1993

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of our colleagues an article written by a friend of mine, Sam Devine, who served this House for 22 years as the Representative from the 12th District of Ohio. As many of you know, Sam was one of J. Edgar Hoover's G-men before, during and after World War II and can attest to Mr. Hoover's character and integrity. He is especially concerned with recent allegations about Mr. Hoover which have been made public in a book by Anthony Summers. I share Sam's observations with my colleagues for their consideration.

J. EDGAR HOOVER—SLANDER FOR PROFIT

(By Former Rep. Sam Devine)

It really troubles me to read scurrilous attacks on a respected person, after they are dead and gone, and unable to respond, by one who was too cowardly to make allegations when the subject was alive and could defend their honor.

During my many years in Congress, I was personally acquainted with J. Edgar Hoover, longtime Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, prior to his death in 1972. He was a man of great integrity and devoted his life to honest, even-handed, law enforcement. I was in touch with him, as were many other Members of Congress, on legislation having to do with the Justice Department and national security.

Recently, a book was thrust upon America by a British author, Anthony Summers, entitled "Official & Confidential—The Secret Life of J. Edgar Hoover."

Curiously enough, the very makeup of the book and the author raises several questions. Namely, what are the principal points of the book? What are the sources that back up the scurrilous allegations? What are the backgrounds of the "sources"? Has the author been previously discredited as a result of his work?

As most of my former colleagues know, I have always been somewhat of a history buff. I enjoy reading and knowing about the heroes of our Country. Consequently, I grow a little suspicious when authors, particularly from foreign countries, constantly defame Americans who have devoted their lives to protecting and defending the United States.

I knew J. Edgar Hoover well enough to realize what he has done for American law enforcement through centralization of fingerprints, scientific crime detection, usage of computerization to promote the splendid National Crime Information Center and many other innovations that have modernized our system of crime detection.

Mr. Hoover had faults like any other human being. He may have stayed on too long in a tough, demanding job, but I seriously doubt that the sensationalized, distorted claims we hear about him twenty years after his death can be anywhere near accurate.

The book to which I make reference, "Official & Confidential—The Secret Life of J. Edgar Hoover," and previous books by Anthony Summers would appear to contain malicious gossip, innuendo and gross distortion.

The chief point of Summers' latest book, the one about Mr. Hoover, seems to be that Hoover was blackmailed by members of organized crime and forced to stop investigations into such crime because the mob had evidence he was a homosexual. These charges are vague and totally lacking in specific facts and dates. Now, let's look at the evidence:

The FBI had no jurisdiction to investigate organized crime until 1961, when President John F. Kennedy signed into law such federal statutes making it a crime for Interstate Transportation of Gambling Paraphernalia, Wagering Information and Travel in Aid of Racketeering Enterprises. The statutes, promoted by both Democrats and Republicans, gave the FBI a whiphand. What were the results?

There were 80 subjects arrested in 1962 under these laws. There were 72 indicted based solely upon FBI evidence. In 1961 through 1972, the year Mr. Hoover died, there were 1,783 convictions of organized crime subjects. These included: Sam Giancana, Johnny Dioguardia, Raymond Patriarca, Sam Decavalcante, Carlos Marcello, Stefano Maggadicio, Nicola Licata, John Cerone, and Anthony Giardada.

But let's look further.

There had to be ongoing intelligence type investigations for the FBI to accumulate sufficient evidence to cause the aforementioned indictments. Much of this evidence was gathered as a direct result of Hoover's Top Hoodlum Intelligence Program which he initiated in the fifties. The investigations into the blinding of syndicated columnist Victor Riesel in the fifties is a splendid tribute to the FBI's careful work at that time. The subject was apprehended, indicted and convicted.

Let's consider another true fact. Summers' book names the deceased hoodlum, Meyer Lansky, as the mobster who blackmailed Mr. Hoover. If so, why did the FBI constantly surveil Lansky and gather considerable evidence on him back in the fifties? And, take into consideration the fact that the FBI had a number of informants inside organized crime. Two were highly placed mob bosses. Facts indicate that at no time did these individuals know of photographs of Hoover and any knowledge of homosexuality possessed by members of organized crime.

In brief, the FBI has had a full court press all along in the field of organized crime. There has been no stoppage, delay or reason to believe anything other than a diligent law enforcement organization doing its serious duty to uphold and defend the laws of the United States.

All of these facts would seem to put the lie to Summers' book and his sleazy trumped up charges.

Who are the sources used by Summers? And what are their backgrounds? A careful check reflects that Summers used convicted perjurers, mobsters, illegal wiretappers and, in rare instances, disgruntled FBI personnel who were either dismissed with prejudice or could not stand up to FBI discipline and left the organization under a cloud! And, customarily with Summers' writing, a collection of deceased individuals who can no longer be called upon to testify. Innuendo, hearsay and third-handed gossip is rampant.

If alleged charges by Summers were ever brought into a Court of Law, or before a Congressional Committee, he would be laughed into ridicule. There are no photographs! There is no proof!

There have been hundreds of FBI agents who worked side-by-side with Mr. Hoover for years. Some of these former personnel later became members of Congress, like H. Allen Smith (Cal.), Paul Kitchen (N.C.), Sam Devine (Ohio), Eldon Rudd (Ariz.), etc. Mr. Hoover was known to them as a straight, tough, well disciplined, deeply religious man who was married to his job, leading the F.B.I. There was no hint of homosexuality known at any time.

To understand completely the nature of such false allegations, we must understand the background of the author: In 1980, Summers wrote a book "Conspiracy" concerning the death of President John F. Kennedy. This publication justly became typical of the tired, archaic, distorted "quick-buck" type books that are rapidly thrown together in order to promote sensationalized sales and make a dollar—regardless of the deliberate falsities shown therein.

In this particular book Summers wrongly accused the CIA of involvement in President Kennedy's assassination and one David Atlee Phillips, a CIA employee, of being subject Lee Harvey Oswald's contact man. Excerpts from this book were carried by the "Observer" in England. These allegations were later repeated in the book "Death in Washington" at a later date.

Mr. Phillips instituted a libel suit and after five years, the author and publisher of "Death in Washington" were forced to give a retraction in the U.S. District Court here, in Washington, D.C. and agreed to make a financial settlement. Mr. Summers' claims were proven to be false.

There is still more. On October 7, 1986, the High Court in London announced the resolution of a libel suit against the London "Observer." This paper agreed to retract Anthony Summers' allegations that alluded David Atlee Phillips had been Lee Harvey Oswald's contact man. The "Observer" agreed to pay Phillips over 100,000 pounds in damages. * * * Based on the facts just stated, how can anyone believe Mr. Summers? It would seem that he has been sufficiently discredited to warrant caution regarding any charges he might make. He is certainly no stranger to gross distortion.

The "Washington Times" of March 7, 1972, in quoting excerpts from another publication, had this to say about Summers: "Irresponsibility isn't quite the word we would use to describe Summers' conduct. Another word better fits him: 'He is a coward who slandered a man who can no longer defend himself'."

Mr. Summers has obviously committed the same errors in writing about Mr. Hoover, a deceased person.

Let us continue to insist on freedom of the press and the First Amendment. I personally will always insist on this premise. But, let us as American citizens while insisting upon literary freedom, also condemn literary license that would defame our Country and its great men.

Yes, criticize whenever the facts clearly justify. We are not perfect, and all should be subject to the rules of society. In observing such rules we should, however, quickly bring to heel those individuals who attempt to capitalize upon our freedoms through the medium of sleaze, outright falsehood and distortions all for the purpose of greed.

Our Country is made of sterner material. The First Amendment does not embrace such liberties.

SUPPORT THE SANCTITY OF LIFE

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the unity human life amendment. I take this action because society has become incredibly desensitized to the miracle of life. Any major newspaper can tell you that much. In fact, human life is taken for granted to such an extent in this country that lyrics from rap songs like "Cop Killa," gang shootings in our schoolyards, and the rhetoric of choice being used to justify the killing of millions of innocent preborn boys and girls no longer seem disturbing to many Americans.

Well, I am one Member of Congress who is greatly disturbed by this gruesome reality and wonder too how shocked and disturbed our forefathers would be if they were alive today in our macabre world? How would they react to over 30 million abortions having taken place in a 20-year span and how would they react to doctors mercifully killing the psychologically depressed? Well, one need not look further than in the words of Thomas Jefferson to learn of the importance life itself had in the shaping of our country and its institutions.

We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.—Declaration of Independence, 1776

The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government.—Thomas Jefferson, 1809

As Federal legislators, it is our duty to uphold the Constitution and to stand firm for the principles that first created it and continue to shape it today. For this reason, I am once again introducing an amendment to the Constitution declaring life itself to be the paramount and most fundamental right of a person. Although Jefferson and our other forefathers assumed that life itself, in all its complexities, was a self-evident truth and a right, our modern society has diverged and now views life as a simple matter of fact. This is why a human life amendment is needed today.

My bill is entitled the "Unity Human Life Amendment." It was drafted with the support and concurrence of every major pro-life organization including the National Right to Life Committee, the American Life League, the Ad Hoc Committee in Defense of Life, the Christian Action Council, and the March for Life. In my opinion, it is a clear and easily understood piece of legislation. The bill contains three primary elements: First, it states the right to life is the paramount and most fundamental right of a person; second, it defines the word "person"; and third, states that "no unborn person shall be deprived of life by any person: Provided however, that nothing in this article shall prohibit a law allowing justification to be shown for only those medical procedures required to prevent the death of either the pregnant woman or her unborn offspring, as long as such law requires every reasonable effort be made to preserve the life of each."

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to return to their American heritage and finally put into law, what our forefathers self-evidently held true—that the right to life is the paramount and most fundamental right of a person.

BEILENSON-LEACH CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM BILL

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and Mr. LEACH, I am introducing a bill today to make significant changes in the way congressional campaigns are financed. Our bill is intended to curb the influence that special interests currently have on our legislative process, reduce the amount of money candidates spend running for office, and make congressional elections more competitive.

We believe that changing our campaign finance system in the manner called for by this bill would do more to increase public confidence in our ability to address the Nation's problems fairly and effectively, and to improve respect for Congress, than any other kind of institutional reform we could possibly make.

Our bill, which is summarized below, calls for financing congressional campaigns primarily through small, home-state individual contributions and matching public funds. House candidates who agree to limit their spending to $350,000 for the election cycle would, in return, receive matching funds for each in-state individual contribution of up to $500, along with postal and broadcasting discounts—Out-of-state contributions would be permitted, but not matched. The matching funds would give candidates sufficient resources to run viable campaigns without relying on PAC contributions or large individual contributions, both of which would be banned under this bill.

This proposed system of financing campaigns is designed to shift the focus of fundraising away from Washington, DC, and back to districts where the elections are taking place, so that fundraising becomes an integral part of a candidate's outreach to the voters he or she hopes to represent. It is aimed at strengthening the relationship between Members of Congress and the people who elected them, and assuring voters that their representative is going to be working only for them, not for special-interest groups or wealthy individuals who contributed to their campaigns.

Our proposal provides several incentives for candidates to participate in this voluntary system of public financing. Along with matching funds and postal and broadcasting discounts, participating candidates who have nonparticipating opponents would receive additional public funds in certain circumstances to help ensure that participation does not place them at a financial disadvantage. For example, if the nonparticipating candidate contributed $250,000 or more in personal funds to his campaign, the participating candidate would receive triple matching funds for eligible contributions. If the nonparticipating candidate raised or spent more than $350,000 from any source, the participating candidate would receive a grant of public funds matching the amount above $350,000 raised or spent by the nonparticipating opponent.

Along with reducing the influence of special interests, our bill is aimed at making congressional campaigns more competitive, which we believe our campaign finance laws must do if they are to have any credibility at all. By eliminating PAC contributions, this legislation would eliminate the enormous advantage incumbents have in a system where incumbents have been receiving from 8 to 12 times more in PAC contributions in recent elections than have challengers. In addition, our bill would prevent all House candidates from carrying over more than $25,000 to the next election cycle, thus preventing incumbents from beginning an election cycle with large war chests that discourage challengers.

Finally, our bill provides reforms in the areas of soft money, independent expenditures, bundling, leadership PAC's, and Federal Election Commission requirements for enforcement which are similar to provisions in campaign finance bills which have been introduced by others.

Mr. Speaker, we decided to introduce this bill because we believe that H.R. 3, the bill identical to the one Congress passed last year, does not do nearly enough to solve the most serious problems with our current system: the enormous amount of special-interest money in the system, the growing cost of running for office, and the unfair advantages that the existing system gives incumbents.

The most glaring flaw in H.R. 3 is that it would allow participating candidates to accept as much as $200,000 in PAC contributions in an election cycle, with up to $10,000 from any one PAC. Even though a limit at that level would in fact reduce the amount of PAC contributions typically received by a substantial number of candidates, $200,000 per candidate is still an immense amount of money. It is an amount that leaves the door wide open to the influence that special interests gain through their campaign contributions.

In addition, it is difficult to argue that a $600,000 spending limit—along with significant exemptions and add-ons—represents a meaningful limit on the cost of running for office. House candidates can run viable campaigns on less than that.

Opponents of our approach are likely to raise two arguments against it, and I would like to take this opportunity to respond to them. One is that the public will not accept the idea of tax dollars being spent on political campaigns; the other is that spending limits will make elections less competitive by hurting challengers.

As someone who is deeply troubled by our enormous budget deficits, I find it difficult myself to propose committing tax dollars to new government spending. However, I view establishing this kind of campaign finance system as an important part of getting our fiscal house in order. A fundamental reason why we have had such a difficult time bringing revenues and spending into balance is that special-interest groups, using the influence they gain through their campaign contributions, have so effectively managed to obtain and keep the spending programs and tax benefits they want.

If we want to eliminate reliance on special interests for campaign financing, we must provide public funds—there are no other alternatives for making it possible for most candidates to have sufficient resources to run a campaign.

We believe most Americans understand that such a trade-off is necessary, and are willing to accept the burden of partly financing our campaigns as a price worth paying to have a Congress that is more responsive to them than to Washington lobbyists. In fact, it was very encouraging to see the results of a recent poll by the Center for New Democracy, which found that 72 percent of voters support extending public financing to elections for Congress so long as the new system is part of an overall reform package aimed at limiting special interests.

The other criticism which I feel compelled to respond to is that setting spending limits puts challengers at a disadvantage—that challengers need to spend more than incumbents to overcome the name recognition and other built-in advantages of incumbency. But the reality of our existing system is that only in rare situations do challengers raise more than incumbents. Challengers are typically at an enormous financial disadvantage to incumbents in terms of campaign resources; our proposal would make many, many more races financially competitive.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has called on us to enact significant changes in the way we finance our campaigns, and our constituents strongly support him on this issue. We have a better opportunity this year than we have had in many years to change what has become a corrupting, demeaning campaign finance system into one that is truly clean and fair. We offer a proposal to do that, and we urge our colleagues to join us in supporting it.

SUMMARY OF BEILENSON-LEACH CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM BILL

Voluntary spending limits for House candidates:

Participating candidates may spend no more than $350,000 per election cycle (or for a special election) plus:

$150,000 extra for the cycle if candidate has competitive primary (where at least one opponent raises or spends at least $50,000); and

$100,000 extra in the case of a run-off.

Up to $25,000 for accounting and legal fees and taxes is exempt from the spending limit, and amounts are indexed for inflation.

Ban on PAC contributions:

Participating and nonparticipating candidates are prohibited from accepting contributions from multicandidate political committees, (PACs).

If the prohibition is held unconstitutional, candidates may accept no more than $1,000 from any single PAC per election cycle, and no more than $70,000 in aggregate PAC contributions (with an additional $30,000 allowed in the case of a competitive primary and $20,000 in the case of a runoff).

Limit on Individual contributions:

Participating and nonparticipating candidates may not accept more than $500 from any single individual per election cycle, and contributors must be of voting age.

Benefits to participating candidates:

Matching public funds (dollar for dollar) are provided for instate individual contributions of $500 or less, up to a maximum amount of $175,000. (Out of state contributions are permitted, but not matched). Matching funds are provided in $10,000 increments beginning with the first $10,000 raised.

Participating candidates may use the third-class non-profit postal rate for a number of pieces of mail equal to three times the number of the voting age population in the candidate's district.

Participating candidates may purchase broadcast time at 50% of the lowest charge 30 days before a primary election and 45 days before a general election. Purchased time would be nonpreemptible unless for a reason beyond a broadcaster's control.

Personal contributions:

Participating candidate may contribute $30,000 of own funds, none of which is eligible for matching funds or counts toward $10,000 threshold for matching funds.

If a non-participating candidate contributes more than $250,000 in personal funds to his campaign, his participating opponent may receive triple matching funds for individual contributions.

Protection from Outspending by Nonparticipating Candidate:

If a participating candidate has a nonparticipating opponent who raises more than the participating candidate's limit, the participating candidate shall be entitled to receive a grant of public funds that matches the amount the nonparticipating opponent has raised above the spending limit.

Surplus campaign funds:

Any campaign funds in excess of $25,000 must be deposited in Treasury by March 1 following the November election. Provision is applicable to both participating and non participating candidates.

Declaration of participation:

Must declare intention to participate by January 31 of election year or when filing statement of candidacy with FEC, whichever is later.

Source of public funding:

Appropriations.

Soft money:

All money raised or spent by any party committee solely in connection with a federal election would be subject to federal law for spending, contribution source limits, and reporting, rather than simply state law. Exemption for national party building funds is removed.

State party spending for general election support of a presidential nominee would be limited to 10 cents for each person of voting age population of the state, and 30 cents for federal elections of national, congressional, state, and local party committees.

Independent Expenditures:

A publicly funded candidate who is the target of an independent expenditure may receive additional $10,000 of public funds for every $10,000 spent against him. A candidate who is the target of an independent expenditure used for a broadcast ad may purchase broadcast time immediately following the time paid for by the independent expenditures.

Leadership PACs:

Prohibits a candidate for federal office from establishing, maintaining, or controlling a PAC to contribute to other candidates. Funds in existing leadership PACs must be turned over to Treasury within 60 days of enactment.

Bundling:

Requires that any contributions made through an intermediary be treated as if they were made by the intermediary. No exemptions for non-connected PACs.

Federal Election Commission Requirements:

Requires random audits for both participating and nonparticipating candidates.

Reduces the contribution amount for which contributor information is required from $200 to $50.

Sense of House of Representatives regarding Senate:

Calls on the Senate to act on legislation establishing a corresponding system of campaign financing for Senate elections which includes spending limits, partial public financing, prohibition on PAC contributions, and a strict limit on the amount of campaign funds that may be carried over from one election cycle to the next.

BEILENSON/LEACH CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM ACT

HON. JAMES A. LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, among the most troubling aspects of last year's Presidential election is the fact that nearly 20 million voters cast a vote of "no confidence" in America's two major political parties.

Many were dismayed by the Government's inability to put its fiscal affairs in order; by the actions of incumbent politicians who, as a group, too often appear to place self-interest ahead of the public interest. Ross Perot's supporters, it should be noted, were not alone in holding these concerns. Tellingly, the findings of a public opinion poll reported recently in the Washington Post remind us that only 1 in 5 voters trust the Federal Government to do what is right most of the time.

At issue is the question of whether Congress can re-establish confidence in itself and thus in the American experiment with self-government.

Few actions would do more to signal a serious willingness of legislators to repair the underlying ethical foundations of our democratic institutions than timely passage of legislation to stem the escalating costs of campaigns and prohibit special-interest political contributions.

At a time when candidates of both parties profess the desire to bring deficits under control, it should be stressed that Federal deficits, and more importantly the economic problems they create, are directly related to current campaign financing practices.

Deficits begin in decisions about spending and taxation, which themselves begin in promises and obligations, and all this begins with candidates. It begins in the way campaigns are financed, in commitments to large contributors, no matter who they are.

In America today, the most effective way for a candidate to build support in a bid for legislative office is to isolate every identifiable interest group—especially moneyed groups—and announce support for the group's vested interests. Accommodating interest groups and their political action committees inevitably leads either to the proliferation of Federal spending programs or the weakening of the tax structure, or both.

Fiscal responsibility is impossible to maintain when lawmakers—that is, successful candidates—have committed themselves in advance to support specific tax advantages or

Government expenditures benefiting those having made generous campaign contributions.

The public interest today demands that restraint be placed on the capacity of moneyed interests to influence public policy-making. That's why I'm proud to join my colleague, Mr. BEILENSON of California, in introducing the "House of Representatives Election Campaign Reform Act of 1993.".

Unlike the legislation passed by Congress but vetoed by the President last year, our legislation represents a comprehensive reform agenda.

Rather than permitting candidates for the House of Representatives to accept a total of $200,000 or more every 2 years from political action committees, this legislation proposes that PAC gifts be prohibited. In the unfortunate event that this provision is determined to be unconstitutional, and it should be emphasized that no one can predict with certainty how the Supreme Court might view the issue, this legislation would limit individual PAC contributions to any given candidate to $1,000 per election cycle, with an aggregate limit for all PAC's combined of $70,000 per election cycle.

Rather than permitting candidates for the House of Representatives to raise and spend unlimited resources each 2 years, our legislation provides for a voluntary spending limit of $350,000, with incentives for candidates to comply and disincentives for opponents to spend egregiously. Any candidate, once having received a $10,000 threshold level of in-State contributions, is eligible under our approach for matching Federal assistance, up to $175,000. And, if an opponent spends in excess of $350,000 his or her competitor is eligible to receive matching Federal assistance for such excessive expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation comes far closer to the kind of real campaign reform the public demands than measures previously considered by this House.

If we are to act responsibly and address the economic and political challenges which confront us, we must come to recognize that status quo approaches to campaign finance and legislative decisionmaking are far more expensive than the system of partial public financing we propose, and that the current system of unrestrained campaign spending benefiting incumbents in almost every instance inhibits electoral competition far more than would reasonable spending limits.

Mr. Speaker, the public interest is best determined by the public. Government of, by, and for the people cannot be a government where influence is purchasable through substantial campaign contributions. It is time to put the ordinary taxpayer first, time for real campaign reform.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION REGARDING "SPECIAL USE" DEDUCTION

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to increase the amount of the special use deduction that helps families preserve their farms. Farms can be extremely valuable in today's climate, involving millions of dollars in land and other assets. Without updating the special use valuation, families may still find it necessary to sell off farm property in order to pay Federal estate taxes.

The bill I am introducing today will double the special use deduction from $750,000 to $1.5 million per descendant. A doubling of the deduction is in line with what has happened in the economy since the $750,000 level was set in 1991. Gross domestic product is 54 percent higher today, consumer prices are 56 percent higher, and labor costs are 44 percent higher. Unless the special valuation is increased to reflect changes in our economy, the deduction will protect less and less property as families try to preserve their farms in the future.

The bill does not change the rigorous restrictions on using the valuations. Families would have to keep property in agricultural use for 10 years. A family member must actually participate in farming the land; ceasing to use property in agriculture means the family will have to pay additional estate taxes.

The bill will also assist families attempting to keep small businesses intact because they will also be able to employ the expanded special use deduction subject to the same rules they have to follow today.

I hope that my House colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation. At a time when we are seeking to encourage preservation of land, preserve family businesses, and to encourage small businesses of all kinds, the special use deduction obviously needs to be restored to its intended value.

KENTUCKY STUDENTS HONORED

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating some of the finest elementary and high school students in the Fifth Congressional District of Southern and Eastern Kentucky—the winners of the Courier-Journal Conservation Essay and the Jim Claypool Conservation Poster Contest.

The following students were selected for this honor:

Bell County: William Eric Moore (Poster), Page Elementary. Mary Ellen Hunley (Essay), Bell County Middle.

Breathitt County: Lindsey Hudson (Poster), Highland-Turner Elementary. Rebecca Marie Finney (Essay), Mt. Carmel High.

Clay County: Tara Bianca Abner (Poster), Horse Creek Elementary. Heather Elisha Jones (Essay), Manchester Elementary.

Floyd County: Katherine Elizabeth Hall (Poster), Mountain Christian Academy. Melissa LeAnn Dye (Essay), Adams Middle School.

Harlan County: William Paul Carrol (Poster), Cawood Elementary. David Dwain Hensley (Essay), Wallins Jr. High.

Jackson County: Kyle D. Pierson (Poster), McKee Elementary. Brent Gabbard (Essay), Jackson County High.

Johnson County: Byron Gardner (Poster), Paintsville Elementary. Erin Allison Collins (Essay), Flat Gap Elementary.

Knott County: William Thomas Smith (Poster), Hindman Elementary. Sarah Hagans (Essay), Knott County Central High.

Knox County: Jennifer Nicole Abner (Essay), Jesse D. Lay Elementary.

Laurel County: Erin Nichole Yaden (Poster), London Elementary. Koula Zaneta Lynch (Essay), South Laurel Middle.

Lee County: Brandy Flowers (Poster), Southside Elementary. John Michael Abner (Essay), Lee County High.

Leslie County: Brandon Hensley (Poster), Hayes Lewis Elementary. John Patrick Hoskins (Essay), Beech Fork Elementary.

Letcher County: Amy James (Poster), Beckham Bates Elementary. Christopher Paul Smith (Essay), Arlie Boggs Elementary.

McCreary County: Kelly R. Cecil (Poster), Whitley City Elementary. Jeffrey Dale Vann (Essay), McCreary Central High.

Martin County: John Robert Horn (Poster), Warfield Elementary. Mandy Horn (Essay), Sheldon Clark High.

Magoffin County: Matthew Sean Allen (Poster), John T. Arnett Elementary.

Menifee County: Keisha Renee Charles (Poster), Menifee County Elementary. Danielle Tackett (Essay), Menifee County High.

Morgan County: Becky Hampton (Poster), Ezel Elementary. Brad Lawson (Essay), Morgan County High School.

Owsley County: Nicholas Gibson (Poster), Owsley County Elementary. Eric Mason (Essay), Owsley County High.

Perry County: Trevor Pollard (Poster), Dennis C. Wooton Elementary. Leslie Danelle Deaton (Essay), MC Napier High.

Pike County: Heather P. Whitt (Poster), Blackberry Elementary. Leigh Anne Burke (Essay), Brushy Elementary.

Pulaski County: Scott Burton (Poster), Nancy Elementary. Brad Jones (Essay), Somerset High.

Rockcastle County: Emily Lewis Correy (Poster), Roundstone Elementary. Beth Anne Durham (Essay), Brodhead Elementary.

Wayne County: Timothy Vaughn (Poster), Rocky Branch Elementary. Stephanie Southard (Essay), Wayne County High School.

Whitley County: Tood Andrew Rickett (Poster), South Elementary. James Seth Meadors (Essay), Whitley County High.

Wolfe County: Nicholas A. Taulbee (Poster), Wolfe County Middle. Glenna Nicole Morrison (Essay), Wolfe County Middle.

AMENDING SUBPART F OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to amend subpart F of the Internal Revenue Code to enable U.S. businesses to function in the single European Community [EC] market more efficiently and competitively. This legislation would facilitate the consolidation of the European activities of U.S. businesses, eliminating duplicative and costly operations and enhancing the ability of U.S. businesses to compete with their foreign competitors.

The EC member nations continue to make steady progress toward a single unified mar-

ket, and EC and other foreign-based companies are consolidating their European operations to take advantage of the elimination of economic barriers to trade within the EC. For many U.S. companies, however, the consolidation of European operations within the EC, while economical from a non-U.S. tax standpoint, would subject those companies' foreign earnings to current U.S. taxation, regardless of whether repatriated. Thus, U.S. tax law forces U.S. businesses to choose between operating inefficient separate subsidiaries in each European country in which they do business or facing current U.S. taxation on the earnings and profits of centralized European subsidiaries. Our tax laws should not impose unnecessary restrictions on the ability of our U.S. businesses to compete internationally. Unless the subpart F rules are modified, however, U.S. businesses will continue to operate at a significant competitive disadvantage in the EC market.

Traditionally, U.S. businesses have operated in the various EC countries through separate subsidiaries, resulting in the duplication of many costly administrative and operational functions. The elimination of the artificial economic boundaries among the EC countries presents a unique opportunity for these companies to consolidate operations to operate more efficiently in the EC. Our U.S. companies' principle competitors have already begun to centralize functions such as warehousing, accounting, purchasing, sales and services, and inventory management to take advantage of the single-economic market. Needless to say, such rationalization of EC operations enables these foreign companies to operate much more efficiently within the EC with substantial economic savings. Our U.S. tax laws, however, act as a substantial deterrent to similar restructuring by U.S. multinationals.

Under subpart F, the earnings from cross-border sales by European and other foreign subsidiaries are subject to current U.S. taxation unless those earnings are subject to an effective rate of tax comparable to maximum U.S. tax rates. Because of certain timing differences—for example, different depreciation and net operating loss rules—between the respective foreign and U.S. tax regimes, U.S. multinationals operating in the EC often are unable to met this high-tax exception for every taxable year, despite the fact that the EC countries impose tax on corporations at rates comparable to, or in excess of, U.S. rates. In these cases, the earnings of these European subsidiaries are taxed currently in the United States, preventing those subsidiaries from reinvesting those earnings in their active foreign business operations. Thus, U.S. tax law creates a bias in favor of operating in the various EC countries through separate operating subsidiaries performing costly and duplicative functions. Our foreign competitors, meanwhile, are operating in the EC free from such restraints and are able to reinvest their earnings in EC operations free from current home-country taxation.

In addition to their disparate tax treatment, European subsidiaries of U.S. companies are forced to track the movement of inventory between the various EC countries to determine whether sales income may be subject to current U.S. tax. This tracking is an enormous administrative burden for these companies, compounded by the fact that, because such inventory can move freely among the various EC countries without customs restraints, this tracking is necessary only for U.S. tax purposes. Thus, U.S. businesses are forced to incur substantial administrative costs solely to comply with U.S. tax law. These administrative burdens are completely inconsistent with the concept of a unified EC market and further hinder our U.S. firms' ability to compete in the EC.

Japanese and EC-based companies have already begun to consolidate their activities in the EC to take advantage of the unified market and have a distinct advantage in efficiency and operating costs over our US. businesses. For example, a recent article describes Canon's views of the EC market. In that article the President of Canon Europa N.V. describes Canon's plans to move away from a structure of separate marketing and distribution subsidiaries in the various EC countries toward centralized operations to take advantage of the unified market. While foreign companies such as Canon are capitalizing on the opportunity to centralize their EC operations to increase operating efficiency and productivity, our U.S. businesses are being forced by subpart F to continue operating in the EC countries through separate subsidiaries and are finding themselves unable to compete effectively with their foreign competitors. As we delay remedying this problem, our businesses are only falling further behind their competitors.

In 1990, I introduced H.R. 4136 to treat the member countries of the EC as a single country for purposes of applying the subpart F rules. Under H.R. 4136, a U.S. parent would not have been subject to current taxation with respect to the earnings of a controlled EC-country subsidiary that were derived from sales to, or services rendered to, customers located in another EC country. This provision, however, would not have allowed U.S. businesses to avoid U.S. tax by taking advantage of any special EC country tax rules, as it was limited to EC countries that had statutory tax rates approximately equal to or greater than the maximum U.S. corporate tax rate and that did not exempt corporations from taxation of such sales or services income pursuant to a tax holiday or similar special rule.

In 1991, in response to technical concerns raised by the Treasury Department regarding H.R. 4136, I introduced H.R. 2277, which was designed to resolve the same concern addressed in H.R. 4136 but would have done so by modifying the high-tax exception of subpart F. H.R. 2277 would have excluded from subpart F income the earnings and profits of EC subsidiaries from sales to and services rendered for customers in other EC countries if the effective rate of foreign tax paid on those earnings was at least 80 percent of the maximum U.S. corporate tax rate. The bill provided further that foreign net operating losses attributable to periods prior to its enactment would not be taken into account for purposes of determining whether the subsidiary met the modified high-tax exception.

It has become increasingly clear that the general approach originally taken in H.R. 3136—to treat the EC as a single-economic unit but to provide strong antiabuse rules to prevent U.S. tax avoidance—is the simplest and most effective approach to allowing our U.S. businesses to compete fairly in the EC market. The legislation I offer today is identical to H.R. 4136, with the exception of one modification to tighten the antiabuse rules of that approach. This legislation recognizes that the EC members are not tax haven countries but also contains sufficient antiabuse rules to prevent U.S. companies from avoiding taxation on income that, due to special circumstances, is effectively sheltered from foreign taxation. To the extent that EC countries impose a maximum statutory tax rate less than 90 percent of the maximum U.S. corporate tax rate, U.S. companies would not be able to avail themselves of this provision to avoid subpart F taxation. Moreover, this legislation permits the Treasury Department to prescribe regulations to prevent abuses of the EC exception in the case of countries that provide tax holidays, preferential statutory tax rates, or similar special rules. These regulations would not, however, treat simple timing differences, such as depreciation schedules or the availability of net operating losses, as special rules giving rise to abusive tax-avoidance schemes.

Foreign-based companies have already begun to rationalize operations in the EC to promote economies of scale and other efficiencies. Our tax laws should not continue to place our U.S. multinational companies at a competitive disadvantage with their foreign competitors. It is essential, therefore, that we act to remove the subpart F barriers to more efficient U.S. business operations in the EC. This issue has been under consideration for several years, during which time our businesses have only fallen further behind their foreign competitors in streamlining their EC operations. We should act to resolve this matter as quickly as possible.

GENDER EQUITY IN SCIENCE AND MATH EDUCATION

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce a bill to amend the Eisenhower Math and Science Education Act to address gender equity in science and math education.

As our Nation moves toward the year 2000, academics, researchers, and classroom teachers are looking for ways in which to study and correct inequities in math and science education. While it is true that many changes have occurred during the past 15 years, women are still underrepresented in math and science fields. Former National Science Foundation Director Erich Block has urged Americans to look to underrepresented women to meet the growing demand for scientists and engineers in the United States.

While girls are taking almost the same number of math and science courses, boys still outnumber girls in upper-level math and advanced chemistry and physics. Research has identified several reasons why boys show more interest in math and science. Boys in

math and science classes tend to receive more time and attention than girls. Teachers have been found to give boys more praise, more criticism, and to be more apt to accept boys' responses. According to a report from the American Association of University Women [AAUW], "Even girls who take the same number of math and science courses as boys, and who perform as well on tests, are much less apt to pursue scientific or technological careers than are their male counterparts."

The legislation that I am introducing today, with my colleague, Congresswoman NITA LOWEY, would encourage the recruitment or retraining of more math and science teachers at the elementary and secondary levels. While 45 percent of the math teachers in grades 9 through 12 are women, the sciences present a more discouraging picture. Only 37 percent of high school biology teachers, 34 percent of chemistry teachers, and 22 percent of physics teachers are women. Women continue to be underrepresented in math and science careers. Female teachers would serve as role models to encourage girls' participation in math and science courses, and would reduce the isolation felt by girls who are interested in math and science.

Research shows that although inequitable practices are widespread and persistent, they are nearly always inadvertent. This bill would provide for training for teachers and other school staff to help them identify and change the unexamined practices that create gender inequities. The Federal Government must take the lead in encouraging local school districts to make gender equity training available to teachers, counselors, and administrators.

My legislation would specify that informal education, such as that provided by community-based organizations, is included in the allowed activities for demonstration and exemplary programs. Research indicates that girls decide to take more math and science after participating in math and science sessions they see as more fun, more relaxed, with less pressure and less competition, with more hands-on work and problem solving.

In order to give gender a higher priority in federally funded education research, this legislation would encourage education data, whenever it is technically and economically feasible, to be collected, analyzed, and cross-tabulated by sex, race or ethnicity, and socioeconomic status.

LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE THE LIVES OF VETERANS

HON. GEORGE J. HOCHBRUECKNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of three bills that will improve the lives of those that have been hit hard during these budget-tightening times, our Nation's veterans.

The veterans of our Nation risked their lives for the United States. It is my belief that they are deserving of our greatest respect. For this reason, I am introducing three bills that will aid them in living their lives comfortably.

BRINGING FAIRNESS TO VETERAN SETTLEMENT CASES

The first bill I am introducing today will bring fairness to veterans who are denied the benefit of receiving legal damage awards by the Department of Veterans Affairs [DVA] due to a loophole in the law. Currently, the DVA includes personal damages awarded veterans in tort claims against the DVA as ordinary income. Therefore, when a veteran accepts a settlement for injuries incurred as a result of DVA negligence, his or her benefits that are means tested, such as pensions, are likely to be reduced. In essence, the veteran is no better off having prevailed on a claim than he or she would have been having lost.

In 1989, Congress enacted a law that excludes personal injury damages awarded as a result of agent orange exposure from being counted as income for the purpose of determining entitlement to Federal benefits. Public Law 101–201 precludes out-of-court settlement payments received by Vietnam veterans who were exposed to agent orange from being counted by the DVA in calculating its income-based benefits. In addition, the law prohibits all Federal agencies from counting as income for means-testing purposes any veteran's out-of-court settlement payment for agent orange exposure. This law, which I sponsored, received unanimous support in Congress.

The legislation that I am introducing is consistent with Public Law 101–201. It will provide that amounts received by a veteran in a legal settlement with the DVA for injuries arising from the negligence of the DVA shall not be counted as income for purposes of determining income-based programs administered by DVA.

REVISION OF DVA STATE HOME PROGRAM PER DIEM FORMULA

The second piece of legislation I am introducing will aid in promoting regional fairness in the DVA State Home Program. With a large number of veterans reaching the later stages of their lives, the DVA will be faced with a greater need for long-term care facilities in the very near future. DVA State home facilities provide cost-effective quality care and are increasingly relied upon by the DVA to meet the long-term care needs of our aging veterans. Under this program, States can compete for Federal grants that provide up to 65 percent of the costs of construction of these facilities. In addition, the DVA provides a per diem for each veteran under care in a designated State home.

The DVA intended for per diem rates to cover 25 percent of State Veterans Home Program costs nationally. However, while medical care costs have skyrocketed, per diem rates have only risen slowly. In States where the cost of care has increased most rapidly, the per diem payment covers a smaller share of costs than in low-cost States. For this reason, the legislation that I am introducing will reimburse individual State homes 30 percent of the cost of caring for veterans in these facilities or the current national per diem rate, whichever is greater. However, the current requirement that these payments not exceed 50 percent of the total cost would remain in effect.

In order to encourage States to build and operate State homes, a reasonable per diem rate must come closer to the actual cost of care. Higher per diem rates would provide this encouragement, and thereby reduce the strain on the DVA to provide such care. This is the very least that can be accomplished to ensure that veterans receive the most appropriate and compassionate care possible considering that veterans' health care is a Federal, not a State, responsibility.

COMBAT MERCHANT MARINERS BENEFITS ACT

Finally, the third bill I am introducing, the Combat Merchant Mariners Benefits Act, will provide benefits for the unsung heroes of the U.S. military, Combat Merchant Mariners.

Combat Merchant Mariners have provided critical support to our troops in the oceans and waterways of the world. While World War II merchant seamen obtained official veterans status, this status has not been extended to mariners who served during the Korean and Vietnam conflicts. These Merchant Mariners were civilians serving in combat, taking on the task of transporting troops and supplies needed to sustain the Armed Forces. They must be treated like all others who served their country during times of conflict.

Mr. Speaker, veterans have been faced with making the ultimate sacrifice for our country. In return for their courageous service, they were promised the best of care for the remainder of their lives. My legislation would go a long way toward providing comfort for veterans, the comfort they were promised and justly deserve. I urge my colleagues to support and cosponsor these three bills.

THE COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION TAX ACT OF 1993

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the Community Revitalization Tax Act of 1993. This is legislation I have worked on since 1986 to encourage investment in our cities and historic neighborhoods through improvements in the historic rehabilitation tax credit.

The rehabilitation tax credit program for historic structures is not functioning as Congress intended because of the passive loss rules enacted as part of the Tax Reform Act of 1986. Prior to the passage of the 1986 Act, the rehabilitation tax credit was one of the Nation's most successful downtown revitalization tools. National Park Service statistics show that over a 16 year period, the credit stimulated $16 billion in private investment for the rehabilitation of 24,656 buildings over 15 years. It also created 125,306 housing units including 23,377 units of low and moderate income housing. In communities from coast to coast, blighted downtowns were transformed.

The Tax Reform Act subjected the credit to the passive loss rules which reduced to $7,000 the allowable annual credit for individual taxpayers and eliminated the use of the credit completely for taxpayers above a certain income level. These changes have crippled the program, an 80 percent decline in use since 1986. The National Park Service reports that the number of historic rehabilitations has declined from 3,117 projects in fiscal year

1985 to 791 in fiscal year 1992. This decline resulted in a drop in private investment from $2.4 billion to $491 million during the same period. As a result projects needed to revitalize older neighborhoods and commercial centers have not been undertaken for lack of equity capital.

The Community Revitalization Tax Act would raise the allowable annual credit to $20,000 and eliminate the income caps. In this manner, the pool of potential investors will be dramatically expanded, and the amount they can invest will be significantly increased. Restoring the rehabilitation credit will create construction jobs, provide affordable housing, increase the tax base, and return economic vitality to troubled downtowns.

This legislation provides the tax incentives necessary to put equity capital to work to revitalize our cities. I would urge my colleagues to support this vital legislation.

DEFENSE CUTS ARE TOO DRASTIC IN CLINTON PLAN

HON. JOEL HEFLEY

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton budget deal is a scam. Not only are tax increases called spending cuts, but almost all of the cuts in spending come from defense.

In fiscal year 1993, we will spend $274.3 billion on defense. This is down from the Reagan buildup high of $368 billion in fiscal year 1985. In those 8 years, defense spending has dropped $94 billion or 26 percent of the total defense budget. I would like a Member of this body to show me one other Federal agency which was taken a similar cut during this same period, or even any cut at all. There are none.

Now, I believe that this 26-percent reduction after the cold war was prudent, we need to reduce defense spending. But insanity has set in here in Washington. Once again there is an effort underway to slash defense spending to dangerously low levels.

The Clinton plan calls for $127 billion in defense cuts over the next 4 years. This would mean that from fiscal year 1986–97, defense spending would be cut by approximately 45 percent. Half of the defense budget wiped away.

Defense spending would be far lower than it was under Jimmy Carter when half our navy ships could not leave port because of a lack of spare parts. Under Carter many of our enlisted military personnel were on food stamps, morale was low, and we couldn't even rescue hostages in Iran. We should do everything that we can to make sure that those days do not come back to haunt us again.

All this talk about slashing the defense budget comes at a time when the world is in confusion. Russian President Boris Yeltsin teeters on the edge of a coup. This is happening in a nation which still has enough nuclear weapons in its arsenal to destroy the United States.

North Korea, Iraq, and Iran continue work on developing nuclear capabilities. Two of these nations border the Persian Gulf, the lifeline of our oil supply. Additionally, all three of these nations continue to deny basic human rights to their citizens.

There are many terrorist organizations still operating in the world. The bombing at the world trade center illustrates the point that even U.S. citizens are not immune to the violence.

The world remains a very dangerous place. For 40 years we knew who our adversary was and we could prepare for them on the battlefield. Now we face a very different threat, one that could popup anywhere, at anytime, and our enemy could be anyone.

It is a moral travesty to send our soldiers into battle ill-prepared to fight and win with decisiveness. If we are going to send our sons and daughters to war, we, the Congress, are obligated to provide them with the training, equipment, and leadership to win with the fewest number of casualties.

Mr. Speaker, we need to reduce defense spending after the cold war but it needs to be done in a prudent way. The Clinton plan cuts drastically at our readiness and forces our military personnel to take the brunt of the cuts.

We need to reduce the deficit, but we are fooling ourselves if we believe that slashing the defense budget will reach the end. We need to cut Government spending prudently and across the board. The Clinton plan simply redistributes spending from defense to domestic social programs. It does not cut Government spending. The only substantial cuts are in defense spending. We owe it to those who serve their country to fund defense adequately.

Mr. Speaker, in 1926, H.L. Mencken wrote that "There is no record in history of a nation that ever gained anything valuable by being unable to defend itself." I hope that my colleagues agree and vote to support adequate defense spending. A 45-percent cut over 4 years is not adequate, it is a travesty.

THE HAITIAN REFUGEE DILEMMA

HON. EVA M. CLAYTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the Haitian refugee dilemma is a human tragedy that has become a familiar symbol of the ongoing human rights violations that have continued to plague the Western world. While we witness the genocide occurring in the former Yugoslavia, a malignancy persists in our own hemisphere.

The Haitians face a truly unfortunate problem. They are faced with a despotic military regime that refuses to acknowledge the fundamental human rights that we as Americans take for granted. At the same time, they face dire conditions if they turn to the dangers of the ocean in their makeshift boats. Under our current policy, these refugees can only look forward to being interdicted while at sea or being incarcerated for literally weeks before they are deported to their troubled land.

Although I support the administration in its policy of discouraging Haitians to jeopardize their lives in their quest for freedom, I strongly urge the administration to expedite the diplomatic channels to speed the return of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide. We must send a clear message to the despotic military junta of Haiti that only President Aristide, the first democratically elected leader in Haiti in 200 years, is the acceptable leader for the Haitian people.

I urge this body to support H.R. 986 which adjusts immigration status for those Haitians who were in the United States prior to January 20, 1993. This legislation allows for the normal naturalization process for Haitians. It does not change or address the administration's policy in regards to those still in Haiti but seeks to justly address those who are caught in the policy limbo. Unlike Cuban refugees, Haitians are unduly locked up as if they had committed a crime. I urge my colleagues to strive toward an immigration policy which is both fair and consistent.

As we stand on the brink of the 21st century, the United States must remain firmly committed to the principals of democracy and human rights. Just as we push for the marketization of the former Communist bloc, so also we must call for the proliferation of justice throughout the world. What better place than in our own backyard.

I strongly urge the administration to continue to work through the United Nations to facilitate the peaceful and speedy resolution of this dilemma.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS CASE

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share an article with my colleagues from my hometown paper the Marietta Daily Journal. I hope they find Mr. Tanksley's article as enlightening as I did.

[From the Marietta Daily Journal, Tuesday, Feb. 9, 1993]

APPEAL OF "TEN" ON TARGET

(By Charles Tanksley)

The recent decision by the Cobb Commission to appeal the U.S. District Court decision directing the Ten Commandments be removed from the Cobb State Court Building or be displayed among other nonreligious documents may turn out to be one of the most important governmental decisions for our community and, indeed, our country.

The Cobb Commission should be congratulated. What is truly at stake cannot be overstated.

Judge Marvin Shoob, who rendered the decision, is one of our most capable, honorable and courageous judges. He was simply following the precedent of current law, which he is sworn to do. Indeed, from a purely legal standpoint, most lawyers would have to concede his ruling is correct.

In the end, this case may be viewed in that light alone, with the U.S. Court of Appeals affirming Judge Shoob without opinion and/or the U.S. Supreme Court declining to hear the case.

Those are the technical and legalistic points of view. They are the anticipated con-

tinuation of current legal trends. They also miss an important point, one that is vastly more important to society.

Under Judge Shoob's ruling, the Ten Commandments, which form the moral base for Judeo-Christian ethics and behavior, can only be displayed in the State Court building if they are accompanied by other, non-religious codes. In effect, the ruling says the Commandments, which biblical teaching holds were handed down by God to Moses, and no more hallowed, important or meaningful than any other code or document. It implies further that any effort by government to exalt these rules of conduct over any of these other items is illegal.

While this is certainly in keeping with Court rulings over the past 40 years, it may be safely assumed few Cobb citizens, indeed, few Americans anywhere, would find such a concept rational or acceptable. In fact, indisputable opinion research shows most Americans deeply believe the court's position on these questions are not just wrong, but dead wrong.

In short, by a process of moral erosion, American courts have lost their way on these sorts of issues. They are wrong. Almost all Americans believe they are wrong, but the anti-moral drumbeat continues on and on without challenge or exception.

Our society, our schools and our governments have become so secularized by these recent interpretations of the Constitution that it is no wonder America has experienced a dramatic moral decline.

It may be cited in the current glorification of fiscal excess and irresponsibility, dishonesty, drunkenness, sexual promiscuity, meanness, perversion and violence that has rifled through our society from Hollywood to Capitol Hill and from Wall Street straight down Highway 41 here in Marietta.

Whether we lawyers want to admit it or not, the legal reasoning which has brought us to the point of tearing down the Ten Commandments has played a major role in our nation's moral decline. This is all the more tragic, since such an extreme and harmful interpretation of the Constitution was not necessary to fulfill the directives and purpose of the non-establishment clause and protect individuals from religious coercion.

Indeed, in today's world, non-religion, or even anti-religion, is forced on the people in school, business and, as in this case, the courts.

Young children have easy, daily access to graphic sex and violence on film and television, but excuse the phrase, heaven help them if they attempt even silent prayer in the classroom or at a sporting event.

In Cobb County schools, they don't even allow celebration of Christmas by name any more.

It would have been easy for the Cobb Commission to accept the decision and save the cost of an appeal. They chose a more courageous course, and I believe, the morally correct one.

Because of their decision to appeal, there is at least the possibility the U.S. Supreme Court may have to confront the stark reality of just where we are. One can only hope the nine members of that court, a court that begins each session with the words: "God save this honorable Court and the United States of America," will take this opportunity to honestly assess the disastrous predicament they and their recent predecessors have put this country in and begin to reinterpret the Constitution so as to allow the basic tenents of our spiritual and moral foundation to be invoked in our public institutions, including our schools.

Returning the Commandments to the court house walls, or even returning the right to pray, to the schools, will not alone change society for the better. But an appellate decision that reconfirms the moral base for our ethics and behavior, instead of straining over misguided legal precedents, would be a most encouraging start.

God knows we need one.

[From the Augusta Herald, Mar. 5, 1993]

AS MORAL DECLINE MARCHES ON, COBB APPEALS FOR THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

The recent decision by the Cobb County Commission to appeal the U.S. District Court ruling that the Ten Commandments by removed from the State Court building, or be displayed among other non-religious documents, may be one of the most important decisions that it or any other local government has ever made.

At first glance the case appears to be just another about the establishment clause, freedom of religion and separation of church and state. It may well turn out to be such, with the U.S. Court of Appeals affirming Judge Marvin Shoob without opinion and/or the U.S. Supreme Court declining to hear the case. From a purely legal perspective this is very likely.

Most lawyers would agree that Judge Shoob, who is one of our most capable, honorable and courageous judges, rendered a correct decision in view of the current law set forth in the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Faced with choice of taking what to many would appear to be the last and defining step in completely serving the roots between the foundation of American law and culture and Judeo-Christian thought, or opting for a remedy which would seem to reduce the "Tablets" to just another code but leave them hanging on the wall, the judge chose the latter course.

The decision is correct in the legal sense, and the Cobb Commission chairman's original inclination not to appeal and waste additional taxpayer's money reflected sound legal advice. However, the case provides as good an opportunity as is likely to arise for our country, or rather our lawyers and judges, to confront a matter which everybody seems concerned about but no one has the courage to talk about.

That issue is the inclination over the last 40 years to interpret the U.S. Constitution and other laws in such a way as to completely eliminate the spiritual and moral foundation of our culture from public life in general.

Ordering the removal of the Ten Commandments would have only been symbolic of what has been done over the years since World War II.

It required skillful legal reasoning to resist the gale wind of legal precedent and popular culture, but the larger issue remains: Have what our courts done been right or good for American society? The answer is a resounding "no."

Coinciding with the recent interpretation of the Constitution and laws which has so secularized American public life and education, America has experienced a dramatic moral decline. It does not mean an occasional failure of character, an immoral act or an immoderate habit. Such has always been the case with human beings, including myself.

Rather, moral decline means the glorification of fiscal excess and irresponsibility, dishonesty, drunkenness, sexual promiscuity, meanness, perversion and violence that has rifled through our society from Hollywood to Capitol Hill, to Wall Street and right through Main Street.

How has modern jurisprudence contributed to our country's moral decline? While the Constitution and laws have been interpreted so as to eliminate the spiritual and moral foundation or our culture from public life and the public classroom, they have also been construed in such a way as to stretch tolerance to the point of creating a licentious society instead of a free society, a society where anything goes, rather than a society where people are free to engage in dialogue, and pursue a livelihood and personal excellence within some reasonable bounds defining decent, as opposed to indecent, behavior.

The interaction of these to major trends in the law has been devastating. Popular culture, free of any legal or self restraint bombards adults, not to mention more impressionable young people, with unmitigated trash.

At the same time, the spiritual and moral foundation of our whole culture, i.e., the Judeo-Christian tradition, is banned from public institutions, including schools. Thus, society is deprived of essential tools for teaching what is right and wrong. The cumulative impact of this state of affairs is conspicuous to the point of being scary.

The interpretation of the Constitution and laws of this country, which has brought us to the brink of removing the Ten Commandments from the State Court building, must be turned on its head. We must restore the people's freedom to invoke the spiritual and moral foundation of our society and culture, whether in the form of the Ten Commandments, the Bible, the Torah or any other form.

We must allow parents and teachers to teach basic moral decency in the schools and utilize the spiritual and moral foundations of our culture if they choose to do so.

Because of the Cobb Commission's decision to appeal, there is at least the possibility that the U.S. Supreme Court will have to confront the stark reality of just where we are. One can only hope that the nine members of that Court, which begins each session with the words "God save this honorable Court and the United States of America," will take the opportunity to honestly assess the disastrous predicament this country is in and begin to reinterpret the Constitution so as to allow the basic tenets of our spiritual and moral foundation to be invoked in our public institutions.

SHIPBUILDING TRADE REFORM ACT OF 1993

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation that is vital to the economic future of the U.S. shipbuilding industry. This legislation, the "Shipbuilding Trade Reform Act of 1993," is designed to discourage, and to provide remedies against, foreign unfair trade practices in the commercial shipbuilding and repair industries.

Over the past 12 years, foreign governments have poured massive subsidies into the construction and repair of commercial ships while American shipyards have received no

Government subsidies. These subsidy and other unfair foreign trade practices, such as dumping, have been devastating for the American shipbuilding and repair industry, particularly since the industry has no effective remedies under existing U.S. trade law to counter these unfair practices. The result has been the collapse of commercial shipbuilding in the United States, the export of 120,000 shipyard and related jobs, and the closure of more than 40 major yards since 1981.

Although I am a strong proponent of international trade agreements to discipline unfair trade practices, we have, unfortunately, nothing to show for over 3 years of international negotiations and shipbuilding in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD]. Indeed, these negotiations have been moribund since April 1992. Consequently, it is now abundantly clear that, without legislation, our Government will never be able to negotiate a strong and effective international agreement that restores fair trade to the global commercial shipbuilding market. In the absence of such an agreement or legislation, America will risk losing another 180,000 shipyard and related jobs by 1998, and will see its capability to build ships for our Nation's commerce and defense seriously eroded.

The legislation that I introduce today will amend U.S. trade law to provide effective remedies for domestic shipbuilders and repairers against foreign unfair practices. The bill has two parts. Title I closes the loophole in existing countervailing and antidumping duty laws which precludes action against dumped or subsidized sales of ships. The bill merely gives to American producers of commercial ships the same access to remedies under these laws enjoyed by American producers of all other products.

Title II of the bill establishes remedies to deal in particular with those situations that cannot be reached under the countervailing and antidumping duty laws and to discourage the use of subsidies by foreign governments. Under this title, a procedure is established in the Department of Commerce for identifying and listing countries which subsidize the shipbuilding or repair industries. Once listed, a country will have 180 days either to eliminate the subsidies or to sign a trade agreement with the United States to do so. Otherwise, it will face sanctions under this title.

With regard to sanctions, the Secretary of Commerce would be required to impose at least one of several statutorily listed sanctions, such as placing a financial penalty of not more than $1 million per vessel per voyage to the United States against vessels from the subsidizing country; reducing U.S. port calls for such vessels; or closing U.S. ports to those vessels. These penalties would only apply to vessels owned or controlled by citizens of the subsidizing country, or to vessels registered in that country. Consequently, American-flagged vessels—other than those owned or controlled by citizens of the subsidizing country—and American-owned vessels—other than those registered in the subsidizing country—would not be subject to any potential sanctions under this title. These sanctions are modeled after those that are currently available to American shipowners and operators under section 19 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 to redress unfair foreign shipping practices.

The remedies provided by title I and title II would not be available against any country that entered into a trade agreement with the United States to eliminate shipbuilding and repair subsidies.

A bill that I sponsored last year to deal with this issue was passed twice by the House, but was not acted upon by the Senate. The bill that I am introducing today has been modified to address various concerns expressed about last year's legislation. Moreover, I understand that a similar bill will soon be introduced in the Senate with strong bipartisan support. Consequently, I am confident that the Congress is now in a position to pass this much needed legislation and send it to the President.

We can no longer afford to stand by while foreign governments subsidize ship prices by an average of 25–30 percent, international negotiations remain at an impasse, and the difficulties of the U.S. shipbuilding and repair industry continue to mount in the face of foreign unfair trade practices. Therefore, this legislation is of the utmost importance to the survival of this vital U.S. industry and I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure its early passage.

REMEMBERING J.B. MORRIS

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the people of Kentucky lost one of its top public servants when J.B. Morris, the Pulaski County coroner, passed away on Saturday, February 27.

For 24 years, J.B. earned numerous accolades for his leadership of the county coroner's office. J.B. and his colleagues were commended for the administration and recordkeeping system at the coroner's office. According to the local press, because of J.B.'s fine leadership, the Pulaski County office was a role model for other coroners in the State.

But perhaps the finest words spoken about J.B. were contained in the many tributes that appeared in the local newspaper following his death. The daily newspaper in Somerset was filled with words of love and respect from a variety of local officials, community leaders, and friends.

Always one of the county's top votegetters at election time, J.B. Morris was a true and dedicated public servant committed to helping his community. He was active in the Science Hill Kiwanis Club and local Red Cross, as well as the Boy Scouts where he served as scoutmaster. J.B. was also a loving father and husband, and will always be remembered as one of Pulaski County's most distinguished citizens.

Those of us who worked with J.B. always marveled at his accomplishments, but more importantly, we enjoyed his fellowship and faithfulness. For those reasons, he will always be missed.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE AMERICAN COMPANIES' ABILITY TO COMPETE OVERSEAS

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing two bills I have developed to improve American companies' ability to compete overseas. It would be far better if the United States recognized reality and developed a value added tax to replace our complicated corporate and international tax rules, but many Members of this body have not seen how such a tax would benefit U.S. firms. If people are going to insist on using an income tax system when our trading partners are using VAT's, giving their companies pricing advantages in international markets, then Congress should make our income tax system as supportive of U.S. companies as possible. These bills will give American firms some of the tools they need to survive.

The first bill overrides Treasury regulations so American companies can deduct for taxes paid to States in which they do business. Treasury regulations, which have been applied retroactively, require companies to allocate a portion of the taxes they pay under worldwide formulae to companies' international income. The effect of these rules is to give American firms less than a full deduction for taxes they have actually paid.

The regulations' effect indirectly limits the deduction of these taxes by manipulating a company's foreign tax credit limitation. To prevent foreign taxes from reducing tax on U.S. source income, the credit is limited to a percentage of a company's pre-foreign tax credit U.S. tax liability. That pre-credit liability is divided between the company's foreign and U.S. source income.

Because the pre-credit tax is apportioned by the percentage of a company's taxable foreign source income, the regulations automatically leave some companies with higher U.S. taxes. A company paying State taxes under a worldwide income formula has to allocate some of those taxes to its foreign income. In theory, such taxes are allocated to, and thus deducted from, foreign source income. This allocation reduces the amount of foreign income which, in turn, cuts down the percentage of pre-credit U.S. tax liability that will be allocated to foreign source income. Companies find themselves with nondeductible excess foreign tax credits representing money they have actually paid to foreign tax authorities.

State taxing methods are not at issue here. The Supreme Court has ruled that States can use formulae that impose a tax on a company's worldwide income under certain conditions. These State taxes should be, but are not fully deductible.

The IRS approach is discriminatory, applying only to U.S. firms with foreign operations. For U.S. subsidiaries of foreign companies, all such tax payments are deductible against U.S. tax. U.S. corporations competing with such firms have an additional cost of doing business because they are, in effect, unable to

fully deduct their State income taxes. It even affects U.S. companies here because corporations operating in formula States have higher after-tax costs than their competitors. The rule is senseless. Companies should not have to allocate capital on the basis of Federal tax rules. Companies should allocate their resources in relation to markets, not theoretical constructs imposed by the tax code.

Treasury has adopted a different rule for charitable contributions that would serve equally well in resolving the State tax problem. The rule has a use test that allows companies to deduct charitable contributions used in the United States from U.S. income on grounds that such contributions but a company goodwill. That theory ought to apply to State taxes as well. Anyone who has dealt with a State taxing authority can easily recognize the importance of making your payments. If a company does not do that, the State locks its doors and seizes company assets. State taxes are directly tied to a company's ability to do business, perhaps more so than charitable contributions.

I introduced this same bill, then H.R. 1429, in 1991 because it is clear companies should not have to bear a double tax burden simply because they observe the law and pay State taxes. H.R. 1429 was endorsed by several trade groups, including the National Association of Manufacturers, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Chemical Manufacturers Association, Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, American Electronics Association, and the American Petroleum Institute. The National Governors Association, Committee on State Taxation of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, and the Multi-State Tax Commission also supported the bill.

The new bill solves the problems created by the IRS position by providing that all deductions for State and local corporate income and franchise taxes are allocated to U.S. source income for foreign tax credit purposes. The legislation will yield a full deduction for State corporate income taxes. The bill addresses a competitiveness problem we have thrust on American companies through the Internal Revenue Code, a problem we should resolve as soon as possible.

Second, I am introducing a bill that would greatly simplify taxes paid by companies in international trade through a series of relatively inexpensive options. The bill exempts U.S.-owned foreign corporations not doing business in the United States from the uniform capitalization rules. It would make the passive foreign investment company rules easier to handle by determining PFIC status on the basis of gross receipts, not gross income. It would ease calculation of the foreign tax credit limitations by providing a de minimis rule whereby companies with gross income of less that $1 million in all the current baskets would be allowed to aggregate the income into one limitation basket. Finally, it would end the complexity of the treatment of dividends from noncontrolled foreign corporations.

Taxes play an important role in companies' decisions about allocating capital and entering markets. If we are going to have an income tax, the bills I am introducing today will help American firms make those decisions crucial to their survival. I invite all of my House colleagues to join me in cosponsoring these important items of legislation.

THE YOUNG AMERICAN WORKERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that I am not opposed to adolescents working for pay under any circumstances. Work can be a positive experience for teenagers from many different walks of life and under many different circumstances.

What I am opposed to is the commercial exploitation of young Americans on the job at a stage in their lives when they have little or no information about how to protect themselves and when it can be very hard for them to strike a good balance between getting a solid education and short-term pressures to earn a paycheck for gas money or whatever.

Recent findings about illegal child labor in the United States by the GAO and reputable media sources are truly shocking.

The 150 percent increase in reported child labor violations since 1983—up from 10,000 to more than 25,000 in 1989.

Reported child labor violations in 1990 increased by 177 percent over the prior year, but the Bush administration actually cut enforcement personnel by 16 percent.

Just prior to a congressional oversight hearing in 1990, the U.S. Department of Labor undertook four highly-publicized sting operations. In less than 3 weeks of serious enforcement activity, they found more than 27,000 minors illegally employed and violations in 41 percent of the businesses inspected.

The GAO found the average fine levied by the Labor Department for the death of a minor in the workplace is $740. In 59 case studies where teenagers had been killed on the job, the U.S. Department of Labor did not even cite 22 employers for any serious violation of child labor or safety laws.

Nationwide there is now the equivalent of fewer than 35 Federal investigators to police child labor violations. While civil penalties were increased in 1990, they still remain at such a low level and the improbability of being caught is so low, that many unscrupulous employers accept whatever penalties are levied as an acceptable cost of doing business.

In short, youth employment is booming in the United States. An estimated 5.5 million youth between 12 and 17 are employed for pay. This figure does not even include illegal employment. Yet, we know for certain that thousands of children, some as young as 6 and 8 years old, work as migrant and seasonal farmworkers, harvesting our Nation's fruits and vegetables. Also uncounted are the youngsters working off the books, in sweatshops in large metropolitan garment districts in Los Angeles and other cities, and on street corners or door-to-door selling candy.

This situation stands in stark contrast with most other industrialized nations. In Japan, for example, it is estimated that only 2 percent of that nation's teenagers are employed for pay outside of their homes.

As American youth are increasingly targeted for employment, disturbing trends are escalating. From the years 1985–90, detected child labor violations increased by 286 percent. Clearly, too many employers are violating existing laws with impunity and endangering the health, education, and future well-being of their young employees.

Where violations abound, injuries commonly follow. Health organizations estimate that tens of thousands of children are hurt in the workplace every year and scores more are killed. Specific nationwide data is unavailable because no Federal agency tracks such information. Workplace injuries and deaths often occur when children are working in violation of U.S. Labor Department hazardous occupation orders. In the most recent Federal child labor stings last April, the percentage of violations attributed to minors working in prohibited hazardous occupations or with prohibited hazardous machines had risen from 21 percent in 1990 to 28 percent in 1992.

Moreover, illegal and inappropriate work is not the only problem. There is growing concern about harmful effects on education standards and performance—the most important job for any American teenager. More than ever our youth are faced with stiff international economic competition inside the classroom and beyond. Yet it is estimated as many as 70 percent of American teenagers are struggling to balance the demands of work and school. Growing numbers of teachers are reporting that education suffers.

Multiple studies now point toward negative results of youth work increasing as work hours climb. One of the experts on adolescent employment—Professor Greenberger at the University of California in Irvine—has shown that among working minors grades tend to decline and students are drawn to easier courses, negative attitudes toward work surface, and drug and alcohol abuse increase. There is a growing consenus among researchers that when work exceeds 20 hours per school week, a student's health and education performance suffer. Some even claim 15 hours per school week should be the limit.

The fact is the child labor provisions of Federal labor law have not been thoughtfully reviewed and updated since 1938. Not surprisingly, the landscape of child labor in 1993 has changed dramatically from what it was 55 years ago.

As this sorry situation has come to light, the response of the Reagan-Bush administrations was to undertake a handful of undercover stings followed by highly publicized media blitzes. Hopefully, the Clinton administration will see that such responses are no substitute for updated, practical laws, and sustained enforcement over time.

I am very pleased to be an original cosponsor of comprehensive legislation to update our child labor laws to address the newer and different violations that compound recurring old problems. It is called the Young American Workers' Bill of Rights (H.R. 1106).

First, the penalties for child labor violators must be made tougher. This bill establishes criminal sanctions for willful violations of child labor laws that result in the death of a minor—

maximum 10 years in prison—or that cause serious bodily injury to a minor—maximum 5 years in prison. Willful and repeat offenders would be ineligible for Federal grants, loans, or contracts for 5 years. They would also be unable to pay the subminimum youth training wage or to employ a minor for 5 years after a repeat violation. Furthermore, a private right of action would be authorized, in cases of serious bodily injury or death, for aggrieved minors or their families against child labor scofflaws that would be coupled with discretionary powers for the States to prevent double dipping for damages vis-a-vis State worker's compensation systems. Such private right of action already exists statutorily to enforce certain minimum wage and hour violations.

Second, the law implementing regulations and enforcement efforts should make clear that getting a good education is the top job for all young Americans. This is a dimension of public policy that could demonstrably improve the quality of public school education without having to spend an additional dime.

Under this bill, work certificates would be required for anybody under age 18 unless he/she is a high school graduate. For the first time, limits of 5 hours per day and 25 hours per week would be established for 16- and 17-year old minors to work during the school and limits of 3 hours per day and 15 hours per week for 1- and 15-year old minors. It does not make sense for juniors and seniors in high school commonly to be working 40 hours per week, while also going to school full time.

Third, the law should emphasize that work experience under the proper circumstances can benefit young Americans. This bill's focus should be on prohibiting the commercial exploitation of children in the workplace and not preventing minors from working for pay at all.

A key feature in this regard is strengthening the work certificate system. Parents, teachers, principals, and health professionals must take more seriously their responsibilities. They are the first line of defense in protecting children from being exploited in the workplace.

Also, the basic conditions under which work certificates can be approved should be revised. For example, before a work certificate is issued to a minor, there should be clear determinations that the proposed work is safe.

Fourth, priority must go to better informing young Americans about their rights and how to protect themselves on the job. By extension, parents of children applying for work certificates must be included in this educational outreach effort.

Currently, minors are routinely instructed in schools on what is expected of responsible employees in the work world. At the time when minors apply for work certificates, why not require that they also be informed and instructed about how to protect themselves on the job? Too often neither working minors nor their parents know their rights. Routinely providing that information would go a long way toward equipping minors to protect themselves.

Similarly, employers of minors should be required to prominently post notices on their jobsites to inform their young employees of their basic rights and protections under the law.

Finally, monitoring and reporting on employment patterns of minors must be improved. Nobody, including the U.S. Labor Department, has wholly reliable and comprehensive statistics on the scope of child labor. Recently disclosed statistics on child labor violators, while shocking by themselves, do constitute only the tip of the iceberg.

Across our country, teenagers are being taken advantage of in every sector of the work force. Now is an opportune time for the 103d Congress in concert with President Clinton to enact overdue safeguards to better protect all young Americans on the job.

CHILD LABOR COALITION

(Co-Chaired by the American Youth Work Center, International Labor Rights Education and Research Fund, and the National Consumers League)

Co-chairs: American Youth Work Center, International Labor Rights Education and Research Fund, and National Consumers League.

Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union.

American Academy of Pediatrics.

American Federation of Teachers.

Americans for Democratic Action.

Asian-American Free Labor Institute.

Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs.

B'nai B'rith Women.

Children's Defense Fund.

Coalition of Labor Union Women.

Consumer Federation of America.

Department of Economic Research, AFL-CIO.

Food and Allied Service Trades Department, AFL-CIO.

Frontlash.

General Federation of Women's Clubs.

International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

International Consulting Associates.

International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

Jewish Labor Committee.

Labor Council for Latin American Advancement.

League for Industrial Democracy.

Mt. Sinai School of Medicine.

National Child Labor Committee.

National Council of Senior Citizens.

National Education Association.

National Parent-Teacher Association.

National Safe Workplace Institute.

People Against Dangerous Delivery.

Public Employee Department, AFL-CIO.

Service Employees International Union.

Social Democrats, USA.

Transportation Communications International Union.

United Food and Commercial Workers International Union.

The Women's Research and Education Institute.

Work Experience Coordinating Association.

FLEXIBLE MEDICAL ACCESS PLAN

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am reintroducing the Flexible Medical Access and Cost Containment Act. This bill is similar to H.R. 4889, which I introduced in the 102d Congress. This legislation abides by the three cardinal principles of health care reform by controlling costs, providing for universal access and retaining the high quality of medical services. A summary of the bill follows my statement.

I introduce this legislation to put forward three essential ideas that I hope will be incorporated into any comprehensive health reform legislation. First, States should be enlisted in the cost containment effort. A fully Federal cost containment system will not be sensitive to the needs of our communities. Health care markets, after all, are regional not national. In Maryland, we have a highly successful all-payer system for containing hospital costs. The hospitals support this system because they feel confident that a commission based in Maryland will be best able to balance the needs of hospitals and citizens in Maryland.

Second, if we truly want to test the ability of Government to provide health insurance more efficiently than the private sector, then any new public insurance program should play by the same underwriting, financing and payment rules as private health insurers.

Finally, any mandate for employers to provide coverage must be sensitive to the needs of small business. The Federal Government should ensure that appropriate subsidies are available, that insurance rules make insurance available, and that real cost containment precede mandates.

I look forward to working with my colleagues and President Clinton to enact comprehensive health reform legislation this year.

THE FLEXIBLE MEDICAL ACCESS AND COST CONTAINMENT ACT

1. HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR EVERY AMERICAN

In general, universal health insurance coverage would be assured by requiring each employer to provide basic health insurance meeting certain minimum standards to all employees and dependents. Individuals not connected to the workforce would be covered under a new public plan similar to the Medicare program.

2. INSURANCE OPTIONS

Employers could provide the basic benefit package through private health insurance or a self-insured employer plan. Employers could charge employees up to 20 percent of the premiums for the coverage. Firms with fewer than 100 employees would have the option of purchasing a new public plan. Firms purchasing the public plan would be charged a per-enrollee premium based on the community-rated, actuarial cost of providing coverage.

3. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PUBLIC PLAN

A public plan similar to Medicare would be established. Benefit payments and direct provider relations would be operated, as is Medicare, through fiscal intermediaries at the state level. The plan would operate under the same rules for provider certification and quality assurance as Medicare. The program would be administered by the Department of Health and Human Services. A Public Health Trust Fund would be established to receive funds from the premiums and other revenues dedicated to support of the program.

4. PHASED IMPLEMENTATION OF COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS

As of January 1, 1994, employers with more than 250 employees would be required to provide coverage. As of January 1, 1995, employers with more than 100 employees would be required to provide coverage. As of January 1, 1996, employers with more than 50 employ-

ees would be required to provide coverage. As of January 1, 1997, all employers would be required to provide coverage.

5. MULTIPLE EMPLOYER RULES

In the case of families with more than one worker and where both employers offer a private plan, families would choose under which employer plan they would be enrolled. The nonenrolling employer(s) would pay a special premium to the public plan equal to 40 percent of the applicable premium for the public plan. The enrolling employer would receive a subsidy from the public plan equal to that amount for each enrolled employee of another firm.

Families with employees covered by both a private and the public plan would be required to choose coverage under the private plan, and the private plan would receive a subsidy equal to forty percent of the applicable public plan premium for each enrolled employee of another firm. The employer participating in the public plan and the firm's employees would pay the public premium.

Families with all employees covered by the public plan would receive coverage from that plan and each employee and his/her employer would pay the premium. Families with more than one employed person would not be liable for paying the extra employee share(s) of public premiums.

6. HEALTH BENEFITS

Basic benefits: Benefits would generally be the same as under the Medicare program except there would be a single deductible of $250 per individual/$500 per family and an out-of-pocket limit of $2500 per individual/$3000 per family. Certain new prevention benefits, also added to Medicare and described below, would be included in the basic benefit package.

Children's benefits: Benefits for children would include a well-child care and preventive care as recommended by the American Academy of Pediatrics without copayments or deductibles, and hospital care without copayments or limits on days of care per spell of illness.

Pregnancy benefits: Benefits for pregnancy-related services would include prenatal care, inpatient labor and delivery, postnatal care, and postnatal family planning services based upon the recommendations of the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology, without copayments and deductibles.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services would be required to establish a system for certifying that insurance plans and employer self-insured plans meet the benefit requirements.

7. HEALTH CARE COST CONTAINMENT

A national limit would be set on the health expenditures of the public plan and of employer plans for services covered under the program and prescription drugs. The limit would equal the average annual percentage increase in the gross domestic product during the most recent 3-year period plus: for 1995, 3.5 percent; for 1996, 2.5 percent; for 1997, 1.5 percent; for 1998, 0.5 percent. In 1999 and thereafter the increase would be equal to the nominal growth in the GNP.

A Federal Health Care Cost Containment Commission would be established consisting of eleven experts in health financing, health insurance, provider reimbursement, and related fields. Commissioners would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Commission would allocate allowable health spending among the states.

States would establish commissions to set payment rates for health care services on an annual basis which would result in aggregate expenditures equal to the amount allowable under the state expenditure limit. The federal Commission would also hear appeals by classes of providers on the adequacy of state rates. The extra billing limits of Medicare would apply to the public plan and to all private plans.

The Physician Payment Review Commission is instructed to report to Congress by March 31, 1994, on medical malpractice liability reform.

8. LOW-INCOME ASSISTANCE

Low-income persons and families would be eligible for assistance relating to premiums, deductibles, and coinsurance for which they would otherwise be responsible. For individuals or families with incomes below 100 percent of the federal poverty level, the assistance would equal the total amount of all premiums, deductibles, and coinsurance. For individuals and families with incomes between 100 and 200 percent of the poverty level, the assistance would diminish on a sliding scale.

Both employed persons and persons not connected to the work force could receive assistance, but employers would still pay their share of the costs of coverage for employed persons and their dependents. Persons eligible for aid to families with dependent children, supplemental security income, or the earned income tax credit would be deemed to be eligible for assistance. Other persons would have to apply for assistance. If family income changed during the year, any assistance received would be reconciled to those changes at the end of the year.

Medicare beneficiaries would be eligible for low-income assistance under the same terms except that the assistance available would relate to the part A and part B premiums, deductibles, and coinsurance otherwise due.

9. PREVENTION BENEFITS

Annual mammography screening, colorectal screening, various vaccinations, and well-child care would be required benefits for employer plans and the public plan and would be added to the Medicare program.

10. GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE STANDARDS

General Standards: All group health insurance plans would be required to meet certain standards. Plans not meeting these standards would be subject to a tax equal to fifty percent of the premiums collected and would lose their status as qualified employer plans.

Under the standards, no group insurance plans could discriminate on the basis of health status, claims experience, receipt of health care, medical history, or evidence of insurability of an individual. Pre-existing condition exclusions could only apply for a six month period and could not apply to newborns. No pre-existing condition exclusion could apply if an individual had been covered under another qualified plan or the public plan for more than six months prior to enrollment. All pre-existing condition exclusions would be disallowed starting four years after enactment.

Small Group Standards: No employer with fewer than 100 employees would be allowed to self-insure. Insurers offering insurance plans to small businesses would be required to offer the plan to all small employers on a continuous, year-round basis. Insurers would be required to offer coverage for a full year. Premiums would be required to be community-rated for a given geographic area, but could be adjusted for age, gender, and type of family enrollment. Insurers would be required to offer a minimum benefit package which contained only the basic benefits required for all employers.

11. COBRA CONTINUATION COVERAGE

The health insurance continuation requirements enacted as part of the Consolidated Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1985 would be repealed.

12. MEDICAID

Medicaid would continue for the currently eligible population for the benefits not covered under this program. Medicaid programs would be required to pay the same rates as all other payors. States would be subject to maintenance of effort rules that would require them to pay the amount they otherwise would have spent for Medicaid benefits into the Public Health Trust Fund.

13. DEDUCTION FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS OF SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS

An additional tax deduction of 20 percent is created to help small businesses afford insurance.

The bill extends the present law 25 percent deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals for 1994 and modifies this deduction for subsequent years to conform to the universal health coverage policies of the bill.

Until the universal coverage provisions of the bill are effective, self-employed individuals and owners of personal service corporations are entitled to deduct 100 percent of their health insurance costs if they provide to all their employees who work more than 17½ hours per week health coverage that meets the requirements of a qualified employer health plan under the bill. If such coverage is not provided, then the deduction for health insurance expenses of such person is limited to 25 percent.

COLORADO EXPERIMENT INFLUENCED NATIONAL STRUGGLE

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, during the month of March we celebrate women's history. In Colorado, this March is made even more special as it is our 100th anniversary of suffrage. It may have taken us 80 years to have the first woman elected but how wonderful that today there are 54 women elected to Congress. Who would have guessed in 1894 that the largest State of the Union would privilege us with two wonderful woman Senators. Women have made significant contributions in shaping American politics. I can only imagine how great the next 100 years will be.

I would like to share with my colleagues the history of three Coloradan women, who helped pioneer the path for women in government and redefined "politics as usual." Enclosed is an article from The Colorado Statesman, I hope you all enjoy it.

[From the Colorado Statesman, Mar. 5, 1993]

"COLORADO EXPERIMENT" INFLUENCED NATIONAL STRUGGLE

(By Heather Ormsby)

During an economic depression one hundred years ago, Colorado women won the suffrage battle by popular election for the first time in U.S. history. A massive campaign by a group of women and men from diverse backgrounds and from all parts of the state succeeded in winning the vote for women.

In addition to celebrating the centennial of woman suffrage this year in Colorado, March

is national Women's History Month. The courage, strength and determination of women in our nation's history is well reflected in Colorado.

Colorado women voted and ran for political office a quarter-century before the 19th Amendment made woman suffrage national law in 1920. The affect of this achievement on Colorado politics was not immediately recognized.

"At the time (1894), women campaigning for elective office was a novelty," said Mary Renstrom of the Suffrage Centennial Committee, part of the Colorado Committee for Women's History. Female lawmakers were seen as amateurs and curiosities, rather than as authentic public figures. Women who undertook what were considered to be male pursuits were defined as oddities.

Marcia Goldstein, also a member of the Suffrage Centennial Committee, said, "Though Colorado had one of the largest populations of women in the West, the whole political system in Colorado was in a turmoil at the time."

"The skills of politicking were taken for granted by men," Renstrom said. "Women had to teach themselves how to lobby, to work with legislators and to draft legislation. I understand the guts it took to run for political office, talk about political issues and to campaign."

The women, however, were not the only ones who had difficulty with these changes. Renstrom illustrated this point with a story she had heard about these times.

"A woman was running for superintendent," she said, "but the man she was running against pulled out as a courtesy to the woman. He did not think it was fair having to be the only man to run against a woman. He was upset that he wouldn't be able to pull any punches in the campaign. People struggled with the concept 'political woman.'"

Renstrom explained that different criteria were used to explain and evaluate the presence and performance of women in a field for which women were expected to have little competence.

When the campaigns for the Tenth Colorado General Assembly of 1894 were over, the first women to sit in the Legislature were Clara Cressingham and Frances S. Klock, both of Arapahoe county, and Carrie C. Holly of Pueblo, all Republicans.

"The elected women had campaigned they were going to cleanse politics and wipe out corruption," Renstrom said. "This came back to haunt them."

People then, as well as now, thought of politics as being corrupt. One of the arguments against suffrage was that if women were to become involved in politics, their reputations would be soiled.

The suffragists, however, argued that for this very reason women should be in politics. Instead of government being a corrupting influence on women, they were going to clean the place up.

"They did try," Renstrom said, "and they passed a lot of progressive legislation. But, the realities hit them smack in the face."

The problem, it seemed, was a lack of experience and training in the government circus ring. "There was no one for them to go to and ask what it was going to be like to be an elected official," Renstrom explained. "They had to learn to compromise. In that way the women were no different than the men."

One of the fears some people had about the suffrage movement was that women would vote as one monolithic force. The liquor industry had fought hard against the suffrage movement out of fear of prohibition which was a political and social concern for a lot of women. But, not necessarily all women.

What men began to realize, Renstrom said, "was that women had divided interests and loyalties." Legislators feared a women's block initially, but politicians found that women divided like men.

Marcia Goldstein said, "The women were more united before the right to vote than after. They were not this giant force," because the women who were elected tended to follow their political party's agenda which did not always follow that of the suffragists.

Many suffragists expected to make some telling and immediate contribution to government. Women were certain a new era was upon them, but many were soon disillusioned because the impact was much less than expected.

The fact that the new "political woman" did not upset the status quo as some had expected, may have actually proved the point of many modern feminists. Women are just as capable in mind and judgment as men. The cry of the Rocky Mountain News on January 1, 1894, "Let the women vote; they can't do any worse than the men have!," was not far off the mark. The question was and still is, can they do any better?"

While this question is being worked out as women across the nation still strive for equal representation in government, it is a fact that Colorado helped lead the way.

In March of 1895, Clara Cressingham, with a bill to encourage sugar beet growing, gained the credit for introducing the first bill in any legislative body by a woman which became the law of a state.

While working hard in the Legislature, these Colorado women also made national tours and spoke at suffrage movements elsewhere about the "Colorado Experiment."

"They really networked with the rest of the suffrage movement," Renstrom said. "I think Colorado definitely influenced the suffrage movement in the rest of the nation."

LESSONS FROM HISTORY III

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, today I am placing in the RECORD testimony of Thomas Wilson, defense counsel to Joe Fernandez in Judge Walsh's Iran-Contra prosecutions. Mr. Wilson gave his testimony on March 3 during a hearing held by the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations. I think we can all learn from it as we contemplate reauthorizing the independent counsel statute:

TESTIMONY OF MR. THOMAS WILSON

Mr. Chairman, my name is Thomas E. Wilson. I am a partner in the Washington, D.C. office of Seyfarth, Shaw, Fairweather & Geraldson. I come before the Subcommittee today to share with you my views concerning H.R. 811, the Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act of 1993. My thoughts on this legislation are informed by the experience I have gained during the six years that I have served as counsel for Joseph F. Fernandez, the former CIA Station Chief of San Jose, Costa Rica who was prosecuted by Independent Counsel Lawrence E. Walsh in connection with the Iran-Contra Affair. Based upon that experience, I believe the Independent Counsel Statute was a bad law which should not be re-enacted.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT RE-ENACT THE INDEPENDENT COUNSEL STATUE BECAUSE THE INDEPENDENT COUNSEL IS ACCOUNTABLE TO NO ONE

The Founding Fathers of this nation conceived of a government comprising three separate branches—the executive, the legislature and the judiciary. Nothing was more fundamental to the Framers of the Federal Constitution than the concept that the powers of each of the three branches of government remain separate from one another.

The Independent Counsel Statute, however, created a fourth branch of government which, as a practical matter, was largely unaccountable either to the other three branches of government or the political processes which operate to make our public servants accountable to the electorate. The demise of the Independent Counsel legislation gives Congress an opportunity—and, in my view, a duty—to evaluate how the law really operated in order to determine whether its re-enactment is truly in the public interest.

Only someone who has had experience working in the field of law enforcement or as a defense counsel can appreciate fully the vast power and the immense discretion which is placed in the hands of prosecutors. In 1988, Justice Scalia reminded us of this power when he reflected on a speech delivered by Justice Robert Jackson when he served as Attorney General under President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Justice Jackson warned that "the most dangerous power" of any prosecutor is his ability to "choose his defendants"—that is, his capacity to "pick people that he thinks he should get, rather than cases that need to be prosecuted." When prosecutors get confused and start prosecuting people rather than crimes, it no longer is "a question of discovering the commission of a crime and then looking for the man who has committed it, it is a question of picking the man and then searching the law books, or putting investigators to work, to pin some offense on him. It is in this realm—in which the prosecutor picks some person who he dislikes or desires to embarrass, or selects some group of unpopular persons and then looks for an offense, that the greatest danger of abuse of prosecuting power lies." *Morrison v. Olson*, 487 U.S. 654, 724 (1988) (Scalia dissenting).

The "sin" of the Independent Counsel legislation is that a pre-selected group of high-ranking government officials identified as potential "culprits"—usually in a highly charged political environment—have the full weight of the federal government hurled at them with the implicit expectations that the "guilty" will be "brought to justice." "[T]he fairness of a process," said Scalia, "must be ajudged on the basis of what it permits to happen, not what it produced in a particular case." *Id.* at 731. Well, in the case of Independent Counsel Lawrence E. Walsh, what has been produced in connection with the Iran-Contra investigation is a case study that illuminates the grisly excesses which the Independent Counsel process encourages.

THE PROSECUTION OF JOSEPH F. FERNANDEZ

Joe Fernandez is an unlikely would-be felon. He is a husband and father of seven children. Before joining CIA, he was a policeman in Dade County, Florida. His performance had been so exemplary that, when he left, the police department retired his shield. He joined CIA in 1967. For twenty years thereafter, he served with the distinction in a series of overseas assignments and at CIA headquarters in Langley, Virginia.

From almost the moment of his return to the United States from Costa Rica in early

1987, Fernandez was pursued relentlessly by Independent Counsel Walsh for more than three years for allegedly making false statements to an officer of the CIA's Office of Inspector General and to two investigators from the Tower Commission. No professional prosecutor would have prosecuted Fernandez.

Fernandez's alleged false statements were made in extremely informal sessions where no formalities were observed and where no transcripts were kept reflecting the questions which Fernandez was supposedly asked and the answers which he gave. Moreover, the notes of the CIA IG and the Tower Commission officers who interviewed Fernandez directly contradicted the charges leveled at him by Independent Counsel Walsh.

Walsh informed Congress in April 1987 that if witnesses were immunized and permitted to testify in the Iran-Contra hearings, it would be impossible later to prosecute them. Fernandez—like North, Poindexter and others—testified on Capitol Hill under a grant of immunity. Walsh still insisted on prosecuting him despite the fact that transcripts of his immunized testimony had been reviewed by virtually every witness that Walsh proposed to call at trial. As a consequence, Walsh knew before he started that any prosecution of Fernandez was bound to fail in the end.

Walsh knew from the outset that any attempt to prosecute a CIA Chief of Station was going to implicate top secret information that almost certainly would not be able to be revealed at trial. Regulations promulgated by the Attorney General under the Classified Information Procedures Act require federal prosecutors before they indict a defendant to consult with the intelligence community in cases which implicate classified information. Walsh was obligated to follow those regulations yet he refused. And that refusal required Attorney General Richard Thornburgh, after Fernandez had been improperly indicted, to withhold from Fernandez classified information vital to his defense, thereby leading the judge in the case to dismiss the indictment on the eve of trial.

Fernandez was never accused of personal venality or official corruption. In fact, he was never even accused of having violated the Boland Amendments, the appropriations measures which from time to time between 1982 and 1987 placed restrictions on funding for the Nicaraguan Contras.

The prosecution of Fernandez was a tragedy. It ruined the career of an able and dedicated public servant and left him and his family with a $1.7 million unpaid legal bill. What is worse for this nation, it radically changed the culture of the CIA's clandestine service by making an organization which was once bold and resolute, tentative and uncertain. In fact, the irresponsible prosecution of Joe Fernandez by Independent Counsel Walsh, and Walsh's manifest indifference to the national security concerns of the Executive Branch of government, may have contributed significantly to the decision of President Bush in December 1989 to launch the invasion of Panama.

THE PANAMA DIMENSION

For years prior to 1989, Presidents Reagan and Bush had used every diplomatic and economic tool available to pressure General Manuel A. Noriega to relinquish power and leave Panama. Nothing had worked.

During the summer of 1989, senior representatives of CIA and other U.S. intelligence agencies were embroiled in an acrimonious debate with Walsh over whether the intelligence community was going to release secret information necessary to permit the Fernandez case to go to trial. In October 1989, as that debate was about to culminate, several Panamanian nationals informed CIA that they were going to mount a coup d'etat against Noriega. Normally, the CIA would have promptly taken steps to facilitate the coup to minimize bloodshed and to bring about a result which was consistent with U.S. foreign policy objectives.

That did not happen. Instead of stepping forward, CIA personnel hung back. Executive Order No. 12333 expressly forbids any person acting for, or on behalf of, the United States government from engaging in assassinations. Coups are messy enterprises in which the targets of the coup sometimes get killed. If United States government representatives were to get involved in the Noriega operation, and Noriega were to be killed, American intelligence officers might find themselves like Fernandez in criminal jeopardy. Even though CIA officials had not instigated the coup, and even though the plan for the coup had not contemplated that Noriega be eliminated, were Noriega to die, the fear was that someone in Washington might charge that CIA officers had broken United States law. CIA already had one field officer in the dock; it did not want any more.

For hours, the leaders of the coup held Noriega at gunpoint. In Washington, decision-makers, many of whom were having to contend with Walsh over the Fernandez case, tried to decide whether, and to what extent, the United States might be able to be involved. In the meantime, the United States government did nothing to help bring the coup to a successful conclusion. Eventually, the coup-attempt failed and Noriega executed as many of those who had been involved as he could find.

Instead of being deposed, Noriega was emboldened. In December 1989, in a move which manifested remarkable hubris even for Noriega, he declared war on the United States. President Bush concluded that the United States could tolerate Noriega no longer and he ordered the Panama invasion.

The existence of the Independent Counsel Statute and the prosecution of Joe Fernandez in a manner that reflected a callous indifference to the national security interests of the United States had the effect of preventing the American intelligence community from seizing the opportunity presented in October 1989 to remove Noriega from power peacefully. While Operation Just Cause was ultimately successful, it cost vast treasure and the lives of 23 American servicemen and hundreds of Panamanians.

CONCLUSION

It is hard to imagine a clearer living example of the kind of prosecutorial excesses against which Justice Robert Jackson warned us than the record which has been amassed by Independent Counsel Lawrence E. Walsh. With the consideration of H.R. 811, Congress has an opportunity to look history full in the face and to learn the lessons which it seeks to teach. Re-enactment of the Independent Counsel Statute is not necessary. The very existence of such a law represents a Congressional vote of "no confidence" in the professional prosecutors who make their careers in the Department of Justice. There is little evidence to indicate that such lack of faith in the established processes of the Executive Branch of government are justified. Also, in a situation like Iran-Contra, the Independent Counsel Statute poses a threat to this nation's national security apparatus. Simply put, it is a bad law which should not be re-enacted.

THE CARIBBEAN BASIN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, the Caribbean Basin Free-Trade Agreements Act, to expand preferential trade benefits currently granted to countries in the Caribbean region under the Caribbean Basin Initiative [CBI] program and to encourage these countries to enter into reciprocal free-trade agreements with the United States. I regard the text of this bill as a basis for discussion and public comment. I intend to consult closely with the Caribbean countries as well as the private sector and the administration on its content.

Congress authorized the CBI program in 1983, as a response to the economic crisis in the region by granting duty-free access for Caribbean products to the U.S. market and certain tax benefits to encourage investment and industrial development. My intent has always been to expand bilateral trade and investment, rather than unilateral aid.

In 1990, Congress improved the benefits and made the program permanent under the so-called CBI II legislation. From the beginning, however, major product sectors significant to the Caribbean economies and to the success of the program, such as textiles and apparel, footwear, and certain leather-related products, have been excluded from CBI duty-free treatment.

The 24 Caribbean and Central American CBI beneficiary countries are now concerned that the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA] will adversely impact them by attracting existing and potential investment from the region to Mexico, particularly in the textile and apparel sector. The bill I introduce today would provide so-called NAFTA parity to these countries by granting them the same tariff and quota treatment that will apply to imports from Mexico of textiles and apparel and other products currently excluded from the CBI program once the NAFTA enters into force.

The bill also lays the groundwork for the CBI to become part of longer term economic integration of the entire Western Hemisphere. The bill limits NAFTA parity to a maximum of 3 years and authorizes the President in the interim to seek comprehensive reciprocal trade agreements under extended Congressional fast-track implementing procedures with Caribbean countries. The extension of additional benefits on a permanent basis is thereby linked to countries entering into reciprocal free-trade agreements or acceding to the NAFTA in lieu of the current unilateral CBI program.

I am including a section-by-section summary of the proposed legislation with this statement. I welcome your views and comments on this proposal, and your support, in order to best fulfill U.S. commitments to increase the economic, social, and political stability of this vital Caribbean region.

SUMMARY OF THE CARIBBEAN BASIN FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Section 1. Short title.

Section 1 provides that the Act may be cited as the "Caribbean Basin Free Trade Agreements Act."

Section 2. Congressional findings.

Section 2 contains various findings by the Congress on the need for the Act, including to preserve economic advantages under the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI) program and avoid potential diversion of investment from the region to Mexico as a result of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and to encourage further reciprocal free trade agreements in the Western Hemisphere.

TITLE I—RELATIONSHIP OF NAFTA IMPLEMENTATION TO THE OPERATION OF THE CARIBBEAN BASIN INITIATIVE

Section 101. Temporary provision to provide NAFTA parity to beneficiary country economies.

Section 101 amends section 213(b) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act to provide tariff and quota treatment on imports from CBI beneficiary countries of articles currently excluded from duty-free treatment—textiles and apparel subject to textile agreements; footwear; handbags, luggage, flat goods, work gloves, and leather wearing apparel; canned tuna; petroleum and petroleum products; and watches and watch parts—that is identical to the treatment accorded like articles imported from Mexico under the NAFTA (so-called "NAFTA parity") during a temporary period of up to 3 years. This transitional period would begin on the date that the NAFTA enters into force for the United States, and end on the date that either NAFTA accession or a reciprocal free trade agreement enters into force with the beneficiary country or on the third anniversary of the temporary treatment, whichever is earlier. Criteria under the present program for beneficiary country status would also apply to the NAFTA parity benefits.

NAFTA tariff and quota treatment (lower tariffs or duty-free treatment) would apply to articles which meet NAFTA rules of origin (treating only the United States and CBI beneficiary countries as Parties for this purpose) and subject to NAFTA customs procedures. Imports of currently excluded articles which do not meet the conditions for NAFTA parity would continue to be excluded from the CBI program.

In addition, textile and apparel articles assembled in CBI beneficiary countries from fabrics wholly formed and cut in the United States and goods identified as Caribbean handloomed, handmade, or folklore articles would receive duty-free and quota-free treatment as provided such imports from Mexico under the NAFTA.

The U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) is authorized to establish tariff preferential levels (tariff-rate quotas with duties identical to those applied to like imports from Mexico) during the transition period for Caribbean products that do not meet NAFTA origin rules, after consulting with the domestic industry and other interested parties on the specific articles to be covered, annual quantity levels and adjustments, allocations among beneficiary countries, and other provisions. As with Mexico under the NAFTA, the USTR shall negotiate reductions in existing bilateral textile agreements to reflect quota-free treatment on originating articles during the transition period.

The duty rate resulting from 20 percent reductions provided under the present CBI program or the NAFTA rate, whichever is lower, would apply to imports of handbags, luggage, flat goods, work gloves, and leather wearing apparel during the transition period.

All imports receiving NAFTA treatment would be subject to NAFTA emergency safeguard authorities during the transition period. For ease of administration, NAFTA safeguard authorities would also apply to non-originating textile and apparel imports from CBI beneficiaries.

Duty-free treatment granted under the existing CBI program would continue unchanged during the transition period and would continue thereafter for countries that do not accede to the NAFTA or enter into free trade agreements, subject to the same criteria and conditions as under the present program.

Section 102. Effect of NAFTA on sugar imports from beneficiary countries.

Section 102 requires the President to monitor the effects, if any, of the NAFTA on CBI beneficiary country access to the U.S. sugar market. If he considers NAFTA implementation is affecting or will likely affect market access adversely, the President shall take action after consulting with interested parties and appropriate committees of the Congress or propose legislation necessary or appropriate to ameliorate such effects.

TITLE II—CARIBBEAN BASIN FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

Section 201. Trade Agreement Feasibility and Objectives.

Section 201 requires the USTR, as soon as practicable, to determine the desirability and feasibility of, and the likely timing for, any CBI beneficiary country or group of countries either to (1) accede to the NAFTA and the supplemental agreements on environmental, labor, and import issues, as appropriate, subject to approval, or (2) enter into comprehensive reciprocal trade agreements with the United States that contain comparable provisions to the NAFTA and achieve applicable objectives under existing CBI and trade agreement authorities.

Section 202. Trade agreement negotiating authority.

Section 202 authorizes the President, before June 1, 1996, to enter into trade agreements with one or more CBI beneficiary countries, subject to prior consultation requirements with Congressional committees of jurisdiction as under section 1102 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, except that the 60-legislative day period for committee disapproval of negotiations of "fast track" bilateral agreements would not apply.

Section 203. Implementation of trade agreements.

Section 203 applies "fast track" procedures to Congressional consideration of implementing legislation for Caribbean Basin free trade agreements, including the required minimum 90-calendar day advance notice by the President to the Congress of his intention to enter into such agreements.

TRIBUTE TO MS. KAREN S. DAVIS

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize one of my constituents, Karen S. Davis, who was selected as the 1993 Child Advocate by the Children's Play Room, a parent-child resource center located in Harrisburg, PA. An awards ceremony will be held on Saturday, March 27, 1993, to honor Ms. Davis for her hard work and dedication to helping young people, The board of directors of the Children's Play Room will present the award to Ms. Davis at this ceremony.

Throughout her volunteer career, Ms. Davis has worked to make the future much brighter for many children in south central Pennsylvania. Her accomplishments include the establishment of the John B. Warden Scholarship Fund, to provide transportation for needy families to attend Children's Play Room activities and events, and the Library of Adapted Toys and Equipment Program, a program serving children with developmental delays. She has chaired and served on the board of directors for numerous community groups including Parents Anonymous of Central Pennsylvania, the United Way, and the Hemlock Girl Scout Council.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Davis certainly is an inspiration and is most deserving of this award. Too often dedicated volunteers receive only the personal satisfaction gained from their work. Awards such as this not only will recognize one outstanding individual, but I hope also will help promote the spirit of volunteerism in our communities. On behalf of the people of south central Pennsylvania, I would like to congratulate Ms. Davis and thank her for many years of service.

BUDGET RESOLUTIONS DO NOT GO FAR ENOUGH

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, over the course of the last several weeks, the media has followed our efforts to design a budget resolution which answers the challenge of our constituents to once and for all do something about our horrible national debt. While much has been made of how much deficit reduction is contained in each of the competing budget plans, little, if any attention has been paid to how each of the plans would affect our national debt.

Regardless of what plan we ultimately agree to, the national debt would increase between $900 billion and $1 trillion over the next 5 years. In my opinion, that is too much.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot reduce the national debt while we are adding to it. Nor can we be satisfied with budgets which are only $150 or $200 billion out of balance. We must be prepared, for the sake of the financial welfare of our future generations, to not only reduce the rate of growth of annual deficits, but to eliminate them entirely, to live only within our means and to finally begin to reduce the national debt.

The best and fairest way I can think of to achieve our goal of a balanced budget is to simply freeze Federal spending, or allow it to grow no more than 1 or 2 percent each year. If aggregate spending levels were to be capped, this body would be forced to once and for all examine its current priorities, and make cuts where cuts are needed and eliminate entirely those programs which no longer serve a useful purpose. such a cap would go

a long way toward forcing upon us a sense of fiscal responsibility which this body has avoided for too long.

HILLARY'S HEALTH CARE LIST—UNVEILED AT LAST

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, health care is an important issue to all Americans. This is why so many of my constituents have been concerned about the clandestine nature of the First Lady's Health Care Task Force. With all the secrecy of the Manhattan project, this shadow government has been working behind closed doors to develop a health care system for the United States, the world's model for free and open debate.

A Federal judge ruled last week that Hillary Rodham Clinton's task force must open its meetings to comply with Federal sunshine laws and the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Still, do we know who is serving on this super-secret panel? And to whom are they accountable?

Mr. Speaker, the Albany Times-Union said it best in an editorial on this issue: "Neither reform nor democracy is served in secrecy." Today I am submitting in the RECORD, making it public for the first time, a complete and comprehensive list—some 538 names—of individuals serving on the First Lady's Task Force on Health Care Reform.

This country has learned, over two centuries, that a free and unfettered exchange in public is the best medicine for any of our Nation's problems. And in the end, as the First Lady will soon learn, the truth will come out.

OPEN UP HEALTH CARE DEBATE

The American Medical Association is upset that the President's wife, Hillary Rodham Clinton, will not allow their representatives to give their point of view, and otherwise have their position represented, on the health care reform task force that she heads.

The apparent rationale for the AMA's exclusion is that the First Lady does not want an "interest group" to corrupt the findings and conclusions of the task force. The AMA responds that attempting to solve the nation's health care problems—or even to understand them—without the advice of the nation's doctors is bizarre.

We are inclined to agree with the AMA, and with the federal judge who ruled Wednesday that the task force's secrecy violates statutory law. This is not to say that we think the AMA membership consistently puts the national interest above its own, considerably more narrow, concerns.

Yet, on the issue of the AMA's exclusion, it is difficult to take a position for the simple reason that no one seems to know who is on the task force. The names of its members are being kept secret, as are the group's meetings. Indeed, very little is known about the composition of the panel, aside from the report that it is loaded with lawyers.

Yet, don't lawyers have their own, narrow, interest in how medicine is conducted? Don't they have an interest, for example, in whether medical malpractice suits are statutorily limited or unlimited?

At this point, the most troubling aspect of Mrs. Clinton's task force isn't that it doesn't include the voice of the AMA. It's that it has done its work so clandestinely. This group—almost wholly unknown—might very well be laying the foundation for the biggest overhaul of America's health care system in history. Yet we know almost nothing about it.

The First Lady wants to keep the "interest groups" out. But deciding what constitutes an interest group—especially in the case of health care, which affects everyone—would seem to be rather arbitrary. Aren't those who receive health care benefits an "interest"? Aren't those who pay for it an "interest"? Aren't those who provide it? Those who work for the providers?

The presumption Mrs. Clinton is operating on strikes us as alarming. It is that what is best for America can best be decided by a "disinterested" elite, rather than by the rough-and-tumble process of open debate and all that goes with that messy process.

The whole thing raises serious questions, and not just about the future of health care. It raises the question about just how much influence one unelected person, unaccountable to the voters, is going to wield over the next four years.

FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON'S HEALTH CARE REFORM TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP

Addison, Laverne.
Addisonburton, Laverne.
Adler, Michele.
Aiken, Linda.
Alberghini, Theresa.
Allen, Lucy.
Alpert, Cynthia.
Altman, David.
Altman, Stuart.
Altmire, Jason.
Anderson, Bob.
Anderson, Robert.
Antos, Joe.
Arnett, Ross.
Arons, Bernie.
Ash, Sherry.
Atkinson, Leslie.
Aukerman, Glen.
Austein, Cheryl.
Baker, Lawrence.
Ball, Judy.
Bandeian, Stephen.
Banthin, Jessica.
Baquet, Claudia.
Barbour, Galen.
Barstow, Scott.
Baum, Nancy.
Beason, Charlotte.
Beauregard, Karen.
Berenson, Robert.
Bergthold, Linda.
Berner, Kevin.
Berry, Roger.
Besteman, Jacqueline.
Beverly, John.
Bielecki, Colleen.
Biewirth, Maggie.
Billy, Carrie.
Bischoff, Victoria.
Blackburn, Kate.
Blauwet, Roger.
Bloch, Robert.
Block, Abby.
Bloss, Greg.
Blumenthal, Susan.
Bode, Molly.
Boehm, Jennifer.
Boerum, Denise.
Boorstin, Bob.
Borzi, Phyllis.
Brand, Marcia.
Brew, Bill.
Briggs, Bette.
Brock, C.
Brodbeck, Laura.
Brostrom, Molly.
Brown, Richard.
Bruns, Kevin.
Buck, Jeff.
Buckingham, Warren.
Budetti, Peter.
Bueno, Irene.
Buffington, Max.
Buonora, David.
Burner, Sally.
Burnett, Laird.
Burney, Ira.
Buto, Kathleen.
Butongol, Kathleen.
Callahan, Cathi.
Cameron, Alice.
Campbell, Laurence.
Carlson, Ron.
Cavanaugh, Sean.
Challinor, Joan.
Chambers, Caroline.
Chang, Debbie.
Charles, Gerald.
Chavez, Melba.
Clark, Robert.
Clark, William.
Clauser, Steven.
Claxton, Gary.
Clay, Jimmy.
Claypool, Robert.
Clemente, Frank.
Cohen, Allan.
Cohen, Joel.
Cohen, Rima.
Cooper, Barbara.
Cooper, David.
Cooper, Philip.
Copeland, Robert.
Coster, John.
Cox, Ken.
Creenfeld, Helaine.
Crow, Shelly.
Crump, Janice.
Curtis, Richard.
Curtis, Rick.
Cutler, David.
Daniels, Susan.
Davies, Monica.
Davis, Karen.
Davis, Rosemary.
Delew, Nancy.
Demlo, Linda.
Denham, Lori.
Denton, Denise.
Dergnan, Kathy.
Dewane, Mary.
Diegman, Kathy.
Dinkelacker, Bill.
Donahue, Agnes.
Doneski, Ellen.
Doty, Pam.
Doyle, Pat.
Drew, Nancy.
Drummand, Faye.
Duggan, Jim.
Dunn, Van.
Duzor, Deirdre.
Earley, Susan.
Eckert, Kevin.
Eddy, David.
Eddy, Judy.
Edgell, John.
Einholm, Ted.
Einhorn, Ted.
Elattar, Suzanne.
Elders, Jocelyn.
Emmer, Sue.
English, Mike.
Epstein, Arnold.
Ermann, Dan.
Errera, Paul.
Etheredge, Lynn.

Evans, David.
Evistness, Jessica.
Faletti, Tom.
Farley, Dean.
Feder, Judith.
Finan, Steve.
Finigan, Thomas.
Fischer, Celia.
Fish, Jim.
Fishbein, Louise.
Fiske, Mary.
Fitzmaurice, J.
Fleming, Mack.
Fletcher, Bennett.
Forbes, Rip.
Fortier, Julie.
France, Molly.
Franck, Becky.
Frank, Becky.
Frank, Richard.
Frantz, Molly.
Frasche, Mary.
Freeland, Mark.
Friedholm, Deann.
Friedman, Bernard.
Fuy, George.
Gagel, Barbara.
Gale, Joe.
Gatz, Carolyn.
Gaudette, Sylvia.
Gawande, Atol.
Gehan, Margery.
Gillingham, Robert.
Glaze, Steve.
Glied, Sherry.
Glieman, Ed.
Gold, Martha.
Goldman, Howard.
Goldman, Sybil.
Goldstone, Donald.
Goldwater, David.
Golub, Larry.
Goodman, Nancy.
Goodwin, Marsha.
Goody, Brigid.
Goplerud, Eric.
Gordon, Nancy.
Gore, Tipper.
Grams, Todd.
Greenberg, George.
Greenwald, Leslie.
Gross, Marcy.
Grundman, Martha.
Gust, Steve.
Hadley, Elizabeth.
Hadley, James.
Haman, Jeffrey.
Hamerschlag, Art.
Handy, Carolyn.
Harahan, Mary.
Hardock, Randy.
Harper, Mary.
Harris, Skila.
Harvell, Jennie.
Harvey, Molly.
Hash, Mike.
Hastings, Kathleen.
Haverkos, Harry.
Hayes, Charlotte.
Headley, Elwood.
Heath, Karen.
Heenan, Tricia.
Hellinger, Fred.
Hensley, Scott.
Hertz, Tom.
Hickman, Peter.
Hight, Joe.
Hill, Tim.
Hinz, Richard.
Hix, Mike.
Hoagwood, Kimberly.
Hogue, Bonnie.
Holtzblatt, Janet.
Horvath, Jane.
Horvath, Thomas.
Hosek, Susan.
Hovath, Jane.
Huckaby, Michelle.
Human, Jeff.
Hunan, Jeffrey.
Hunter, Gillian.
Ibson, Ralph.
Irwin, Jean.
Iskowritz, Michael.
Ivory, J.
Iwry, Mark.
Jackson, Paul.
Jacobs, Terry.
Jarboe, Kenan.
Jencks, Steve.
Jennings, Christopher.
Jensen, Peter.
Jodrey, Darrel.
Johnson, Don.
Joice, Sylvia.
Jones, Marcia.
Jones, Sandra.
Jorling, Jim.
Joseph-Fox, Yvette.
Justin, Murray.
Kass, David.
Katten, Azar.
Katz, Ruth.
Katzleavy, Judith.
Kazden, Bob.
Kazdin, Bob.
Kazdin, Robert.
Keene, Brad.
Keith, Sam.
Kelley, Lauren.
Kelley, Samuel.
Kemper, Peter.
Kendall, David.
Kennedy, Fortunata.
Kenyon, Kathleen.
Kepner, Colleen.
Kery, Pat.
Kichak, Nancy.
King, Andrea.
King, Gary.
King, Kathy.
King, Roland.
Klein, Jennifer.
Kolodner, Robert.
Koludner, Robert.
Koss, Shannah.
Krahauer, Henry.
Krakauer, Henry.
Kreuger, Alan.
Kronick, Rick.
Kruger, Alan.
Kursh, Gail.
Kutzera, Michael.
Kuzmack, Rich.
Langenbrunner, Jack.
Lasker, Roz.
Lavizzomourey, Risa.
Lawler, Gregory.
Lawson, Eric.
Lawson, Kurt.
Leathers, Howard.
Lee, Phil.
Lefkowitz, Bonnie.
Lehmann, Laurent.
Leshner, Alan.
Levine, Debbie.
Levine, Greg.
Levitt, Larry.
Levy, Helen.
Lewisidema, Deborah.
Lillie, Steve.
Lincoln, Michael.
Lindrew, Jerry.
Link, Ken.
Lipner, Robyn.
Lohr, Kathy.
Long, Steve.
Lopatin, Alan.
Lofti, Sharif.
Lubitz, James.
Lucas, Debbie.
Lutter, Randy.
Lyon, Andrew.
Magruder, Kathryn.
Maguire, Daniel.
Maloney, Daniel.
Manderscheid, Ron.
Manowitz, Michelle.
Mantel, Lewis.
Marconi, Katherine.
Martinez, Felix.
Mather, Susan.
Matton, Greg.
Mays, Jim.
McClenney-Elliott, Lucretia.
McConnell, Bruce.
McConnell, Steve.
McCusick, Dave.
McKee, Timothy.
McKenney, Nampeo.
McKer, Tim.
McNamee, Nikki.
Meadows, Cynthia.
Means, Kathy.
Melman, Lori.
Melnick, Dan.
Mika, Harriet.
Miller, Bernard.
Miller, Edward.
Miller, Melanie.
Miller, Mike.
Miller, Nancy.
Millman, Michael.
Mink, Doug.
Moeller, John.
Moeller, Jonathan.
Molloy, Jane.
Monheit, Alan.
Morgan, Jacqueline.
Mullan, Fitzhugh.
Munnell, Alicia.
Murguia, Janet.
Murray, John.
Murtha, Donald.
Narrow, David.
Nelson, Chuck.
Neuman, Tricia.
Nexon, David.
Nichols, Len.
Nichols, Marjorie.
Norman, Alline.
Norquist, Grayson.
O'Brien, Marygo.
Offner, Paul.
Ogden, John.
Omeara, Janis.
O'Neil, Patricia.
O'Neill, Kim.
Osher, Fred.
Otrin, Susan.
Pahwa, Raj.
Pang, Frederick.
Paradise, Julia.
Patel, Parashar.
Payne, Mary.
Payton, Sallyanne.
Picillo, Theresa.
Pigeon, Steve.
Pires, Sheila.
Plaut, Tom.
Pollitz, Karen.
Portez, Lisa.
Portman, Robert.
Posey, Kendall.
Potetz, Lisa.
Pratt, Donald.
Price, Andrea.
Purkiss, Cynthia.
Puskin, Dena.
Pyle, Thomas.
Quam, Lois.
Rader, Anya.

Rafuse, Bob.
Raymond, Victor.
Reeves, Linda.
Regier, Darrel.
Reinecke, Peter.
Reinhart, Uwe.
Reyes, Louane.
Rice, Cheri.
Richardson, Sally.
Ricketson, Denise.
Rivo, Marc.
Robinson, Sandra.
Rodriguez, Louis.
Rogers, David.
Rosen, Bob.
Rosenbaum, Sarah.
Rosenman, Pat.
Ross, Marjorie.
Roswell, Bob.
Rouse, Beatrice.
Rovin, Lisa.
Rowland, Diane.
Rozen, Robert.
Rueschemeyer, Simone.
Ruyle, Kenneth.
Ryan, Patrick.
Sage, William.
Salmon, Marla.
Sampson, Neil.
Samuelson, Ellen.
Satcher, David.
Scheckel, Lisa.
Scheppach, Raymond.
Schieber, George.
Schmid, Stuart.
Schneider, Andy.
Schulke, David.
Schultz, Bill.
Schuneman, Mary.
Schuster, Jim.
Scott, Sharon.
Seagrave, Chuck.
Shaffer, Ellen.
Sheiner, Louise.
Sheingold, Steven.
Sheldon, George.
Shinn, Ruth.
Shirley, Aaron.
Short, Elizabeth.
Short, Pam.
Short, Pamela.
Shriber, Donald.
Silva, John.
Silver, Jonathan.
Simon, Marsha.
Simpson, Bobby.
Siskind, Fred.
Slackman, Joel.
Smith, Barbara.
Smith, Curt.
Smith, Elmer.
Smith, Mark.
Smith, Mary.
Sobel, Larry.
Sochalski, Julie.
Sofaer, Shoshana.
Solomon, Dan.
Solomon, Loel.
Solomon, Marla.
Spaulding, Vernon.
Springer, Michael.
Starr, Paul.
Steele, Pamela.
Steinauer, Dennis.
Steinbrook, Erna.
Stephens, Sharman.
Stoline, Anne.
Stone, Robyn.
Stroul, Beth.
Suchinsky, Richard.
Sumaya, Ciro.
Svenonius, Diane.
Swire, Andy.
Sykes, Kathy.
Taeuber, Cynthia.
Taplin, Caroline.
Tarmey, Marjorie.
Taylor, Amy.
Taylor, Lois.
Terry, Donald.
Testoni, Maureen.
Thorpe, Ken.
Thurm, Kevin.
Tibaet, Geoff.
Tibbits, Paul.
Tims, Frank.
Torresgil, Fernando.
Trachtenberg, Alan.
Trapnell, Gordon.
Ukockis, James.
Valdez, Bob.
Vanderwater, Paul.
Varma, Vivek.
Varnhagen, Michele.
Veazey, Brenda.
Veloz, Richard.
Vistnes, Jessica.
Volpe, Lane.
Waldo, Dan.
Walker, Edwin.
Walters, Karen.
Wasserman, Mark.
Weich, Ron.
Weich, Ronald.
Weil, Alan.
Weiss, Gail.
Weiss, Marina.
Welch, Peter.
Welch, William.
Wellford, Suzanne.
Welsh, Peter.
Werner, Michael.
Weston, Jennifer.
Whang, Judy.
Wiener, Josh.
Wiggins, Cliff.
Williams, Christine.
Williamson, John.
Wills, Darryl.
Wilson, Frank.
Wilson, Mark.
Winslow, Walter.
Witter, Jon.
Witter, Jonathan.
Woo, Michael.
Woodward, Al.
Woolley, Barbara.
Wren, Robert.
Wyler, Bob.
Yamamoto, Alan.
Yoshikawa, Thomas.
Zarabozo, Carlos.
Zawistowich, Ludmila.
Zelman, Walter.
Zettler, Susan.
Zuvekas, Ann.

HELP HIV HAITIANS IN GUANTANAMO

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Murray Kempton which appeared in the March 14, 1993 Washington Post entitled "The Haitians, the President and the Colonel." The article reminds all who read it, of the simple humanity of individuals, in this case Col. Stephen Kinder and Col. Larry Zinser, who are the officers in charge of the 264 Haitians at our naval base in Guantanamo. Both men have tried to make an intolerable situation more tolerable for the majority of Haitians who are HIV positive and the many children who are not. Both have expressed their concern for these people by stating that they should be in the United States receiving medical care.

With the funds used to house the Haitians at the base, they could be receiving medical care as do people suffering from cancer and other illnesses. That Cardinal O'Connor is willing to give the Haitians treatment in the archdiocesan hospitals, speaks about those who would not spend one public cent on these unfortunate people. I implore the President to do the compassionate thing, to let the Haitians come here for treatment.

THE HAITIANS, THE PRESIDENT AND THE COLONEL

(By Murray Kempton)

The president of the United States gives no evidence of troubling his mind with the 264 Haitians who wait behind the barbed wire at our naval base in Guantanamo.

He could not be this indifferent if life had taught him that sooner or later history judges every president by the standards of personal honor that command us all to feel the consequences of not telling the truth to those whose one great hope we are.

Col. Stephen Kinder came to Guantanamo last September as military commander over its Haitian internees. His army career began 22 years ago, and he ran the camp on detached leave from the 18th Airborne Corps. Kinder is thus a not untypical specimen of the military that the young Bill Clinton said his generation loathed. The Haitian refugees can scarcely share that harsh assessment, because Col. Kinder was a better friend to them than any official civilian has bothered so far to be.

His charges, Kinder recalls, "kept looking at milestones, like they looked at the presidential election as a milestone."

Any why shouldn't they have? From May to November last, Bill Clinton, the candidate, denounced the Bush administration for snatching Haitian boat people from the open seas and forcing them home without distinction between those who were fleeing persecution and those merely poor and hungry.

From January until now, Clinton, the president, has maintained the Bush blockade and added a blimp to make it even more efficient. In July, candidate Clinton hailed as "right" a Court of Appeals decision voiding Bush's summary repatriation order; this month, President Clinton's Justice Department prayed the Supreme Court to overrule that finding.

And so another milestone has come and gone, and these stranded Haitians are no further along the road. All 264 of those penned on Guantanamo have been found qualified for political asylum. They are debarred because 216 of them have tested HIV-positive. The remainder are their dependents, mostly children, HIV-negative in the main so far.

The squalors of their camp cost the government $56 million a year, it could hardly be more expensive than that to let in 215 fully AIDS-developed patients and treat them as public charges. But such has not been the problem since Cardill John O'Connor offered to open his archdiocesan hospitals to those who are already sick and help find homes and jobs for those who aren't.

In the meanwhile, lawyers for the Justice Department and the Immigration and Naturalization Service were united last week in imploring U.S. District-Judge Sterling John-

son in Brooklyn to leave these unfortunates where they are in circumstances that one doctor has described as worse than prevail in a Louisiana hospital built for lepers and that the government insists are abounding with amenities. Conditions in the camp do indeed sound better than they were; and all the thanks seems to be Col. Kinder's duo.

A portion of barbed wire was removed on his orders to permit access to the soccer field for the internees. He found them a television set and opened the possibility of their calling home. He provided access to sodas and even arranged for the children to visit the base McDonald's for hitherto unimaginable delights that ought to commend them to William J. Clinton's fellow feelings. All these are the small graces Col. Kinder's civilian betters once denied and now set their lawyers to vaunting as though they were their own. Kinder's final word when his duty tour ended was to urge that the Guantanamo camp be closed and its prisoners transferred for proper care in the mainland. Marine Col. Larry Zinger, his successor, expressed the same opinion when he observed in February that "my heart says that they ought to be in the United States."

From the president of the United States all the way down the line, the civilians do not yet know what these soldiers know, which is that we are finally judged for what we do unto the least of our brothers and sisters.

THE CHILD LABOR DETERRENCE ACT OF 1993

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation along with Senator TOM HARKIN that will prohibit the importation of products made by children under 15 who are employed in factories or mines.

In 1986, the International Labor Organization [ILO] estimated the number of working children under the age of 15 to be at least 200 million worldwide.

Just last year, the ILO issued a 105-page report on the worsening child labor situation and called upon governments to tighten legislation against child labor and improve enforcement and education. Children younger than 14 account for as much as 11 percent of the work force in some Asian countries. In India alone there are an estimated 44 million working children. In Latin America, more than one-quarter of the children are thought to work.

Millions of children, especially in developing countries, can be found working in such dangerous industries as mining, metal works, glass and fireworks manufacturing, commonly without any protection or awareness of the health risks. Often these children are the victims of burns and cuts; many are maimed and left miserably handicapped; and many more contract diseases that lead to death or to incapacitation for life. In recent years Cox newspapers in a series called "Stolen Childhood" and the Christian Science Monitor in a series called "Children in Darkness" documented in detail the heart-wrenching consequences and scope of global exploitation of children in the workplace. I'd be happy to provide reprints on request.

Here are a couple of examples of what they found:

In Thailand, thousand of young peasant girls work seven days a week inside hole-in-the-wall Bangkok factories called "shophouses" for less than seven cents an hour.

Shadab is 9. Since he was 6, he has spent 12 hours a day, six days a week, squatting in semi-darkness on damp ground, polishing little pieces of metal on high-speed grinding wheel. In the lock factory where he works, the gloom is only broken by a few narrow shafts of light entering through holes in the brick walls, and by a single light bulb. The air is visibly, palpably thick with metal dust, the temperature about 120° F. The bare floor is damp with acid that sloshes from big vats onto the ground. The factory where Shadab works is in Abigash, 80 miles southeast of New Delhi. It employs nine people, five of whom are under 12. The adults are paid more than three times as much as the children, though many of their tasks are the same.

The misery associated with international trading of products made by exploited children goes on out of sight and, almost always, out of mind. Once in a great while, the well-to-do American consumer is jolted upon learning that the beautiful, hand-knotted rug that he bought for $449 at Macy's was made by 7-year-old Moroccan girls who are lucky if they are paid 90 cents a day.

That children are working and sometimes must, is unacceptable, but that they should be forced to work under conditions demonstrably dangerous to their health and safety is reprehensible and must be discouraged in all countries, regardless of differing stages of development. A recent World Health Organization [WHO] study has found that compared with adults, children tend to react differently and more severely when exposed to chemical substances and physical agents at work. There is a growing body of research evidence indicating that the exposure limits recommended for adult workers are not adequate for protecting children. Surely, no children should be exposed to extremely toxic chemicals or to dangerous physical agents like ionizing radiation.

To hear some people talk, we should not be disturbed that imports entering the American marketplace are sometimes made by children working under barbaric conditions. We are told nothing can be done to stop the suffering and, besides, it is none of our business. Still others, knowing in their hearts that they are profiting from something very wrong, seek to forestall U.S. action and tell us to wait for multilateral action. Some of the same bad actors then proceed to quietly frustrate any consensus for international action at the GATT or elsewhere.

I am fervently opposed to the commercial exploitation of children in the workplace. Moreover, I do not believe it is fair to ask American workers to compete with imports made by brutalized children slaving away under medieval working conditions.

Sadly, the number of children working and the scale of human suffering increase every year, despite the existence of more than 20 ILO conventions on child labor and innumerable pieces of high-sounding national legislation in many countries which purportedly prohibit the employment of children under the age of 15. Something else clearly must be done to effectively deter the exploitation of children in the workplace.

I think a key to effective action is drying up international markets for goods made by exploited children.

America should push for the rules of international trade to be changed to pointedly discourage child labor, especially in industry and mining. The basic human rights of children deserve at least as much GATT protection as is already provided to the intellectual property rights of businessmen and to the capital investments of financiers. Simple fairness and due regard for American workers require that we settle for nothing less.

But I also recognize that securing international agreement to outlaw trade in goods made by exploited children will not be easily attained. While the need to act is widely recognized, the political will to do so has been surely lacking. That is precisely why the U.S. should break the long stalemate and move expeditiously to enact legislation to prohibit imports made by children exploited in the workplace. Toward that end, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleagues in the House and U.S. Senator TOM HARKIN in sponsoring the Child Labor Deterrence Act of 1993.

In shaping U.S. trade policy to discourage the exploitation of children in the workplace, our bill follows a few straightforward guidelines. First, it should be acknowledged that child labor cannot practically be eradicated overnight. Rather priority should go in the near-term to stopping the most egregious forms of exploitation of children in the workplace around the world. In our opinion, the widest possible international consensus can be mobilized around the proposition that children under 15 should not be allowed to work in industry or mining. This approach would prevent younger children from being put to work in occupations where they would be in the greatest danger of traumatic injury or occupational disease.

Second, the U.S. Department of Labor has both the commitment and the expertise to compile and maintain a list of foreign industries and countries that condone child labor in industry and mining for the production of exports. Identifying such foreign industries and host countries each year and releasing that information to the congress and to the general public will alert U.S. importers to be on the lookout to avoid trafficking in child labor products from any of the listed offenders.

Third, rather than placing the onus solely upon the U.S. Government to make certain that manufactured products imported into America are not made by exploited children, that responsibility should be placed primarily upon the importers themselves. Our bill simply requires that U.S. importers, as a condition for bringing a manufactured product into the American marketplace, take reasonable steps and certify in writing that such product was not made by children under the age of 15. Under this approach, eligibility to import would be treated as the privilege that it is and basic standards would need to be upheld if an importer wants to retain the privilege. In the course of doing business, it is reasonable to expect foreign producers and importers not to undermine the international trading system by

trafficking in manufactured products made by exploited children.

Fourth, stiff civil and criminal penalties would be imposed upon importers who knowingly violate the prohibition against bringing into the U.S. market manufactured products made by exploited children. Those tempted to violate the import ban would be running the risk that investigators from inside or outside the U.S. Government at anytime will uncover evidence that could be brought to bear in administrative review proceedings and/or a court of law.

Fifth, the United States should push for multilateral action to redress the commercial exploitation of children. The President should seek an agreement with other trading nations to invoke a worldwide ban on trade in products, in whole or in part, made by children under age 15 who are employed in industry or mining.

In conclusion, we recognize that to avoid chaos and global stability, the international trading system must operate according to basic rules of fairness. The fact that current GATT rules assiduously protect property rights, while basically ignoring the rights of working people, including children, reveals much more about our priorities than our logic and ethics. But we have the capacity to change this situation. Access to the American marketplace is powerful leverage that should be used positively to encourage foreign producers and importers to treat defenseless children with dignity, rather than contempt. We cannot accept the bizarre reasoning and skewed priorities whereby international rules and U.S. import laws now protect endangered animals and plants, but remain silent on imports made by children shamelessly exploited in the workplace.

A TRIBUTE TO THE TEXAS TECH LADY RAIDERS

HON. LARRY COMBEST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the women's basketball team at Texas Tech University in Lubbock, TX; the Lady Raiders.

With a sweeping victory in the Southwest Conference basketball tournament in Dallas, the No. 5 ranked Lady Raiders have propelled themselves into the NCAA Women's Basketball Tournament for the sixth time. They will face Washington in the tournament's second round on Saturday, March 20.

A team does not earn national honors just by chance. The Lady Raiders have advanced to a higher level of competition under the watchfull eye of Head Coach Marsha Sharp, who has been selected as Coach of the Year by the Women's Basketball News Service. Coach Sharp's leadership and dedication are evident in the Lady Raiders's highly successful record, as they have won 30 of their past 31 games.

Also instrumental to the Lady Raider's success is forward Sheryl Swoops, of Brownfield, TX. Swoops was named player of the year by Sports Illustrated and USA Today. The six-foot tall All-American senior was also named 1992–93 women's basketball player of the year, for the third time this season. Swoops also earned the honor of Southwest Conference player of the year for a second season in a row. The success of the Lady Raiders can be credited to strong leadership and highly talented players such as Sheryl Swoops.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to recognize the Texas Tech University Lady Raiders, a team who has turned teamwork, dedication, and persistence into a winning combination and a winning record. A team such as the Lady Raiders is deserving of any honors they receive. I congratulate them on their successful record, and wish them the best of luck during the NCAA tournament.

ALCOHOL INGREDIENT LABELING ACT

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today, along with several of my colleagues who were cosponsors of the legislation last year, I reintroduce the Alcohol Labeling Act. This low-cost proposal requires makers of alcoholic beverages to label each beverage container with the alcohol, other ingredients, and calories it contains.

President Clinton has pointed out that abuse of legal drugs accounts for a very large chunk of our spiraling health care costs. In turn, failing to control health care costs will stymie deficit reduction efforts. Providing consumers with the information they need to make good decisions about drinking is a sound first step in the direction of reforming our national alcohol policy.

We omitted alcoholic beverages when we passed nutrition labeling requirements 2 years ago. As a result, we are still burdened with an alcohol labeling law that dates from the prohibition era of the 1930's. It is so inconsistent that, on the one hand, alcohol contents of wine and distilled spirits must be disclosed, and, on the other hand, beer and malt liquor are not permitted to print alcohol contents on their labels.

Surgeon General Antonia Novello identified the need for labeling alcohol contents at a Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families hearing entitled "Underage Drinking." She explained to committee members that young, inexperienced drinkers have an urgent need for a user-friendly measure of beverage potency.

This bill creates a new, straightforward unit of serving size called the drink. One drink equals 0.6 ounces of alcohol—the amount usually found in one beer, or one shot of distilled spirits or one glass of wine. Hopefully, a standard gage of the impairment caused by an alcoholic beverage will help avoid the teen overdose deaths we suffer every year.

Binge drinking has not decreased appreciably among teens in recent years—in 1991, 5.4 million junior and senior high school students reported consuming five or more drinks in a row. In one well-publicized case, several teens fatally overdosed on Cisco, a high-octane product that packed the equivalent of five shots of vodka into a container the size of a single beer bottle.

Young consumers are not the only ones who will profit from a knowledge of the contents of alcoholic beverages. Diabetics and others with diet-sensitive health conditions need to know exactly what they are consuming.

The only cost to the taxpayer is $500,000 for a toll-free number—similar to the existing 1–800–Cocaine hotline—for referral for help with a drinking problem. This number and all required information will be legibly printed on each container.

Groups ranging from the Academy of Pediatrics to coalitions of major insurance companies have endorsed this legislation. Several major beer manufacturers have endorsed the notion of disclosing alcohol contents, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms is in the process of releasing interim, voluntary regulations to allow them to do so.

Predictably, some segments of the alcohol industry have complained about the expense of printing new labels, and others within the industry have called the required health information unnecessary or burdensome. Obviously, some expense will be involved, but it will be required only once, and no company will face a competitive disadvantage because all companies must comply.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of mandating ingredient labeling on alcoholic beverages. As individuals, we need this information in order to be more responsible in our use of alcohol. As a nation, we must end marketing practices that mislead and target our youth.

TRIBUTE TO JOHANN "HANS" STRUFF

HON. RICK SANTORUM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to pay tribute to one of Pittsburgh's good citizens Johann "Hans" Struff who is retiring from dedicated service in the Greater Beneficial Union of Pittsburgh [GBU].

Upon his retirement, he'll be heeding Horace Greeley's advice to "Go west, young man, go west." Hans and Karla will take up residence in California joining their son Lothar and their daughter Sylvia and their respective families, including their two young grandsons, Dylan and Alexander.

Never one to do things half-heartedly, Brother Hans has been an active and vibrant member of GBU since 1963 when he joined the society in Toledo, OH. He held various district offices throughout his years in Toledo from auditor to president. Additionally, in 1966 he became a district representative and proceeded to become GBU's top producer for many years. In fact, he was the first district representative to qualify for the Sales Leader Club and the President's Millionaire Club.

In 1966 and 1970, he served as a national delegate to GBU's National Conventions. At

the 1970 convention, Hans was elected regional vice president—south and held that position until July 1981 when he was elected national secretary of the GBU. Following that election, he and his wife Karla relocated to Pittsburgh. Then, at the 1990 convention, the offices of national secretary and national treasurer were combined, and Brother Struff became GBU's first national secretary/treasurer.

Being a dedicated fraternalist, Hans Struff has also served the fraternal benefit system well at both the State and national levels.

From 1972 to 1982, Brother Struff was a member of the board of the Ohio Fraternal Congress, serving as president of the congress in 1980–81. At the OFC's 1986 annual meeting, Hans was selected as its Fraternalist of the Year. After moving to Pennsylvania, he took an active role in the Pennsylvania Fraternal Congress and was a member of its board of directors from October 1989 through October 1992. During the year 1990–91, Brother Struff was president of the PFC, thus setting another first for a GBU officer by having served as president of two different State fraternal congresses.

On the national scene, Hans Struff has given generously of his time on behalf of the National Fraternal Congress of America. He served as chairman of many committees, including the credentials, membership, and Fraternalist of the Year committees throughout the years, beginning in 1973 when he first attended an NFCA annual meeting. In 1988 he was elected to serve a 3-year term on the NFCA board, and that same year he was chosen secretary/treasurer of the NFCA Secretaries section. At the 1990 annual meeting, Hans was elected to serve as the section's president.

Among his many accomplishments, Brother Struff is extremely proud to have been one of the original founders of the famous Toledo German-American Festival Society. He also has acted as the master of ceremonies at the Cleveland Octoberfest since 1979 and subsequently was named Honorary Lieutenant Governor of the State of Ohio on October 16, 1979. In 1986 he received a citation from the Ohio State House of Representatives commending him for his many contributions to the Midwest (Cleveland) Octoberfest.

A date which will always have a special place in Brother Hans' memory is November 15, 1990. That day, at the German Consulate in New York City, Dr. Leopold B. von Bredow, the consul general, presented him with the Cross of the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany. This decoration was conferred on Brother Struff in recognition of his significant contributions to the strengthening of cultural relations between the United States of America, his adopted homeland, and Germany, the land of his birth.

As Brother Hans prepares for his leave-taking, we all know we shall miss him greatly. His friendly smile and charming personality have endeared him to all who know him, and their numbers are legion. He'll take with him our best wishes for a healthy and happy retirement, and may he and Karla enjoy many, many years together, basking in the California sunshine.

THE CRIMINAL ALIENS DEPORTATION ACT OF 1993

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today, along with my colleague BILL MCCOLLUM, as an original cosponsor, of the Criminal Aliens Deportation Act of 1993. The problem of criminal aliens crowding our prisons, especially on the State and local level, grows worse each day. We need to place a much greater emphasis on efforts to identify, apprehend, and remove criminal aliens from the United States, particularly those involved in drug-related or violent criminal activity. The purpose of our legislation is to set up procedures to deport criminal aliens from the United States as expeditiously as possible.

Our proposal will streamline the deportation process in two general respects. First, it will expand the most serious class of Federal and State crimes—known as aggravated felonies—for which an alien may be expeditiously deported. Second, the proposal will ensure that aliens convicted of aggravated felonies are deported as quickly as possible upon completion of their sentence. In the case of permanent resident aliens convicted in Federal court, a final deportation order could be issued at an alien's criminal sentencing hearing. For all other aggravated felon aliens, an administratively final deportation order could be issued by the Attorney General, obviating an unnecessary and burdensome administrative hearing process. Judicial review for both categories of aggravated felon aliens would remain. Our proposal will also increase the current penalties against the following classes of aliens: First, those who have been formally deported but who reenter the country without permission, and second, those aliens who have received a final, unappealable order of deportation, but who have failed to depart the country within the required period of time. These toughened penalties are designed to deter illegal aliens who are repeat offenders. The Criminal Aliens Deportation Act of 1993 will not increase our current deficit and meets the pay-as-you-go requirements of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act.

The problems in California with respect to criminal aliens have become insurmountable. California is incurring heavy costs associated with incarcerating criminal aliens in State correctional facilities. There are more than 15,000 undocumented aliens in our State's prison system, at an annual cost of about $330 million. Federal law currently requires the INS to take custody of, and begin deportation proceedings against, undocumented aliens who have been convicted of violent felonies and who have served their minimum sentences, making them eligible for early release into supervised custody. Unfortunately, this procedure has slipped through the cracks, and there has been a lack of cooperation between local and Federal authorities, allowing illegals to be released to the streets rather than to INS officials for deportation proceedings. One of the major flaws in our current deportation process is that the INS lacks sufficient detention space, therefore the alien is paroled into the community with instructions to report several months later for a hearing before an INS officer. Most of these aliens simply disappear and end up back in our State penal system a few months later. In Los Angeles County, more than half of incarcerated illegal aliens are rearrested within 1 year.

According to the GAO, less than 2 percent of the estimated 1 to 2 million deportable aliens are sent out of our country each year. More than 41,000 foreign born criminals are now incarcerated in State prisons, and nearly 20 percent of the total prison population is deportable. California is 185 percent over capacity in its prison population and houses approximately 15,000 illegals at a cost of $21,000 per year per inmate.

The 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act included a provision to reimburse States for costs incurred for the imprisonment of any illegal alien convicted of a felony. Governor Wilson is requesting a Federal reimbursement of $250 million in fiscal year 1993–94 to pay for the cost of keeping criminals illegally residing in California in the correctional system. The illegal immigration policy in this Nation rests in the hands of the Federal Government and carries with it a financial obligation to pay for services that are mandated by Federal Government policies. The failure of our Federal Government to shoulder its responsibility in this area continuously results in deportable criminal aliens being released on bond with the assumption they will appear for a deportation hearing at a later date. Instead, they descend upon our streets, where they continue to contribute to our Nation's drug and violent crime epidemic.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this proposal and the House to adopt the Criminal Aliens Deportation Act of 1993.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM SACKMANN

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his recent retirement, I would like to recognize Mr. William Sackmann, from my home of Hancock County, OH. I know I join many other friends from throughout our county in giving Mr. Sackmann our thanks, recognition, and best wishes for a happy and productive retirement.

Mr. Sackmann completed two terms as Hancock County Commissioner, following a long career as an attorney with Marathon Oil Co. at the headquarters in Findlay. He adopted Findlay as his home in 1955, after being transferred there in 1955. He began his career as a public official at age 64 and is now still going strong at age 73. Mr. Sackmann served the people of our county well during his tenure as county commissioner. Consistent with his Republican philosophy, he worked to streamline county government and coordinate it with the private sector.

Active with the Black Swamp Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America, I understand

that Mr. Sackmann intends to continue his volunteer work with that organization, as well as other local agencies. He also intends to practice law part time.

My best wishes to Bill Sackmann, his wife, Suzanne, and their children as Bill begins his retirement years.

STIMULUS PACKAGE MAY INCREASE LEAD POISONING AMONG CONSTRUCTION WORKERS

HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has asked Congress to raise taxes, in part, to pay for his short-term economic stimulus package. As we debate H.R. 1335, the emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1993, we should also keep in mind some significant concerns regarding lead poisoning and the need to wait for worker training standards from the Environmental Protection Agency.

The Energy and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Health and the Environment recently held a hearing on the question of whether the highway infrastructure portion of the stimulus package would increase lead poisoning among workers by expanding the current activities involving removal of lead-based paint from bridges before EPA has acted to set out accredited worker and contractor training requirements. The testimony was compelling in making the case that accelerating projects without the safeguard of EPA training requirements would increase lead poisoning.

At the hearing, Dr. James Keogh from the occupational health project at the University of Maryland stated that during the early 1980's Baltimore was hit by a wave of lead-poisoning cases and that he suspects the magnitude of this epidemic was due in part to Congress's effort to stimulate the economy by increasing the number of road projects. Richard Dwyer, director of the Brotherhood of Carpenters' health and safety funds, stated that without specific training regarding the hazards of lead, where it is found, and the appropriate work practices necessary to work safely in environments where lead-based paint is present, OSHA standards, no matter how stringent, will not be effective. Mr. Dwyer also stated that "stimulus activities such as Farmers Home Administration grants for low-income housing, the National Trust for Historic Preservation Museum Properties deferred maintenance projects, and the Federal Building Energy Efficiency projects will all involve construction workers in the disturbance of lead-based paint. Other witnesses recounted the physically disabling problems of lead poisoning from the activities covered in the stimulus package."

Last year, former President Bush signed into law the Residential Lead-Based Hazard Reduction Act which required EPA to set training and certification standards for workers and contractors—including those engaged in paint removal from bridges and demolition activities—by April 1994. The act also authorizes training grants for these purposes. Members of Congress, labor unions, and the occupational health community all supported these requirements as critical to ensuring a safe working environment. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment noted in the recent hearing, the new training programs are not up and running and the current system simply does not provide adequate safeguards to protect workers and the public from lead poisoning.

With a 4.8-percent annual growth rate of the gross domestic product in the last quarter of 1993, seven consecutive quarters of growth, and the recent reports of over 350,000 new jobs in the economy in the last few months, the need to accelerate Federal spending through tax increases in the name of stimulus should not overtake prudent measures to protect workers. Obviously work done in fiscal year 1995 will be safer and performed under established EPA training standards. It would not make sense during the next 2 years to accelerate projects which, as stated at the hearing, would cause a wave of new lead-poisoning cases unless those projects must be done in the near term to provide for the structural safety of the bridges.

I should also note that the administration's plan to provide money only to projects which can implement funding in less than 90 days—a use quickly or lose provision—will make it impossible for States and municipalities to evaluate their training standards or even make short-term changes in worker protection practices for fear of losing the Federal funding.

This is not simply a matter of pumping more money into training. Establishing and making proper training available to workers will take time. Mr. Dean Carleson, from the Federal Highway Administration, stated that proper training would minimize health concerns and that the Highway Administration was not the proper agency to establish training standards. This can only affirm the need to proceed in a prudent fashion consistent with EPA training standards and with the mandates of the 1992 lead legislation.

CUT SPENDING FIRST

HON. DAN SCHAEFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, if there is one single message coming through loud and clear from my constituents about the President's deficit reduction proposals, it is simply this: Cut spending first. Eliminate wasteful and inefficient programs, they are telling me, before allowing any new tax increases or new spending.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am today submitting a plan that does just that. It is a list of $650 billion in program-specific budget cuts over 5 years, more than five times the total cuts proposed by the President and all without a single tax increase.

If these cuts are combined with modest restraint in the growth of new spending and some common sense budget reforms, we can eliminate the deficit—not just cut it in half.

Here, then, are the cuts I propose:

SCHAEFER BUDGET CUTS

(Dollars in billions: All savings reduce the appropriate budget cap)

Description	1994	1994–98
Cuts in defense spending:		
1. President Bush's proposed defense reductions	($5.300)	($74.800)
2. Consolidate intelligence agencies, as described by CBO	(0.355)	(8.470)
3. Defer procurement of a new aircraft carrier, as described by CBO	(0.009)	(1.807)
4. Terminate the C–17 aircraft program, as described by CBO	(0.180)	(8.630)
Subtotal defense spending cuts	(5.844)	(93.707)
Cuts in domestic mandatory spending:		
5. Cap the growth of non-Social Security mandatory spending by allowing increases in mandatory spending for new beneficiaries plus a full cost of living	(15.000)	(257.000)
6. End Federal farm subsidies for wealthy individuals with annual net taxable income over $120,000 and corporations with annual net taxable income over $5 million	(0.225)	(1.040)
7. End Federal export enhancement program bonuses for wealthy individuals with annual net taxable income over $120,000 and corporations with annual new taxable income over $5 million	(1.200)	(6.000)
8. End Federal market promotion program subsidies for wealthy individuals with annual net taxable income over $120,000 and corporations with annual net taxable income over $5 million	(0.010)	(0.050)
9. End Federal International Trade Administration subsidies for wealthy individuals with annual net taxable income over $120,000 and corporations with annual net taxable income over $5 million	(0.090)	(0.130)
10. End Federal Minority Business Development Agency subsidies for wealthy individuals with annual net taxable income over $120,000 and corporations with annual net taxable income over $5 million	(0.009)	(0.049)
11. End Federal National Institute of Standards and Technology grants for wealthy individuals with annual net taxable income over $120,000 and corporations with annual net taxable income over $5 million	(0.039)	(0.199)
12. End Federal Disaster Relief Payments subsidies for wealthy individuals with annual net taxable income over $120,000 and corporations with annual net taxable income over $5 million	(0.001)	(0.005)
13. End Federal unemployment subsidies for wealthy individuals annual net taxable income over $120,000	(0.400)	(1.650)
14. Conform CSRS/FERS child-survivor benefits age to Social Security[1]	(0.005)	(0.075)
15. Base CSRS/FERS survivor annuities on reduced retiree annuity[1]	(0.035)	(0.525)
16. Institute Medicare fee limits over 65: Federal Employee Health Benefits[1]	(0.012)	(0.102)
17. Medicaid: Eliminate mandatory medicaid care[1]	(0.000)	(5.845)
18. Medicaid: Tighten estate asset rules[1]	(0.025)	(0.565)
19. Pay hospitals for impatient services by hospital-based physicians[1]	(0.000)	(0.570)
20. Gradually lower indirect medical education rate to 5.65 percent[1]	(0.000)	(3.540)
21. Set laboratory rates at market levels[1]	(0.390)	(4.480)
22. Phase-in resource-based practice expense[1]	(0.100)	(2.975)
23. Implement single fee for surgery[1]	(0.050)	(0.510)
24. Permanently extend 2 percent laboratory fee update[1]	(0.030)	(1.310)
25. Permanently extend Medicare Secondary Payer (MSP) for disabled[1]	(0.000)	(2.695)
26. Permanently extend IRS/Social Security Administration/Health Care Financing Administration data match[1]	(0.000)	(0.370)
27. Third party liability—Enhance identification of other health coverage[1]	(0.000)	(1.250)
28. Base Medicare direct medical education payments on a national per resident amount[1]	(0.350)	(1.680)
29. Provide electronic billing incentive[1]	(0.000)	(0.440)
30. Medicare: Maintain 1995 ratio of premium collections to program outlays with a 27-percent ceiling[1]	(0.000)	(11.575)
31. Medicaid: Equate matching rates for welfare program[1]	(0.160)	(2.030)
32. Strengthen child support enforcement[1]	(0.027)	(0.505)
33. Equate matching rates for welfare programs[1]	(0.040)	(0.390)

SCHAEFER BUDGET CUTS—Continued

(Dollars in billions: All savings reduce the appropriate budget cap)

Description	1994	1994–98
34. Reform Federal Housing Administration insurance [1]	(0.028)	(0.336)
35. Require States to reimburse the Federal Government for food stamp overpayment errors caused by States, as described by CBO	(0.000)	(0.800)
36. Require States to share default costs in the Student Loan Program [1]	(0.080)	(0.596)
37. Implement Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands funding agreement [1]	(0.006)	(0.043)
38. End Federal subsidy for honey	(0.035)	(0.065)
39. End Federal tobacco loan program	(0.015)	(2)
40. End Federal subsidy for peanut	(0.000)	(0.025)
41. End Federal subsidy for rice	(0.250)	(2.600)
42. End Federal subsidy for cotton	(0.350)	(4.220)
43. Eliminate 0/92 and 50/92 (pay/92) programs starting in 1996 [1]	0.000	(1.577)
44. Limit payments on wool and mohair to $50,000 per person [1]	(0.010)	0.278)
45. Permanently extend market promotion program at 1993 level [1]	(0.052)	(0.260)
46 Increase non-eligible payment acres (triple base) starting in 1993 [1]	0.000	(1.750)
Subtotal domestic mandatory spending cuts	(19.024)	(320.105)
Cuts in domestic discretionary spending:		
47. Reinstate a cap on overhead costs charged to university research and development grants	(0.100)	(1.000)
48. Freeze Federal agency spending in FY94 and FY95 at FY92 levels. Travel, transportation, rent, utilities, office supplies and other administrative costs are frozen for two years and then adjusted for inflation in FY96–FY98	(4.850)	(45.860)
49. Cut 25 percent of the White House budget [1]	(0.043)	(0.250)
50. Cut 25 percent of the Legislative Branch budget	(0.600)	(3.610)
51. Eliminate tax subsidies for political parties	(0.002)	(0.123)
52. Improve management of VA hospitals [1]	(0.100)	(1.500)
53. Maintain current program level for programs in small agencies [1]	(0.012)	(0.318)
54. No Federal Pay Raise CY94; ECI-Based Raise minus 1 percent CY1995–1997; revise locality pay beginning CY1995 [1]	(1.361)	(11.311)
55. Cut 100,000 Federal employees [1]	(0.932)	(10.518)
56. Other administrative savings [1]	(0.676)	(11.252)
57. Streamline Department of Agriculture [1]	(0.038)	(0.466)
58. Streamline Department of Education [1]	(0.070)	(2.252)
59. Streamline Department of Energy [1]	0.000	(0.023)
60. Streamline Department of Health and Human Services [1]	(0.199)	(4.211)
61. Streamline Department of Housing and Urban Development [1]	(0.104)	(2.255)
62. Streamline Department of Justice [1]	(0.025)	(0.211)
63. Streamline Department of Labor	(0.002)	(0.535)
64. Streamline Department of Transportation [1]	(0.010)	(0.166)
65. Streamline Department of Treasury	(0.033)	(0.289)
66. Streamline Dept. of Veterans Affairs [1]	0.000	(0.020)
67. Streamline Army Corps of Engineers [1]	(0.013)	(0.279)
68. Streamline Environmental Protection Agency [1]	(0.010)	(0.358)
69. Streamline other Agencies [1]	(0.100)	(1.059)
70. Bar U.S. payments to international "anticonsumer" organizations for coffee, rubber, jute and tropical timber	(0.003)	(0.017)
71. Eliminate additional funding for Int'l Development Association of the World Bank	(1.250)	(6.250)
72. Limit Eximbank credit to tied-aid	(0.700)	(3.500)
73. Eliminate Russia/Eurasia research [1]	(0.001)	(0.040)
74. Consolidate overseas broadcasting [1]	(0.060)	(0.894)
75. Reorient AID programs and reduce spending [1]	(0.007)	(0.841)
76. Reduce International Security Assistance [1]	(0.084)	(2.526)
77. Reduce Enterprise for the Americas debt forgiveness (AID) [1]	(0.008)	(0.161)
78. End funding for Russian Far East Technical Center [1]	(0.002)	(0.010)
79. End funding for North-South Center [1]	(0.004)	(0.042)
80. Replace Crop Insurance with disaster assistance, as described by CBO	(0.230)	(2.410)
81. Reduce Rural Electrification Administration 5-percent loan subsidy [1]	(0.027)	(0.545)
82. Reduce Economic Research Service Programs [1]	(0.012)	(0.079)
83. Reduce Foreign Agriculture Service Programs [1]	(0.005)	(0.045)
84. Eliminate subsidies for non-power functions of TVA as described by CBO	(0.035)	(0.575)
85. Eliminate Appalachian Regional Commission, as described by CBO	(0.010)	(0.528)
86. End Federal subsidies for under-used AMTRAK routes	0.000	(1.012)

SCHAEFER BUDGET CUTS—Continued

(Dollars in billions: All savings reduce the appropriate budget cap)

Description	1994	1994–98
87. Adjust Coast Guard for military pay [1]	(0.029)	(0.336)
88. Replace the commitments for new housing construction with vouchers, as described by CBO	(0.021)	(0.788)
89. Eliminate community development block grants, as described by CBO	(0.160)	(14.210)
90. End funding for Economic Development Administration, as described by CBO	(0.026)	(0.767)
91. Eliminate individual Housing and Urban Development Dept. Special Purpose Grants [1]	(0.005)	(0.853)
92. Eliminate public housing new construction amendments [1]	0.000	(0.101)
93. Repeal Davis-Bacon Act	(0.260)	(3.300)
94. Repeal the Service Contract of 1965 to reduce Federal contracting costs, as recommended by GAO	(0.500)	(2.500)
95. Target funding for health professions curriculum assistance grants [1]	(0.014)	(0.116)
96. Eliminate Trade Adjustment Assistance for firms [1]	(0.001)	(0.044)
97. Terminate State Justice Institute [1]	(0.003)	(0.068)
98. Eliminate SBA earmarked grants [1]	(0.044)	(0.431)
99. Reduce SBA 7(a) business loan subsidies [1]	(0.058)	(0.526)
100. Porkbusters bill—eliminate projects not properly authorized	(2.000)	(2.000)
Subtotal domestic discretionary spending cuts	(14.839)	(143.381)
Receipts:		
101. Increase revenues from IRS tax compliance [1]	(0.011)	(1.537)
Subtotal receipts	(0.011)	(1.537)
Debt service savings:		
102. Shorten maturity of debt securities [1]	(1.634)	(16.354)
103. Interest Savings from above cuts	(1.298)	(77.811)
Subtotal debt service savings	(2.932)	(94.165)
Total deficit reduction	(42.65)	(652.895)

[1] President Clinton's proposal.
[2] Awaiting estimate.

AMENDMENT OFFERED REGARDING THE EMERGENCY SPENDING BILL

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I went before the Rules Committee to ask that they rule my amendment, and a joint amendment from myself and Congressman KOLBE, in order when the House considers the President's emergency spending bill.

The committee denied my request, surprisingly, on a party line vote. I can only conclude that the Democrats on the Rules Committee do not want to allow free and open debate about the spending in the President's spending package.

The goal of the Packard amendment and the Kolbe-Packard amendment was to help the administration reconcile the two conflicting ideas of increasing Government spending to create jobs while at the same time reducing the deficit.

The Packard amendment is simply a budget neutral amendment. It would withhold funds for all programs in the spending package, except for unemployment compensation, until the increase in the deficit caused by the remaining programs is offset through other legislation.

The Kolbe-Packard amendment would withhold funds for all programs in the emergency spending bill until spending cuts are made elsewhere so that the deficit does not increase.

The administration has advertised this as a stimulus package. By withholding funds for the programs in the President's emergency spending package until cuts are made elsewhere, our amendments would ensure that we do not add to the deficit, which is a drag on our economy. If we add to the deficit, it seems to me, we defeat the rationale of a stimulus.

Our amendments would have simply required Congress to accept this stimulus package on the basis of the bipartisan budget agreement of 1990 stipulating offsets if spending is increased.

Under the provisions of the 1990 budget agreement, Congress cannot pass legislation in which spending exceeds caps on the three budget categories—defense, domestic, and foreign—thus adding to the deficit. The only exception is when the President and Congress declare that such spending is an emergency.

Not a single witness who testified before my committee as we considered the emergency spending bill could explain to me why this spending qualified as an emergency.

By denying our right to debate and vote on these amendments, we were denied our right to participate in the democratic process on this very important issue.

LET'S STOP THE MINING OF ONE OF OUR NATIONAL SYMBOLS THE MAJESTIC REDWOOD

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which will impose a 75-percent severance tax on the mining of old growth redwood. The legislation also imposes a 75-percent severance tax on redwood timber used as security for timber collateralized bonds.

Old growth redwood trees continue to be chain-sawed every working day. These old growth redwood trees are a non-renewable resource, at least over the next 1,000 years or so. They should be treated as other non-renewable resources which are mined by having an excise tax imposed. The excise tax recognizes the public interest and benefit in this non-renewable resource.

The severance tax is also imposed on timber collateralized bonds. What would normally be a renewable resource is now subject to the relentless demands of bond payment schedules. Because of the defining symbolic nature of the redwood tree both to the United States and to the State of California, their harvest schedule cannot be dependent on the needs absentee bond-holders. Timber-harvesting on a bond repayment schedule could be like killing the goose that laid the golden egg. What could be a renewable resource would be exhausted because of the needs of the bond-holders could come before responsible forestry.

Mr. Speaker, Maxxam Corp. has been looting the redwood holdings of Pacific Lumber Co. from the day it took over the company in a corporate raid. This legislation will protect the legitimate interests of the American public in the remaining unprotected redwood forests.

NORTH KOREA'S WITHDRAWAL FROM THE NPT THREATENS REGIONAL SECURITY

HON. JAMES A. LEACH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Democratic People's Republic of Korea [DPRK] mounted an unprecedented challenge to the international nonproliferation regime. In a surprise announcement, the DPRK gave notice of its intent to withdraw from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT]. This action, coupled with widely reported appraisals in recent years of nuclear technology development in North Korea, has fueled worldwide suspicions that Pyongyang is bent on establishing nuclear weapons capacity. As a result of North Korea's precipitous announcement, tensions have increased on the Korean Peninsula and prospects for reunification have been set back.

As ever, North Korean motivations remain murky. The DPRK move might be a tactical gambit designed to buy time with the IAEA and test the response of the world community. On the other hand, it could be a manifestation of a regime in crisis; or, worse yet, a prelude to aggressive action against the south. At a minimum, Pyongyang's withdrawal from the NPT represents a fundamental about-face in its recent policy of advancing dialog with the Republic of Korea [ROK] and limited openings to the outside world.

Whatever the North's motivation, the response of the United States must be unequivocal. North Korea's action not only contradicts its treaty commitments under the NPT but the 1991 Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, which obligates parties not to possess or develop nuclear weapons. We have no choice in these troubling times except to stand firm with our ally in Seoul in a joint commitment to peace and security on the Korean Peninsula.

In this regard, Pyongyang should understand that there is no partisan or institutional differentiation in the United States in our united concern with the specter of nuclear proliferation on the Korean Peninsula.

This Member joins with the executive branch in urging North Korea to reconsider its intentions. North Korea should take immediate steps to fully comply with the resolution adopted without opposition by the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] Board of Governors on February 25, calling on Pyongyang to fulfill its responsibilities under the NPT and its IAEA safeguards agreement. Such a step is imperative if there is to be any hope of restoring international confidence that North Korea is fulfilling its international responsibilities in the nuclear area. Here it is relevant to observe that, under the NPT, North Korea's obligations to the IAEA remain in force for 90 days, even after formal notification of intent to withdraw.

The concerns of the United States and other members of the world community about the suspected clandestine nuclear weapons program in the North are both serious and well founded. In testimony before the Senate in late February, CIA Director James Woolsey noted that North Korea is probably hiding evidence of a clandestine nuclear weapons program from international inspectors, including enough plutonium to make at least one nuclear weapon.

Six previous routine IAEA inspections have established that North Korea had engaged in an extensive program to develop a capability to produce plutonium, including an unfinished reprocessing plant, at its Yongbyon nuclear complex. In addition, the North Koreans have acknowledged reprocessing a small amount of plutonium. While the focus of IAEA concern appears to be how much plutonium the North has extracted from its reactors in the past, the full dimensions of its nuclear weapons program remains unknown. It is unclear, for example, whether North Korea is still secretly reprocessing plutonium.

NORTH KOREA AND REGIONAL SECURITY

North Korea's apparent quest for a nuclear weapons capability constitutes the most serious threat to regional peace and security in Northeast Asia. The prospect of a nuclear-armed North is of profound concern to the ROK, the United States, Japan, China, Russia, as well as other members of the international community.

As all Members understand, the Korean Peninsula remains the most dangerous potential flashpoint in Asia and perhaps the world. The North Korean conventional military threat—a 1 million man army largely forward-deployed within 100 kilometers of the Demiliarilized Zone—remains of serious concern to the ROK and the United States. In addition, North Korea is emerging as a key supplier for missile programs in Iran as well as Syria. The DPRK is developing a 620-mile missile capable of hitting Japan as well as all of South Korea, where 37,000 United States troops are stationed as a tripwire. The United States also suspects that North Korea may be developing biological weapons. Despite North Korea's economic difficulties, Pyongyang's resources are still disproportionately geared to maintaining a dangerous offensive military capability.

North Korean capabilities to produce and deliver weapons of mass destruction are destabilizing in themselves. Equally worrisome, however, is the thick veil of secrecy with which the world's last Stalinist regime shrouds almost every action. Washington's knowledge of political and military decisionmaking processes in Pyongyang remains extremely limited. Little is known, for example, how the DPRK will react to its increasing isolation. We also remain uncertain about prospects for a smooth transfer of power from the octogenarian "Great Leader" Kim IL-Sung to his designated successor, his son, Kim Jong IL. Likewise, even though the North has intensified the cult of personality surrounding the younger "Dear Leader," we know little about his basic policy views. In tandem with North Korea's military capabilities, the basic nature of North Korea's closed totalitarian system reinforces the tension and insecurity that characterize the politics of the Korean Peninsula.

IAEA SPECIAL INSPECTION AND TEAM SPIRIT

The current crisis arose early this February when the IAEA requested an unprecedented special inspection of two nuclear waste sites at Yongbyon. The IAEA requested the inspection because the sites in question may contain nuclear waste from the operations of a small 5-megawatt research reactor. Inspection of the waste would reveal how long the reactor has been in operation, whether its fuel rods have been changed, and how much plutonium it may have produced.

Pyongyang claims the areas in question are unrelated military sites, accused the IAEA of spying on behalf of the United States, and denied the request. In response, on February 25, the IAEA Board of Governors adopted a resolution calling for North Korea to fulfill its responsibilities under the NPT and IAEA safeguards agreement, or risk having the issue of DPRK noncompliance taken up by the U.N. Security Council.

As Members understand, the IAEA is a U.N.-affiliated international organization. It serves in a dual capacity as a facilitator of the transfer of peaceful nuclear technology to developing nations and as the primary verification mechanism under the NPT to ensure that nuclear materials are not diverted from peaceful purposes to production of nuclear weapons. The NPT commits nonweapons member states to place all of their nuclear activities under IAEA inspection. International safeguards in use by the IAEA before the gulf war were designed to verify the peaceful use of nuclear material in declared nuclear facilities and activities. Clandestine activities—such as those undertaken by Iraq prior to the establishment of the U.N. Special Commission in 1991—were outside the scope of classical IAEA safeguards.

But international concern with the failure of the IAEA to detect Iraq's clandestine nuclear program led the organization's Board of Governors in the summer of 1992 to explicitly approve the right of the agency to conduct special inspection of undeclared nuclear facilities. Although not as intrusive as short-notice, on-demand challenge inspections, the conduct of special inspections should nevertheless provide the international community with a higher degree of confidence that nonnuclear weapons states are complying with their NPT obligations. The United States believes that the principle of special inspections is vitally important to the effective enforcement of the NPT regime, and in that sense is not aimed at any one country. Nevertheless, the special inspection of North Korea would have been the first in IAEA history.

North Korea has also been angered by the resumption of the annual Team Spirit military exercise by the United States and ROK. The exercise was suspended in 1992 in recognition of the steps North Korea had taken to resolve international concerns about its nuclear program. The suspension was also undertaken on the assumption that further progress would be made on implementing the December 1991 Joint North-South Declaration on Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, especially agreement on a credible and effective bilateral nuclear inspection regime.

For its part, the United States has been disappointed that North Korean intransigence has led to little progress on a bilateral inspection regime.

The DPRK asserts that mutual inspections should include only civilian nuclear facilities and what it terms "nuclear bases," or bases suspected of having nuclear weapons. North

Korea claims that since it has no nuclear weapons, the only nuclear bases on the peninsula are those of the United States. Thus the DPRK position is that mutual inspections should include only the North's declared nuclear facilities and the nuclear bases and other nuclear facilities in the South—not military bases in the North.

This argument is profoundly specious and without foundation. The public position of the United States is that its bases are open to inspection under any credible and effective mutual inspection regime on which the DPRK and ROK can agree. In addition, in September 1991, President Bush announced the withdrawal of all tactical nuclear weapons from overseas bases, and during his visit to Seoul in January 1992 he implicitly affirmed with ROK President Roh Tae Woo's December 18, 1991, statement that there were no nuclear weapons anywhere in South Korea.

As a result of the North's foot dragging, an October 1992 communique of the United States-ROK Defense Ministers stated that "in the absence of any meaningful improvement in North-South relations, especially on bilateral nuclear inspections," the United States and ROK would continue preparations for Team Spirit in 1993. Here it should be noted that Team Spirit is a purely defensive, well-publized conventional military exercise, with North Korea, Russia, and China each invited to send observers.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE KOREAN PENINSULA

Mr. Speaker, the international community has no desire to corner Pyongyang or encourage it to contemplate desperate action. For its part, the United States bears no permanent enmity toward North Korea. But North Korea's leadership must understand that its decision to withdraw from the NPT has the effect of further isolating the North from the United States and other members of the world community.

If the IAEA is not able to resolve the issue, then the matter will be referred to the U.N. Security Council. Unless the North fundamentally reassesses its decision to withdraw from the NPT, strong diplomatic condemnation and international economic sanctions are surely in order.

Mr. Speaker, if North Korea does not reverse this extremely unfortunate decision, Pyongyang will have jeopardized any hope of ever joining the family of nations and any prospect of establishing closer relations with the United States. Normal dealings with a confirmed rogue state, the first-ever withdrawn from the NPT, is inconceivable.

TRIBUTE TO THE NEW YORK POST

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my solidarity with the writers, editors, and all the employees of the oldest continuously published daily newspaper in the United States—the New York Post. The very survival of the paper is in question and its fate is being decided in Bankruptcy Court this week.

For almost 200 years, the New York Post has enjoyed a long tradition as a mainstay of New York's lively and vital newspaper industry. Now the management of the Post has fallen into the hands of someone whose wholesale firing of reporters and editors tears out the very heart and fiber of that great newspaper. As a business decision alone, this act, which destroys the New York Post's greatest asset—the structural integrity and journalistic excellence of its staff—defies reason. Oftentimes, in pursuit of profit, impetuous acts, such as this, result not in profit but in financial disaster. Sadly, in this case, Abe Hirschfeld's fortune will not be all that will be diminished; the lives of those dedicated men and women who work for the Post and this great newspaper itself will all suffer.

But, beyond the question of business judgment of the Post's new manager, lies the more central question of what qualifications are needed to publish a great newspaper. With trepidation, lest I intrude into the province of the Bankruptcy Court considering this matter, permit me to address a question to the judge who is deciding the future of this national institution. Is wealth all that is required, or should more be demanded? Should the court not require that the owner be someone who has a balanced and judicious view of the role of a publisher in relation to the editors and journalists? Should he or she not be someone who has respect for journalistic integrity and for the important role that the "fourth estate" plays under the first amendment to the Constitution? Or with ownership of this paper?

I give my wholehearted support to the real owners of the Post—those who heroically defend and uphold the rich tradition of true journalism, as envisioned by Alexander Hamilton.

CONGRESSMAN KILDEE CELEBRATES FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF NEW MOUNT MORIAH BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in commemorating the fourth anniversary of the New Mount Moriah Baptist Church in Pontiac, MI. To honor this outstanding occasion, the congregation will come together in unity and celebration on Sunday, March 21, 1993.

The New Mount Moriah Baptist Church has been a bedrock of faith and spiritual support for the members of the church since it was organized on April 8, 1989. The pastor, William H. Murphy, Jr., has helped the members through many difficult periods and has given generously of his time, talents, and love to make this church a tremendous resource of spiritual and educational support for the Pontiac community.

The New Mount Moriah Baptist Church celebrated its first service in the ORA Building on Perry Street. The church moved to its current location at 68 West Walton Boulevard and has become the heart of a vibrant Christian community on the north side of Pontiac. Under the leadership of Pastor Murphy, the congregation has grown to 500 members.

Pastor Murphy and his staff have had a strong, unifying influence on the community. Sunday school, Bible studies, and Christian outreach youth and action weekly meetings have been instrumental in molding good families and developing good citizens of the Pontiac community.

Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, our community is a much better place in which to live because of the dedication and leadership provided by the parish of the New Mount Moriah Baptist Church. I urge my House colleagues to join me in congratulating the people of New Mount Moriah Baptist Church for a wonderful, fulfilling 4 years and wish them even greater success in the years ahead.

TERM LIMITS

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, today I am cosponsoring two resolutions which call for constitutional amendments to provide for term limits for both Congressmen and Senators. I signed a pledge during the campaign to support efforts to limit the length of service, and I am meeting that pledge.

I am cosponsoring the Inglis resolution, which provides a 6-year limit for Members of the House of Representatives, and a 12-year limit for Members of the Senate. I do so to keep my pledge to the people of Michigan who overwhelmingly supported this particular term limit under Proposal B in last fall's election, and who had only one specific limit proposal before them.

I am also cosponsoring the McCollum resolution, which provides for identical 12-year term limits for Members of the House and Senate. The House and Senate are equal houses of the legislative branch of our Government, and I personally believe that Members of the House and Senate should be treated in the same fashion. To do otherwise would allow the improper impression that one branch is superior to the other. In fact, it is also my view that this particular resolution is more demanding on House Members who need to stand before their constituency every 2 years rather than every 6 to earn the ability to continue through their election.

Term limits are coming. The only question is the specific of those limits. We now have the obligation to work for the best interests of our Nation, and I firmly believe that identical limits for both the House and the Senate is the best policy for our Nation.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI MURRAY LEVINE

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Rabbi Murray Levine, a devoted spir-

itual leader, dedicated teacher and active and caring member of my community.

Rabbi Levine has devoted his life to studying the rituals of Judaism and putting Jewish principles of compassion, charity, and public service into action. In a time when some have tried to widen class divisions, Rabbi Levine has dedicated himself to building bridges. As rabbi at Temple Beth Sholom in Framingham, MA, he has reached out to the community's young people, senior adults and recent immigrants.

From his pulpit in Framingham, Rabbi Levine has inspired his congregation with his insights into the Jewish faith. However, he has not been satisfied simply to preach. Since he first became a rabbi, Rabbi Levine has been deeply committed to promoting mutual understanding among the community's many cultures and religions. He has been an active member of Framingham's Interfaith Council, and he has worked to bring the spirit of community to the homeless shelters, nursing homes and hospitals of my district.

Within his own synagogue, Rabbi Levine's influence can be felt everywhere. The children of his congregation love watching Rabbi Levine's fun and educational presentations at holiday times. Senior adults participating in his lively study groups are energized by his enthusiasm and active teaching methods. Immigrants arriving from the former Soviet Union appreciate the rabbi's efforts to help them get settled in their new country. With such a strong commitment to so many different groups, Rabbi Levine is truly a rabbi for all seasons.

After graduating from the City College of New York, Rabbi Levine entered the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, where he received a Masters of Hebrew Letters degree. Over the course of his 39-year career, Rabbi Levine has established himself as a respected scholar and a widely published author. He holds a Doctor of Hebrew Letters degree, a Doctor of Divinity degree and an honorary doctorate from the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. He has been a frequent contributor to several publications, including, Conservative Judaism, The Jewish Spectator, The Reconstructionist and The American Rabbi.

Rabbi Murray Levine retires this year after 39 years of distinguished service. He will certainly be missed, but I know that his influence will continue to be felt. I wish him the best of luck in the future, and I am confident that the high moral standards and spirit of giving practiced by Rabbi Levine will continue to guide the efforts of the many people he has influenced in the community.

TRIBUTE TO AMERICARES

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to a special humanitarian relief organization called AmeriCares, founded by Robert Macauley in 1982. Since its establishment, AmeriCares has distributed more than a half billion dollars in medicine and other relief to over 73 countries across the globe. It seems that wherever in the world there is a humanitarian need, AmeriCares and its founder, Robert Macauley, are there; and often they are the first relief group to arrive.

Whether it was the Chernobyl disaster in the Ukraine, the Bhopal explosion in India, the war in Kuwait or the Armenian earthquake, AmeriCares has provided critical relief. Since it is a small organization with no bureaucracy, it moves fast—sending humanitarian flights within hours of a disaster. In just the past year, they have sent aid to several foreign countries, including Somalia, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Alabania, and the former Soviet Union. But just because AmeriCares is active in foreign countries does not mean it has forgotten the needs of disadvantaged Americans here at home. AmeriCares distributes a variety of nonpharmaceutical supplies to lower income Americans and operates a much touted Christmas in April Program.

One of the things which makes AmeriCares unique is that it does not rely on large government grants. Instead, the organization primarily depends on donations from private citizens and corporations to fund its work. Another aspect of AmeriCares which stands out is that it maintains the lowest overhead of any comparable organization in the country—1.5 percent. At a time when we recognize that the limits of government's ability to fix every problem, it is encouraging to see the contributions of a private group like AmeriCares. As long as there are floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, droughts, or famines, we will continue to depend on the good work of this organization.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS' FULL POTENTIAL

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, 1993, the Washington Post published a letter from the Librarian of Congress, the Honorable James H. Billington, in which he clarifies the need for enactment of the Library of Congress Fund Act. The passage of this legislation is crucial to the ability of the Library to continue to meet the needs of traditional users—at no cost—yet also be able to respond to expedited demands of research scientists, lawyers, and other groups on a cost recovery basis. Mr. Billington explained the position of the Library of Congress clearly and concisely in his letter, which I would like to include in the RECORD:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS' FULL POTENTIAL

"Budget Cuts, Not User Fees, Library Told" [Style, Feb. 26] touches on matters that require clarification.

For two years the Library of Congress has proposed legislation (S. 345, The Library of Congress Fund Act) giving it added authority to meet requests for "extra" services from research scientists, lawyers, entrepreneurs and other individuals on a cost recovery basis ("user fees") without increasing the burden to the taxpayer.

Expedited document delivery, picture research and complex legal analyses are some examples of the requests we get now and must turn away because they cannot—and should not—be supported by public monies.

On Feb. 25 I testified at the scheduled Library of Congress budget hearing before the Senate subcommittee on legislative branch appropriations. Contrary to The Post reporter's assertion, I did not appear before the subcommittee "to sell the library's proposal to charge user fees for new electronic information services." I appeared to discuss the library's FY '94 appropriations. The fund bill is before a different committee.

For two hours, the Senate appropriations panel, chaired by Sen. Harry Reid (D-Nev.), and I covered the library's proposed 1994 budget, the library's 1993-2000 strategic plan and current fiscal pressures. Following that, we had a short discussion on the fund act. The Post reporter failed to mention that the legislation was the business of a different committee.

The bill gives the Library of Congress greater authority to do what some 550 other libraries in America now do for patrons in need of "extra" services. The act contains strong controls: (1) It affirms the library's congressional mandate to provide free basic services—e.g., cataloging, reference, inter-library loan, access to the collections. (2) It requires public notice and congressional review of any proposed new specialized services. (3) It protects copyright owners.

All traditional free services have been preserved—and have been augmented dramatically (in ways I explained at the hearing but were not reported in The Post) by putting on-line without charge to the nation both the contents of our recent exhibits and our public catalogue.

The 21st century is almost upon us with its great demands for information that, in the national interest, the library ought to help meet. Those interest groups that fear or do not understand change would have us deny a limited number of needed cost-recoverable services that would help the nation's economic competitiveness but should not be undertaken at taxpayer expense. With the fund legislation, the library, created and sustained by Congress for almost 200 years, will fully realize its potential for serving the entire nation.

JAMES H. BILLINGTON,
Librarian of Congress.

WASHINGTON.

KEVIN BRINK WINS AAU/MARS MILKY WAY HIGH SCHOOL ALL-AMERICAN AWARD

HON. PAUL B. HENRY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize a young man from Grandville, MI. His name is Kevin Michael Brink and he is a senior at Grandville High School. Kevin has recently been selected to be a regional recipient of the prestigious seventh annual Amateur Athletic Union/Mars Milky Way High School All-American Award. The AAU/Mars Milky Way High School All-American Award is part of a continuing program that recognizes student achievers and encourages academic advancement through higher education. Kevin is one of eight outstanding high school seniors—four boys and four young women—from across the country to receive this honor.

Kevin was chosen for his extraordinary academic, athletic, and community service achievements. Academically, he has been ranked first in his class. He's been listed in "Who's Who Among American High School Students" and is a Princeton Book Award recipient. He has been a National Honor Society member, vice president of the student council, and was awarded an academic letter for each of his 4 high school years.

In the athletic arena, Kevin is cocaptain of the wrestling team. A three-time varsity letter winner, a two-time conference champion and a district champion, he has helped lead his team to a State runners-up title. As a starting right guard in football, Kevin has earned two varsity letters. He also holds a black belt in karate.

Despite a demanding schedule, Kevin finds time for a variety of community service activities. Since its founding, he has been involved with U.C.A.B. for YOUTH, an organization chartered by the Boys & Girls Club to build a local youth center. He is president of the group's Youth Advisory Board—Keystone Club. He also participated in L.E.E.P., a 4–H leadership program which culminated in a weeklong nationwide Citizenship Conference in Washington, D.C.

As a regional recipient, Kevin has been awarded a $10,000 scholarship toward his college education and is eligible to become an AAU/Mars Milky Way High School All-American Award National Recipient. In April, two national recipients will be named—one young man and one young woman—and awarded a $40,000 scholarship.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join with me in congratulating Kevin Michael Brink, a young man whose achievements should serve as an inspiration to all young people, as well as to his community.

THE CONGRESS SHOULD CATCH UP WITH THE PRESIDENT

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we are nearing the end of the first step of the very important funding function of the Federal Government. The President with vision submitted his proposal; the Budget Committee with no vision revised his proposals downward, and loyalty now brings all Democrats firmly behind a package that should have done more. A great window of opportunity was opened by the President but the Budget Committee lacked the vision to see the vital objectives for the year 2000. The Budget Committee has joined the conservative Democrats and the Republicans in the grand scheme to preserve the military welfare state. A swindle of the taxpayers is being perpetrated when we insist that the CIA cannot be cut in half, or that star wars cannot be totally eliminated; and there are many other sacred cows left untouched by those who secretly conspire to maintain obsolete weapons systems, unworkable defense initiatives, and boondoggle scientific projects because they provide jobs. Let us have an open and honest massive conversion program to train CIA agents, star wars scientists and technicians, and ex-soldiers. America now needs to mount an overwhelming economic offensive. It is imperative that we cut the umbilical cord from the Defense budget and retool for the products which enhance life.

It is time to shut down the military welfare state. Every job we lose in the defense sector can generate three jobs in the civilian sector. It is time to act boldly. Our President with vision should not be dragged down by wimps who secretly yearn for their good old days of Reagan and Bush.

WIMPS WITHOUT VISION

Budget Committee wimps
Are whining
While NATO Generals
Keep dining
Wimps funding Star Wars
In Phantom skies
Great fiscal minds
Blind in both eyes
Budget Committee wimps
Bowing to burned out
Military pimps
Smiling at scientific whores
From NASA space station doors
Welfare under the rugs
Wimps blackmailed
By CIA thugs
Who long ago
Lost their role
Violating Presidential orders
Of only two years
On the dole
Weary whining
Wimps catering to
Subsidized fat farmers
Whose wives
Dressed in lace
Loudly label welfare mothers
A national disgrace
Budget wimps whining
Star wars fool's gold
For swindlers
Keeps on shining
Democrats in charge
But whining is our style
Never mind courage
In our '93 profile
Play it cool til '94
Watch the voters
Close the vision door.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 90th anniversary of the Commonwealth Club of California, which is the largest and most prestigious public affairs speaking forum in the United States.

The Commonwealth Club was founded in 1903 by San Francisco Chronicle editorialist Edward F. Adams, his managing editor, a president of the University of California, a future president of San Francisco State University, and an attorney who later became justice of the California Supreme Court. The club became an arena where issues of public concern could be debated by educators, government officials, and community leaders. Headquartered throughout its history in San Francisco, the club is an integral part of San Francisco and a major influence throughout California and the Nation. In its early years, the development of its study sections and concern for the issues of the day have resulted in such important reforms as the California grand jury and civil service system, the first statewide water plan, and the establishment of the public defender's office.

The hallmark, however, of the club has been the steady stream of national and international political and social celebrities who have appeared before the organization. Beginning in 1911 with Theodore Roosevelt, even a partial reading of its luminary list of guest speakers reads like a Who's Who listing: William Jennings Bryan, Clarence Darrow, Samuel Gompers, Guglielmo Marconi, Ansel Adams, Lincoln Steffens, Martin Luther King, Jr., Robert Kennedy, Nikita Khrushchev, Paul Robeson, and Audrey Hepburn. In 1933, Franklin Delano Roosevelt introduced his New Deal policies from the podium of the Commonwealth Club.

In 1924, the advent of radio presented new opportunities to take the Commonwealth Club outside of the bay area with a statewide broadcast. Indeed, the regular Friday luncheon speech broadcast has now become the radio industry's oldest program. In the 1950's, the radio show broadened beyond California, and now is carried to over 200 stations across the country on National Public Radio and over commercial stations as well, and selected programs are now carried on television.

The continuing vitality and popularity of the Commonwealth Club is a tribute to its founders' vision and the continuity and wisdom of its leadership. The club has had only six executive directors in its 90 year history: Earle Ashley Woolcott, Stuart Richardson Ward, William L. Hudson, Durward S. Riggs, Michael J. Brassington, and currently, James Rosenthal. They have overseen the growth and expansion of the club including, in 1931, initiating the Commonwealth Club Gold and Silver Medal Book Awards, the oldest and only awards exclusively for California writers. John Steinbeck, William Saroyan, and recently, Amy Tan are among the many notable recipients of these awards.

Now, in 1993, the 17,000 members of the Commonwealth Club of California provide the largest membership base of any public affairs organization in the country. Its nonpartisan approach to the issues ensures that every point of view is represented and debated. Just last year, over 35,000 persons attended its over 500 meetings, luncheons, receptions, regional programs, and study sections.

Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth Club has dedicated itself for 90 years to "housing diversified convictions on emotionally charged economic, political, and social questions." It is with great pride that, on behalf of the Congress, I commend the Commonwealth Club, the Nation's premier public affairs forum for its contributions to this Nation's debate and study of the important national and world issues of the day.

THE ARAB BOYCOTT ARMS SALES PROHIBITION ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to introduce legislation that targets one of the most pernicious economic weapons used by Arab nations against Israel—the economic boycott.

My bill is simple. The Arab Boycott Arms Sales Prohibition Act would ban United States weapons sales to any country which participates in the boycott of Israel.

It is difficult to believe that nearly 50 years have passed since the League of Arab States launched an economic boycott of the Jews that lived in what was to become the State of Israel. In the early 1950's this primary boycott—which prevented direct business contacts between Arab States and Israel—was expanded to include a secondary boycott aimed at non-Arab third parties who do business with Israel and a tertiary boycott against companies who deal with blacklisted institutions.

A recent study conducted by the Federation of Israel Chambers of Commerce concluded that the boycott has cost Israel $45 billion in lost trade and investment. The study pointed out that total foreign investment in Israel is only $200 million a year, compared to the $1 billion invested annually in Ireland by United States interests alone. And despite Israel's well-established leadership in such areas as high technology and agriculture, only 5 of the world's largest 500 companies do business in Israel. These dramatic numbers clearly demonstrate that the boycott's shadow impact has severely hampered Israel's economic growth.

The Arab boycott has also been harmful to our own economy. Hundreds of American firms—including many from New York City—are blacklisted from doing business in most of Arab world. This policy is blatantly discriminatory and contrary to free trade, and it unfairly disadvantages our companies and impedes job creation at home and abroad.

Our Government should not reward countries whose actions harm the economic vitality of our only democratic ally in the Middle East. And while some U.S. companies prosper by selling arms to Arab nations, many others are hurt by the boycott. It is particularly distressing that Saudi Arabia and Kuwait still refuse to renounce the boycott, even after Americans fought to preserve the sovereignty of these countries in the gulf war.

I believe that the Arab Boycott Arms Sales Prohibition Act reflects an important statement of principle. And I hope its introduction will help focus attention upon—and ultimately help eradicate—this outrageous act of economic warfare.

DO NOT ELIMINATE THE SBDC PROGRAM

HON. LARRY COMBEST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my strong opposition to President Clinton's plan to eliminate the Small Business Development Center [SBDC] Program over the next 3 years as part of his economic plan, "a vision of change for America." This program would be replaced with a technology extension network which would virtually duplicate the SBDC Program, adding enhanced efforts in technology and manufacturing.

Small business creates two of every three new jobs in the United States, and is the backbone of a prosperous nation. We cannot expect to compete internationally if we do not have a strong economic foundation which, as we all know, relies heavily on the success and growth of small business. The SBDC Program has proven to be an integral part of our successful small business community by providing much needed services, such as management and technical assistance, that enhances the profitability of small business. I know firsthand the value of SBDC Program as shown by the SBDC at Texas Tech University in Lubbock, TX, which is in my congressional district.

As with all programs, there have been some SBDC's that have experienced problems and I support efforts to improve the current program. On the whole, however, the SBDC Program has proved to be invaluable. For example, the Government Accounting Office [GAO] found an 81 percent approval rating among SBDC Program clients. Furthermore, the SBDC Program actually gave more than it got from the Federal tax coffers. This program has developed strong, productive relationships with State and local government agencies and the business community. it is recognized nationally as the most efficient and effective assistance program to small business.

The President wants to dismantle the SBDC Program and replace it with one which will cost the American taxpayer unnecessarily. Efficiency will be lost and so will several hundred million taxpayer dollars during the phase-out/phase-in of the two programs. I am not sure what vision the President sees for America, but he needs to take another look.

THE CARIBBEAN BASIN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT AND NAFTA

HON. J.J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join my colleague SAM GIBBONS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade, Committee on Ways and Means, in the sponsorship of the Caribbean Basin Free-Trade Agreements Act. I believe this legislation is an excellent starting point for further discussion of the interrelationship between the Caribbean Basin Initiative and the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA].

Back in 1983, the Congress embarked on an effort to promote economic and political stability in the Caribbean region by enactment of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, commonly referred to as the Caribbean Basin Initiative, or CBI. The CBI legislation, granting special tax benefits to Caribbean nations, as well as duty-free treatment for many Caribbean imports, reflected the belief that improved trade, rather than outright aid, was the most effective method for promoting economic and political stability in America's Caribbean and Central American neighbors. CBI benefits were further refined and made permanent in 1990.

The Caribbean Basin Free-Trade Agreements Act responds to the concern of our Caribbean and Central American neighbors that the economic progress they have seen as a result of the CBI legislation will not continue if the NAFTA is adopted. These nations fear that business opportunities and investments will be diverted away from their countries and lost to Mexico.

The Caribbean Basin Free-Trade Agreements Act builds upon and complements the NAFTA. It gives CBI beneficiary countries the opportunity to accede to the NAFTA, with appropriate supplemental agreements, or to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements with provisions similar to the NAFTA. I should emphasize that this legislation is in no way intended to derail or slow down the NAFTA, but rather should be carefully coordinated, and developed hand-in-hand, with the NAFTA.

Economic strength is essential to the political stability of America's neighbors in the CBI region. We took an important first step toward this goal when we enacted the CBI Program. The Caribbean Basin Free-Trade Agreements Act takes us one step further, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES FARINA, HOBOKEN LIONS CLUB MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. James Farina on his selection as the Hoboken Lions Club's Man of the Year.

The Lions' selection is well founded. Jim's dedication as a community activist and leader serves as an example both to the Lions' membership and the community at large. Jim was the founder of the Hoboken Young Democrats Club, which under his leadership made it possible for the youth of Hoboken to participate in athletic leagues, helping them to develop skills, a healthy lifestyle, and a spirit of competition. In fact, Jim's Hoboken Young Democrats Club made national history in the mid-1970's by sponsoring the first Little League baseball team to allow girls to participate.

In 1974, Jim's dedication to community service inspired him to seek election to the

Hoboken Board of Education, and he has served admirably as a board trustee since that time as president, vice president, and chairman of athletics.

In 1977, the mayor of Hoboken appointed Jim as director of the health and welfare department, where he served until 1984 when he was appointed city clerk.

Jim Farina's contribution to the community has been, and I trust will continue to be, outstanding. In short, Mr. Farina truly exemplifies the Lions' credo, "We Serve."

TRIBUTE TO GEN. EDWIN H. BURBA, JR.

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to recognize Gen. Edwin H. Burba, Jr., for his exemplary dedication and selfless service to this Nation during more than 34 years as an officer in the U.S. Army. Since entering the Army in 1957, from the U.S. Military Academy, Gen. Ed Burba's career has been by a succession of assignments of increasing responsibility which earned him a reputation for tenacious leadership, keen analytical ability, and sound managerial skills. His leadership is evidenced by his command assignments from platoon through Forces Command—the Department of Defense's largest command consisting of over 1 million men and women.

General Burba's dedication to the Nation extends beyond the Army. He introduced the capstone concept that reflects national military strategy and the increasingly important reserve component role in projecting power worldwide. As supporting commander-in-chief during operations Just Cause, Desert Shield/Storm, and Restore Hope, General Burba oversaw the mobilization of over 140,000 reserve component soldiers and deployment of over 252,000 active component soldiers. His establishment of Joint Task Force Six to counter the major influx of illegal drugs into the United States has greatly improved the effectiveness of the war on drugs and has helped to deter the entry of illegal drugs into the United States. He paved the way for increased civil-military coordination through the forces command crisis action team during Hurricane Hugo, the Boise Interagency Fire Center's wildland firefighting efforts, Joint Task Force-Los Angeles, CA Francisco earthquake, and Hurricane Andrew.

I request that my colleagues join me in expressing heartfelt gratitude to not only General Burba, but to his wife Trish as well for their distinguished service to the Army, Forces Command, and the Department of Defense.

ARTS ADVOCACY DAY

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 17, marked Arts Advocacy Day—the day when arts leaders from across the country come to Washington, DC, to discuss the cultural issues facing their communities and the country as a whole.

It is certainly an important time for this discussion. As we face our Nation's great challenges—the economy, education, trade, community development—we must remember that the arts are an integral part of this discussion and truly one of the country's greatest assets.

Speaking as the Nancy Hanks lecturer for the American Council on the Arts on the eve of Arts Advocacy Day, our former colleague, the Honorable Barbara Jordan, spoke as only she can on this subject—in passionate and insightful terms. In her stunning lecture, Professor Jordan addressed the economic, educational, and unifying aspects of the arts and communicated that the arts are not an adornment but an intrinsic part of the American experience, of the American dream.

I am thrilled to share these comments with my colleagues and insert them in the RECORD. As Chair of the congressional arts caucus, I also humbly ask that my own comments on the occasion of Arts Advocacy Day, as well as those of the caucus' vice chair, Senator JAMES M. JEFFORDS, be inserted.

STATEMENT OF BARBARA JORDAN

I am most delighted to be included among the list of distinguished persons who have presented the Nancy Hanks Lecture. Thank you for the honor.

In 1988, Arthur Schlesinger Jr. gave this lecture. He referred to the well-regarded work he and his father have done in developing and promoting the idea of the cycles of American history. I quote now from his book, which bears that name:

"Wise men have remarked on a pattern of alternation, of ebb and flow, in human history. "The two parties which divide the state, the party of Conservatism and that of Innovation," wrote Emerson in 1841, "are very old, and have disputed the possession of the world ever since it was made. * * * Now one, now the other gets the day, and still the fight renews itself as if for the first time, under new names and hot personalities." Innovation presses ever forward; Conservatism holds ever back. We are reformers spring and summer, in autumn and winter we stand by the old; reformers in the morning, conservers at night. 'Innovation is the salient energy; Conservatism the pause on the last moment.'"

Continuing, from Professor Schlesinger:

"Half a century later, Henry Adams applied a more precise version of the cyclical thesis to the first years of the American republic. "A period of about twelve years," he wrote, "measured the beat of the pendulum. After the Declaration of Independence, twelve years had been needed to create an efficient Constitution; another twelve years of energy brought a reaction against the government then created; a third period of twelve years was ending in a sweep toward still greater energy; and already a child could calculate the result of a few more such returns."

We are properly positioned in time, in this year, 1993, to begin a new cycle. Optimism is fairly dripping from the air. A new generation of leaders struggles—at first somewhat awkwardly—to find its sea legs. Old words are coming out of new mouths as we seek to find our niche. This is not a time to be shy. One way to guarantee that this sense of hope will not be lost is to act on it now.

If your thing, that is, your interest, concern, involvement or passion, is the arts, you are probably at this moment in time some what reluctant to speak too loudly. With all the rhetoric of budget deficits and sacrifice perhaps you feel that it would be somehow sacrilegious to talk about the arts. *Wrong!!* The arts are an integral part of us and have often been pivotal in reinvigorating our national spirit.

The primary thesis of my remarks today is that the arts, instead of quaking along the periphery of our policy concerns must push boldly into the core of policy. The arts are a response to our individuality and our nature and help to shape our identify. Or as a young student in a class at Laguna Gloria Art Museum in my hometown of Austin, Texas, wrote, "Every feeling comes out on my paper and in my drawings." The arts *are not a frill* and should not be treated as such. They have the potential to become the driving force for healing division and divisiveness.

I would guess that few of you in this room think that the arts are a frill. I doubt that you would be here if you held that view. But each of us knows that to further what progress the arts have made as an integral part of American life—we must *reason* with those who are inclined to consider the arts as one of those things to be dealt with seriously much later on.

I want to offer to you today a premise, with which I hope you agree, that in this time of change in American life, in this new administration of hope, in this time of putting people first, it is the arts that are uniquely placed not just to tag along in the changes, but to be part and parcel of every bold new step we take.

I submit to you the idea that the arts can be the validation of the American dream. We heard President Clinton in his address to a joint session of Congress last month speak about renewing our economy so that the American dream can be a possibility for everyone. No one disputes that a healthy economy is part and parcel of the American dream. But it is our job to teach emphatically that the arts are more than just the decorations on that dream.

And what precisely is the American dream? It is—*That we are one people.*

E Pluribus Unum. The Latin phrase on the great seal of the United States literally translated means one from many. We need to re-attach pluribus to unum—the many to the one. That motto challenges our diversity. No nation on the face of the earth had tried so bold an experiment until us, the Americans. No one thought that success would come easily. Even though the founders were aggressive in pursuing liberty, their quest for equality failed to include all. They envisioned no role for former slaves and deferred for a century even thinking about the issue. Even the great Democrat of Monticello, Thomas Jefferson, was apprehensive. He—quoting now from a recent Wall Street Journal article—"feared that a simple biracial America, white and black as equals, would not long endure. He advocated Black Freedom, but remained paralyzed by its implications."

Jefferson articulated his quandary regarding slavery when he said, "We have the wolf by the ears and we can neither hold him, nor safely let him go." What frustration!

The arts can help us painlessly to articulate and showcase our oneness. The arts have no pigmentation. The American Dream has survived many attacks from our deadliest war to Rodney King. That's a long stretch. To borrow a phrase from William Faulkner,

I remain confident it will continue not just to survive, but to prevail over the attacks from extremists of every ilk. Today, we are made uncomfortable by newly awakened notions of "ethnic cleansing." Why the discomfort? Perhaps we are haunted by our past. Again, we do not know what to do with that wolf.

Assimilation was *never* the goal of the diverse ethnic groups in America. Inclusion without discomfort is now and ever will be the goal. Maybe one day we will be comfortable enough with each other to drop the hyphens. There should be no hyphenated Americans. The idea of a melting pot was and remains a myth. Universal inclusivity is not a radical idea. The President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities, writing under the Bush administration, concluded that "American culture incorporates the heritage of many people and thereby provides a unique context for multicultural understanding."

But what is there that can transcend deep differences and stubborn divisions? I suggest—the arts. They have a wonderful universality. Art has the potential to unify. It can speak in many languages without a translator. Art does not discriminate—it ignores external irrelevancies and opts for quality, talent and competence. Let me quote again from the children attending the class at the Austin museum—children who could not have attended without scholarships. When asked if they were surprised at what their classmates had made, as well as what they had made themselves, some of the responses were, "Yes, because I didn't expect to see some of the things I could do," and "Yes, I didn't think I could do it that good," and "I was surprised that all the art work turned out great." Again, art unifies, it does not discriminate.

We are all concerned about the economy. We know it has been in a deep rut and President Clinton is struggling mightily to find the tools to get us out. We need to make our voices heard with the message that the arts should not be overlooked in the economic decisions being made today. I applaud our President for seeking to avoid the quick-fix mentality that got us where we are today. It is only in long-term solutions that we will thrive. And I think the arts offer one of those long-term solutions. Yes, this is one of those "radical" ideas spelled out by none other than the last administration's Committee on the Arts and Humanities.

There is no reason, patrons of the arts, to apologize for beauty. But it is important in this time of economic worries to articulate what is obvious to each of us—that art does more than stimulate and please the senses. The arts, in the words of the President's Committee, are integrally related to the U.S. economy and contribute to our Nation's wealth, competitiveness and growth. If we look just at the copyright industries of broadcasting, records and tapes, motion pictures, theatrical productions, newspapers, periodicals and books, plus computer programming and software, we find a contribution of more than $173 billion, or 3.3 percent of our gross national product. Add art, photography and architecture and you find a contribution of almost 6 percent to the GNP from the arts—more than food, apparel, chemical and refining industries combined.

These figures don't include the economic impact of increased tourism and revitalization of downtown urban areas. Nor do these figures speak to a vital part of the American dream: The arts provide a passage out of poverty for thousands of economically disadvantaged individuals. Professional sports may capture the imaginations of many economically impoverished young people, but the arts—historically more open to all of the diverse segments of our society—provide the careers that can lift young men and women out of poverty.

And why is it that the arts can work this economic magic? It isn't magic, it's common sense. There is a direct relationship between the arts and self-esteem. Again, quoting from the children in the Laguna Gloria museum school: "No one can say you art is ugly because it is in the eyes of the beholder." One child learned "that I could be productive." Self esteem is a good that each individual cherishes. An artist creates beauty and others enjoy it. He or she gets pleasure in knowing that he is the source of that pleasure and thus, regard for self is enhanced.

Self esteem is a value which forecloses destructive tendencies; that is, you cannot feel good about who you are and where you are and simultaneously destroy your neighborhood. Such a contradiction is inherent and would be personally painful and debilitating.

I have just echoed the thoughts of Jacques Barzun, who in the 1973 Mellon Lectures In the Fine Arts, declared that "art is power." He said that art "influences the mind, the nerves, the feelings, the soul" and that it "carries messages of hope, hostility, derision and moral rebuke. It can fight material and spiritual evils and can transmit the ideals of a community now living, long past, or soon to be born." The arts are a multigenerational communicator.

In order for the arts to live up to the ambitious agenda I have prescribed, those of us who are patrons and supporters must be more than distant observers and appreciative spectators. We need to seek a permanent place in public school curricula for arts education. I commend the New York Times for its attention in a number of recent articles entitled "Missing Muses." Those articles point out that art classes teach the very qualities educators can re-invigorate American schools—analytical thinking, teamwork, motivation and self-discipline.

In Austin, an elementary school teacher is quoted as saying, "Fine arts is where every child can succeed. It doesn't matter if the child is a genius or a slow learner. You have a natural at-risk program at every school." A school board trustee said, "Public school arts programs are the only outlet that poor people have. While some families can afford private lessons, there are thousands who can't." That trustee was obviously not in the majority when two years ago, the Austin school board cut art and music and physical education classes out of its kindergarten curriculum as one way of balancing its budget. Some of the district's schools have managed to re-institute those classes, but only through extraordinary efforts by teachers, parents and private contributions.

The arts deserve a higher place on America's public policy agenda. Sondra Myers, the cultural adviser to Pennsylvania's governor, recently wrote:

"At this moment of political change—which offers the promise of a people-centered political agenda—we must wake up to the realities of our rich cultural resources and make the case for the integration of culture into public policy. We need to use every asset at our disposal to restore a sense of community and humaneness to our society, and culture."

We must—to borrow a phrase from the 1960s—seize the moment that has been handed to us. We are embarking on the first movements in a new cycle in American history. We have just completed a cycle during which the arts survived but only by scratching and clawing to hold the gains of the previous cycle. It is up to those of us in this room to lead the way. We must be sure that our President and the Congress—and the American people most of all—understand that the arts can lift us all up.

I listened on January 20, to Maya Angelou as she captured beauty in language. She said:

Here on the pulse of this new day
You may have the grace to look up and out
And into your sister's eyes and into
Your brother's face, your country
And say simply
Very simply
With hope
Good morning.

I listened; I heard; I believed. Patrons, practitioners, supporters of the arts—I say to you—very simply, with hope—Good morning. Have a very good day.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER

I greatly appreciate this chance to speak to you all today at this yearly strategy conference which has such an influential role in shaping the national arts agenda. It is a particular pleasure to do so as Chair of the more than 250 bipartisan members of the Congressional Arts Caucus. Arts Advocacy Day is clearly an opportunity for legislators and arts advocates to discuss what they see as the cultural priorities facing their artistic fields and communities. But, it is also an opportunity to convey to the nation the vital and far-reaching role that the arts play in every facet of American life and to insist, with directness and clarity, that the arts not be taken for granted or relegated to a secondary status.

This session of Congress marks a momentous time for America's cultural community and presents us with a tremendous opportunity. The 103rd Congress, along with a new Administration, faces a legislative agenda which promises to have long-lasting implications for our nation's cultural vitality. As we roll up our sleeves to tackle the crucial issues facing our country, we must all work to keep the arts as a national priority across the spectrum of national concerns.

I believe that the mission for each of us here must be to communicate the important link between the arts and such areas as the economy, education, health care and trade. We must convey that the arts are truly our greatest asset, that we flourish as a nation, a society and a civilization when the arts flourish.

Discussion of the arts should include an explanation of the role that the arts play in economic revitalization of our cities, in the anchor they provide to every type of community and the economic impact they have on every aspect of a geographic area—be it through tourism, commerce, business and development. For instance, in my District of Rochester, we are blessed with such extraordinary institutions as the Eastman School of Music, the Garth Fagan Dance Company, the GeVa Theatre and countless other groups, all of which are not only beloved but inextricably tied to the vitality, the character and the success of the area.

For that matter, it should be conveyed that the arts are our most popular and lucrative export and have consistently made a positive contribution to the balance of trade. We should also raise awareness as to tax policy here at home, whether it is through full

value for gifts of appreciated property or the ability to deduct legitimate arts and theatre expenses. When we discuss the arts and the legislative agenda, we must explain that the most innovative and effective reforms in education involve the arts, and that only when we educate our children to understand their own and other cultures do we prepare them for the challenges of the future.

Similarly, when there is talk of better educating our children in math and science, we must remind our leaders that the best training in creative thinking in any academic discipline can and should involve the arts.

Certainly, health care will be considered this session, and we must explain that artists have specific concerns regarding health insurance and such issues as hazardous arts materials, AIDS and other matters.

Special attention must be focused in areas such as homelessness and on young artists—not only those studying in conservatorie but those gifted and talented children living in our poorest communities.

Of course, we will work to ensure that the federal arts agencies are treated fairly in the budget process, that postal rates for nonprofit organizations are maintained and that the federal arts agencies are reauthorized in a manner that allows them to continue their exceptional work in fostering artistic excellence and creative expression.

However, in our advocacy, we must be sure that we are fighting the correct battles and acting on accurate information. For instance, the rumor that Leon Panetta, Director of the Office of Management and Budget—a staunch supporter of the arts for many years—intends to do away with all arts funding is simply not true, and it does not serve the arts community well to expend time and energy fighting what is essentially an unnecessary battle. Certainly, a positive expression of support for the arts to the administration or to Members of Congress should never be discouraged.

But, on a more fundamental level, our advocacy for the arts must convey the role that the arts play in the very success and advancement of our nation. We must explain that the arts are our greatest asset, in terms of the economy, education and trade but no less so in the power of the arts to heal, to inspire, to entertain and to bring out the greatest humanity in each of us.

I encourage each of you, in meetings with your Representatives and Senators, to encourage them to join the Arts Caucus if they have not already done so. Quite simply, the Arts Caucus is the most effective link within Congress between legislators and the full range of cultural issues and concerns. By joining the Arts Caucus, they receive a steady stream of factual information and specialized assistance on each and every legislative issue of importance to the cultural community.

Finally, I commend all of you on the work that you do day in and day out to ensure that the arts continue to thrive and to touch the lives of all of our citizens.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAMES M. JEFFORDS

I would like to welcome you to our nation's capital—a city which represents the synthesis of a vibrant and successful arts community and host to many of the national and local arts organizations present today. As Vice-Chair and a founding member of the Congressional Arts Caucus, I would like to commend all of you for your crucial work as advocates in generating and preserving support for the arts in America, and I encourage you to keep up your grass roots efforts.

The last several years have demonstrated the importance of recognizing the economic as well as cultural impact of the arts on our neighborhoods, our schools, and especially our homes. This is a great opportunity for your increased participation on the local level—making sure that citizens back home understand the wonderful returns for the community that arts funding provides for less than 1 percent of the entire national budget. You are all well aware that one of the arts' greatest strengths is its ability to cross social, ethnic and even geographic differences, creating a cultural common ground and promoting understanding of those very differences.

To that extent, Congress has and should continue to support endeavors to reach out to undeserved rural and urban areas across America. The new administration has pledged support for government funding of the arts, but your efforts are needed to emphasize the daily impact of the arts on the lives of all Americans. Arts organizations and agencies such as the NEA have made tremendous strides in broadening the spectrum for whom and where arts programming is targeted. Still, too many people from too many towns and cities have not been given the chance to fully experience live theater, a musical performance, or have a community center for cultural and family artistic events.

The arts have played a vital role in the reinvestment of our communities and thus an instrumental part in our revitalization. The NEA recently announced its 1993 Challenge grants program to 22 different states and I am proud to say that the Vermont Folklife Center in my home state received a grant for operating costs and program development. Apparently, the NEA received the most applications ever for its Challenge grants, and 31% of the grant recipients were first-timers. These statistics not only demonstrate the growing importance of the arts; they focus on our country's artistic diversity as well as highlighting the private support that needs to be tapped to match public money.

Most importantly, we must work together to build a strong coalition of arts supports. One of the best ways to ensure your Members of Congress are well informed is to encourage them to join the Arts Caucus during your visits tomorrow. And if they are already Caucus members, don't forget to let them know how much you appreciate their membership and commitment.

Let me reiterate, the Congressional Arts Caucus understands the important role that Congress has in determining arts policy. But it is your duty as advocates to speak out for concerned citizens. Now more than ever, you must reach out beyond Congress and directly to the people that are most helped by the arts—your neighbors in every town, city and state across America.

LIVING BY THE LAW

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday some in the antiabortion movement raised the debate to a new level after a pro-life zealot tragically shot and killed a physician outside his clinic.

The issue of abortion generates intense emotions. But, in a democratic society, individuals, regardless of their strong feelings, cannot place themselves or their cause above the law.

Yet, following the murder, some within the antiabortion groups created an even more unstable environment by subtly condoning the murderous act and depicting the doctor as a perpetrator rather than a victim. Activist Don Treshman of Rescue America reminded his supporters that "Over a dozen babies would have died Wednesday" if the doctor hadn't been shot.

This encouragement of lawless acts disparages the rule of law we hold sacred. It diminishes the individual and degrades the very sanctity of life that the pro-life movement seeks to defend.

It has helped to lead me to support H.R. 796, the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act, obviously needed because some in our society, blinded by their fanaticism, cannot live within the ample freedoms provided to all Americans—rights that demand only one responsibility: to live according to the rule of law and respect the equal rights of others.

THE AMERICAN INDIAN AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1993

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the American Indian Agricultural Act of 1993. I am pleased to be joined by Representatives WILLIAMS and JOHNSON as cosponsors of this very important legislation. This bill will provide a statutory framework for the Federal Government to carry out its trust responsibilities to Native Americans and their agricultural and range lands.

Native Americans suffer the highest poverty and unemployment rates in the Nation. Indian agriculture has been a longstanding source of employment and economic development for Indian tribes and Alaska Natives. Unfortunately, history is ripe with instances where Indian agricultural lands and rangelands have been severely mismanaged and their productivity destroyed. The Federal Government, as trustee, has been a party to the continuing mismanagement of Indian agricultural lands and rangelands. As compared to other federally managed lands, Indian agricultural lands and rangelands do not receive the same level of assistance from the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, Indian agricultural and range lands provide income, employment, and subsistence to many native Americans. Over 33,000 Indian families are actively engaged in agriculture or ranching. In addition, nearly 45,000 native Americans grow agricultural products for subsistence. Nearly 75 percent of the 54 million acres of Indian trust lands are currently used for agriculture. In 1991, the value of agricultural products grown on Indian lands nationally, topped $892 million.

The bill I am introducing today, recognizes the Federal Government's trust responsibility to Indian tribes and their natural resources. The bill also recognizes the fiduciary duty to

protect, conserve, and enhance Indian agricultural lands and range lands. These agricultural lands are important natural resources and vital to economic, social, and cultural welfare of Indian tribes and their members. The bill establishes a process for Indian tribes to develop a 10-year management plan for their agricultural lands and range lands. It will increase educational and training opportunities for native Americans in agriculture and land management related areas.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will increase the development and productivity of Indian agricultural and range lands. It will provide for improved management of Indian agricultural and range lands which will increase economic returns, enhance Indian self-determination, and promote employment opportunities for native Americans. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

KILLING AN INDUSTRY THAT SAVES LIVES

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring my colleagues' attention to the following Op-Ed piece that recently appeared in the Wall Street Journal. Dr. Steven M. Paul provides us with a vivid testimony about the dangers of attacking a part of the health care industry that saves lives and money—pharmaceutical manufacturers.

Before the Democratic leadership in Congress and the administration launches their next round of attacks on the pharmaceutical industry, they should think of three words: jobs, cost, and health. First, the pharmaceutical industry provided our economy with an astonishing 38 percent job growth throughout the 1980's compared to 5 percent in the manufacturing sector. Furthermore, the drugs provided by this industry allow sick Americans to avoid costly surgery and hospital stays, and most important, the stunning advances made by these drug manufacturers have given people longer, healthier lives. By continuing their unrelenting attacks, the Democratic leadership in Congress and the administration will destroy this important industry.

WHY I'M LEAVING GOVERNMENT FOR A DRUG FIRM

(By Steven M. Paul)

I am the scientific director of the intramural research program of the National Institute of Mental Health, part of the National Institutes of Health. I head the largest and, arguably, most successful government-funded central nervous system (CNS) research program in the world. My federal career, with its opportunities to do exciting science and be of benefit to others, has brought me immense satisfaction. Yet in just a few weeks I will be leaving my government position to become vice president for CNS research at Eli Lilly Co. in Indianapolis. I will be joining the industry that President Clinton has accused of pursuing "profits at the expense of our children."

It is important for me to explain why, for I think the attack on the drug companies by the administration and its friends shows a misunderstanding of the process by which medicines are discovered and brought to bear on human disease. This misunderstanding and the angry rhetoric it produces threaten the future of drug development and the success of the healthcare reform that is one of Mr. Clinton's chief policy objectives.

The attraction of my new job is not primarily financial; my salary here at NIMH is more than comfortable. I am leaving government because of the real—even likely—possibility that in the private sector I will make a direct contribution to discovering and developing drugs to treat some of the world's most devasting brain disorders. This mission is nothing less than noble, whether it is pursued by public agencies or by private companies. Moreover, the development of drugs, vaccines, medical devices and diagnostics has been and will be our most powerful means of saving health-care dollars.

Mr. Clinton's recent charges against American drug companies have never acknowledged the true value of drugs and vaccines. We have a duty to remember the human suffering alleviated by modern vaccines for polio, rubella, whooping cough, measles and other such diseases, or by the new generation of antibiotic, antihypertensive, antiulcer, and antipsychotic drugs introduced over the past 10 years. Retrospective analyses of the performance of today's drugs and vaccines show staggering cost savings.

Such drugs promise to be even more beneficial in the future. As a practicing physician, I know that present treatments for diseases like AIDS, Alzheimer's disease, cancer and schizophrenia are not very effective. Such illnesses now require extensive medical intervention, long-term hospitalization, or even chronic institutionalization, at incredible personal and financial cost.

But biomedical research is in the midst of a revolution that is transforming our basic understanding of disease and our ability to diagnose and treat previously hopeless conditions. If the pharmaceutical industry's critics seriously consider the moral and economic consequences of such a prospect, I cannot believe that they will ignore or mischaracterize it as they have done so far.

The government cannot produce these new medicines. Our contributions are valuable, but our programs do basic, relatively nontargeted research. We simply do not have the money, personnel, or organization needed to develop specific drugs and take the high risks of bringing them to market. Some think that the drug companies' ratio of marketing expenses to research costs is too high. But Eli Lilly, just one such company, spends almost $1 billion a year on high-quality research, as much as NIH spends on all its intramural research programs together. Thus the medicines we need can be found and developed only through private entrepreneurship.

This entrepreneurship cannot simply be counted on as an automatic outgrowth of profit-seeking. Public authorities can easily erode the morale of a chance-taking enterprise like the pharmaceutical industry and send its people scurrying for safer ways to generate corporate income. The adversarial relationship with the industry that the administration and other officials are promoting by characterizing its people as predators creates disincentives to creativity and its consequent innovation.

In the 1992 presidential election, I voted for Bill Clinton because he based his campaign on the politics of inclusion and diversity. He convinced me that he strongly supported U.S. business and technology and that he recognized their contribution to our welfare. I do not understand why a president so intent on improving this country's health, reducing its medical costs, and increasing its domestic and international economic performance through high-technology pursuits would single out for criticism an industry that has made outstanding contributions on all three fronts.

There are questions about the prices and availability of drugs and vaccines that are serious and must be discussed. But the answers are complicated ones and should not be reduced to demagogic rhetoric. I ask the president to elevate this discussion by beginning a reasoned dialogue with the pharmaceutical industry about the public decision that will affect its future. We all need an environment that allows the industry to prosper and support continuing scientific creativity. As Mr. Clinton has eloquently stated, we in this country do not have a single individual to waste. Can we afford to waste a successful industry and the immense benefits that it stands ready to bring us?

STORM OF THE CENTURY

HON. KAREN L. THURMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, seven of the nine counties in my district have been declared Federal disaster areas in the wake of this past weekend's storm of the century which ravaged the Eastern third of the country and leveled many communities in my district. My thoughts and prayers are with those who lost loved ones to the storm, and those who struggle to cope with the loss of home and property in the aftermath of this terrible disaster.

As I express my sorrow and grief, my bereavement is tempered by hope. In the days following the storm, officials at the Federal, State, and local level have acted with speed and efficiency to begin the process of repair and rebuilding.

My thanks go out to President Clinton who responded Monday to my call, and those of other Representatives, to add hard-hit Dixie County to the list of declared disaster areas. I also wish to recognize FEMA officials who answered a request from me and others for a disaster assistance center to be established in Citrus County. That center will open in Crystal River on Friday afternoon.

I look forward to meeting with FEMA representatives tomorrow as I inspect the disaster assistance programs in my district, and look for ways in which my staff and I might continue to lend a hand to those in need.

FEMA has already established six Disaster Assistance Centers:

1. Evans Square Shopping Center, Corner of U.S. 19 and Alligator, Cross City, FL.
2. VFW Post, 3435 Shoreline Blvd., Spring Hill, FL.
3. Marion County McPherson Government Complex, Property Appraisers Office, 501 SE 25th Ave., Ocala, FL.
4. Veterans Memorial Center, 14333 Hicks, Hudson, FL.
5. National Guard Armory, 203 Forest Park Drive, Perry, FL.
6. National Guard Armory, 605 South Bay Street, Eustis, FL.

In addition to FEMA, the following agencies have set up on site administration to help the victims of the storm:

Small Business Administration: The SBA will coordinate directly with FEMA and will be working out of the Disaster Assistance Centers established by FEMA. The SBA has opened its own disaster assistance hotline: 1-800-359-2227.

Social Security Administration: The Ocala office of the Social Security Administration is currently working with the Postmaster to insure that those who are unable to receive their checks at home will be able to get their checks at alternate locations. Any constituent needing assistance with their April 3 check should call the SSA Office at (904) 629-1850.

Department of Agriculture: USDA will also be located at the disaster assistance centers. Any constituent needing additional assistance with storm relief from the USDA should not hesitate to contact my office at 1-800-833-4352.

In addition, the Farmers Home Administration has offices in the following locations:

State Office: Louis Frost, Acting State Director, 4440 NW 25th Place, PO Box 147010, Gainesville, FL 32614, (904) 338-3400.

District Office #3: Charles L. Nichols, District Director, Federal Building, Rm. 248, 207 NW 2nd Street, Box 19, Ocala, FL 34475, (904) 732-9796.

Alachua County: Mel L. Thompson, County Supervisor, 5709 NW 13th Street, Suite C, Gainesville, FL 32606, (904) 376-5858.

Levy, Dixie, Gilchrist Counties: Donna C. Burns, Highway 27, PO Box 1299, Bronson, FL 32621, (904) 495-2831.

Marion County: Rod C. Quainton II, County Supervisor, Federal Building, Rm. 236, 207 NW 2nd Street, Box 20, Ocala, FL 32670, (904) 732-9840.

Sumter, Citrus, Hernando Counties: Dorothy L. Westmore, County Supervisor, 507 N. Market Street, PO Box 217, Bushnell, FL 33513, (904) 793-2821.

The American Red Cross has established a disaster headquarters in Ocala to coordinate relief efforts in all of Florida. Following is the current list of Red Cross Service Centers that were established:

Dixie: Old TG&Y Store, Cross City, FL.

Pasco: Veterans Memorial Center, 14333 Hicks Street, Hudson, FL.

Additionally, the Red Cross will open centers in Hernando Beach and Crystal River. I have talked with the office of Elizabeth Dole and pledged to work closely with them in order to help the victims of this storm as much as possible.

The Red Cross always needs money. Anyone wishing to contribute should do so through their local Red Cross Office.

MEDICINE FOR 724 CHILDREN

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I placed a George Will column in the RECORD with the comment that he had slammed one home again.

This article by Mr. Will approaches Churchill's favorite word, sublime.

[From Newsweek, March 22, 1993]

"MEDICINE" FOR "724 CHILDREN"

(By George F. Will)

Herewith an understated introduction to the practice of pediatrics in the inner city: "The young child's attempts to master the age-appropriate fears of monsters under the bed are severely undermined when the child needs to sleep under the bed to dodge real bullets or attempt to screen out the violent fights of his or her caregivers."

That is from a recent article in The Journal of the American Medical Association, which reported a survey of elementary school-age children in New Orleans: 90 percent had witnessed violence; 70 percent had seen a weapon used; 40 percent had seen a corpse. An estimated 10 to 20 percent of Los Angeles homicides are witnessed by children. And a study at Boston City Hospital found 10 percent of the children treated in the pediatric primary care clinic have witnessed a shooting or stabbing before they are 6, half at home, half in the streets.

BCH has been serving Boston since 1864, when Sherman was burning Atlanta. Today there are war conditions, and war effects, in many urban neighborhoods. A recent study found similar post-traumatic stress disorders in children in war-torn Mozambique, Cambodia, the West Bank—and Chicago. The disorders include inability to concentrate, persistent sleep disturbance, flashbacks, sudden startling and hypervigilance, nihilistic and fatalistic orientation toward the future, leading to increased risk taking. To be a witness to violence is to be a victim of violence.

Small wonder that Boston has its share of what are known, in the grim argot of today's cities, as "724 children"—children kept at home, indoors, seven days a week, 24 hours a day, because of the epidemic of violence. Some of the fortunate ones come into contact with the doctors and social workers at BCH, a hard-used hospital that gives new meaning to the phrase "family medicine." Children are patients but families, such as they may be, are treated.

BCH's youngest patients often ask why the adults in their lives—parents, teachers, police—can't keep them safe. BCH physicians and social workers—a commingled group—regard as a treatable health problem the consequences of traumatically learning at an early age that he world is dangerous and unpredictable. A pervasive sense of danger, according to BCH doctors, causes people to make decisions that seem inexplicable to people more safely situated. For example, some women who are HIV-infected will still purposely get pregnant even though there is a 20 to 30 percent risk of having an infected child. Doctors say those odds do not seem so daunting when considered against the odds of being shot, raped, mugged . . . Besides, for the HIV-infected mother, childbirth is an affirmation of normality, of the fact that life goes on. Similarly, for a young inner-city male who sees death before 20 as common on the mean streets, a baby as an heir is an attractive idea.

A child who learns early to fear the world is apt to lose his or her natural proclivity for exploration of the world. A "724 child" may need to be taught how to participate in normal socializing play that other children learn naturally when growing up where civil peace prevails. Because we are apt to parent as we are parented, many unwed mothers or others from the culture of poverty need to be taught—and are movingly eager to learn—about talking, playing and reading with children. So BCH doctors have given children 9,000 books. Reading together can be therapy for families under the stress of crowding in apartments where children are kept on beds to prevent them from crawling on floors flecked with fragments of lead paint.

"Not a quick fix": A BCH doctor notes that it is common to hear grandmothers living in poverty say of young children, "They're smart when they're little. They get dumb when they get older." There is a sad wisdom behind such statements. The children of the poor are apt to be developmentally on a par with middle class children until, say, 2. Then apparent cognitive deterioration, relative to other children—actually, failure to attain potential—is apt to become noticeable. This is a result of various traumas and emotional and cognitive deprivations, in the withering of or failure to articulate parental expectations. This deterioration is neither necessary nor irreversible, but preventing it requires intense, unremitting one-on-one contact whereby a person with the coping skills necessary for flourishing in an urban setting imparts such skills to someone who lacks them. "We know how to do this," says a BCH doctor. "It is fixable. It is just a quick fix."

It doubtless seems anomalous, and may be in some ways inefficient, for so many social services to be dispensed through the urban health care system. But an inner-city hospital often is, for its poorest patients, the point of entry into the system of social services. So BCH's staff find themselves arranging with the employers of patients for time off for hospital visits; or dispensing basic nutritional counseling; or encouraging families to talk about everything from goals to heroes; or suggesting strategies of urban prudence.

This last, especially, can be urgent for health: an inner-city person who becomes a victim of violence has a 40 percent chance of becoming a victim again. This not only because of where he or she lives, but because of an inability to step away from the "bad vibes" of someone else's ugly intent; or because of an inability to get angry—which is normal—without acting out the anger, action being the articulateness of the streets; or because a victim often looks like a victim. Social workers here say that of the appalling numbers of children carrying weapons to school most are not aggressive but frightened. (According to a 1990 survey by the Centers for Disease Control, 1 of every 5 high school students had carried a weapon and 1 in 20 had carried a gun in a 30-day period.) And many of the aggressive ones have been so desensitized by urban life that they feel alive only when enjoying a "rep" (reputation), something most quickly acquired by installing fear.

So BCH's staff does a lot that is not, strictly speaking, medicine, "But," says one doctor, "it's all health." Says another, "This is not like trauma surgery, where you leap in, stop someone's bleeding and are a hero in an instant." Yes, but what BCH does is much more than medicine, and does much for the dignity of doctoring, and although it does not deal in instantaneous drama, it has its own heroism.

THE NEGRO EDUCATIONAL EMERGENCY DRIVE [NEED]: AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME, 1963-93

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note 30 years of outstanding efforts by the

Negro Educational Emergency Drive [NEED] to provide over 13,000 African-American students from western Pennsylvania with a source of educational financial assistance when all other avenues of assistance have been exhausted.

The NEED organization will celebrate 30 years of service to the African-American community on March 25, 1993. This Pittsburgh-based group has labored over these many years to provide a court of final appeal for African-American students who require special financial assistance to enter or remain in school. NEED financial assistance has empowered these students to overcome the final hurdles of dealing with the increasing cost of seeking a higher education.

I want to commend the efforts of the Negro Educational Emergency Drive over the past 30 years. Special tribute should be given to Florence Reizenstein and Marion Jordon, the founders of NEED. I also want to wish this organization, its executive director, Dr. Herman L. Reid, Jr., its executive committee and its trustees continued success in the future. It is groups like NEED which provide hope for young men and women who work hard to obtain a better education and a brighter future. NEED deserves our recognition and our thanks for the service it provides to young African-American students.

I insert the following statement by Herman L. Reid, Jr., Ed.D., executive director of NEED, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NEGRO EDUCATIONAL EMERGENCY DRIVE

(By Herman L. Reid, Jr., Ed.D.)

Thirty years ago, a small group of concerned citizens, led by Florence Reizenstein and Marion Jordon, established the Negro Educational Emergency Drive (NEED). The goal was to provide last dollar financial help to 76 talented financially needy students. Since then approximately 13,000 young people and their families have benefitted from the program.

When the program began, NEED bought books, bus fare and paid tuition, room and board for the 76 students. The last dollar concept remained the same but has blossomed dramatically—the dollar amounts, and the number of people assisted have increased several times over. From a handful of people getting average grants of $300.00 in the 1960s, NEED now supports over 500 scholars each year, with an average grant of $500.00. The grants, primarily tuition, room, board and books, are sent directly to the school. It's last dollar financing—the difference between make or break.

In addition to money, NEED provides counseling. The world of higher education is a maze to every parent looking at the range of financing opportunities and aid. For students on the low end of the economic scale, it is almost impossible to understand, unless you turn to NEED. Volunteers work with parents, educators, students and admissions officers to crack the financial barriers separating students and schools.

In 1992, the Buhl Foundation funded a study to determine the impact that NEED had in the community. Four major findings highlighted the study.

The NEED Alumni are economically viable professionals. They are employed in 50 types of organizations, holding over forty types of occupational roles.

The NEED impact is multi-generational. The benefits associated with completing college level education were reflected in the future plans of NEED Alumni to enroll their children in colleges and universities. The majority (97.3%) of the NEED recipients indicated that they have or intend to encourage their children to earn college level education. If only half of those respondents succeed in sending their children to college, that is over two and one-half times higher than the current rate for the present population served by NEED.

The educational scholarships awarded to NEED recipients yield significantly large returns to our communities. It is estimated that during 1990, NEED Alumni contributed over $131.4 million to our society through financial and volunteering contributions and tax payments while only $7 million was provided as financial support to those individuals through NEED. Various organizations which benefitted from NEED Alumni financial and volunteering contributions include religious, social service, health/medical, educational, civic and arts/cultural.

NEED has been forced to turn away as many as 350 qualified students in a given year. The failure to support a number of qualified NEED applicants results in an enormous cost to our society. The achievements attained by NEED Alumni are an example of the tangible benefits to be gained by supporting those talented individuals with limited financial resources who aspire to higher education. Despite this record of success, NEED has been unable to meet the financial needs of a growing number of talented students, due to a shortage of funds.

As NEED looks to the next decade, a major initiative is being planned. It is the Adopt-A-Student Program. A donor can adopt one of the students that NEED does not have the funds to help by contributing $1,000.00 annually. This program will be started in churches, clubs, businesses and civic organizations. The program is currently operational in more than twenty churches, civic and business groups.

SOPHIA LOREN AND NIAF COMMENDED FOR EFFORTS TO END FAMINE AND HUMAN SUFFERING IN SOMALIA

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend the noted actress, Sophia Loren, and the National Italian-American Foundation [NIAF] for their efforts to end the hunger and human suffering in Somalia.

This month, the award-winning actress participated in two Somali benefits held back-to-back on March 9, and March 10 in Washington, DC, and Florida, respectively. These are the only two benefits for Somali relief that Miss Loren has scheduled in the United States to date. The March 9 black-tie event was held at the Four Seasons Hotel in Washington, DC's Georgetown. The March 10 gala was at The Breakers in Palm Beach, FL.

Both benefits were organized at Sophia Loren's request by the NIAF, a major advocacy group for the Nation's 20 million Americans of Italian descent, based in Washington, DC. The NIAF agreed to sponsor the fundraiser with Ms. Loren without a moment's hesitation for humanitarian reasons, according to NIAF president and former Congressman Frank J. Guarini.

The actress has maintained a long-standing association with the organization. Last October, Miss Loren received the NIAF's 1992 Quincentennial Award. This was the second time in a decade that the NIAF honored the Italian actress. In 1982, Miss Loren was the recipient of the NIAF's Lifetime Achievement Award for the Performing Arts.

Earlier this year, after the United Nations asked the award-winning Italian actress to serve as Goodwill Ambassador for its High Commissioner for Refugees, the actress visited Somalia. "I know from my experience as a child in war-torn Italy of the special plight of refugees and the displaced," she said upon her return.

But I was not prepared for the depth of feeling that came pouring from my heart as I held a crying, starving Somali baby in my arms while visiting the devastated town of Baidoa. Nothing prepared me for this moment, which has haunted me ever since.

The impact of 5 years of civil war and drought upon the Somali people has drawn the world's attention and pity. It is estimated that more than 300,000 Somali have died either as casualties of the war or because of starvation. About 2 million currently are on the brink of starving to death.

More than 1 million Somali people—80 percent of them women and children—have fled the country as a result of the civil war and famine. Terrorized, they have made long journeys on foot to seek sanctuary in neighboring countries. Currently, there are 500,000 Somali in Ethiopia; 300,000 in Kenya; 65,000 in Yemen and 15,000 in Djibouti, according to estimates by the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees [UNHCR].

Most of the Somali refugees are in camps run by the UNHCR in these countries. But the UNHCR is staggering under the burden of caring for so many sick and needy people.

In her capacity as U.N. Goodwill Ambassador for refugees, Miss Loren has recently agreed to two fund-raising events and turned to the NIAF for help in coordinating both of them. The NIAF tapped its Washington and Florida networks and also contacted a broad spectrum of other ethnic philanthropic individuals and groups for both events. The funding raised will help provide Somali refugees with food, medicine, blankets, bedding, and clothing, according to Miss Loren.

Miss Loren's career spans four decades and includes more than 80 films. In 1960, at age 26, she received the Academy Award for Best Actress for her performance in "Two Women." In 1991, she received an honorary Oscar for her lifetime contribution to the cinema.

As the major Italian-American voice in the Nation's Capital, the NIAF works closely with Congress and the White House on issues that affect Italian-Americans and their families. The NIAF is dedicated to preserving the history, heritage, and accomplishments of Italian-Americans and to promoting a fair and positive image of them in the media and to the American public. The NIAF also: Uses its national network to keep Italian-Americans informed about important issues; monitors the national media's treatment of Italian-Americans; helps

young Italian-Americans reach their educational and professional goals; serves as a clearinghouse of information on the activities and achievements of Italian-Americans; and encourages cultural exchange between the United States and Italy.

The NIAF was founded in 1975 as a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization, according to NIAF Chairman Frank D. Stella. "Our participation in Somali relief efforts is part of the NIAF's mission: To make a difference," Stella said.

HUMAN PROTECTION ACT REINTRODUCED

HON. JAMES V. HANSEN

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to reintroduce the Human Protection Act. Since I introduced this bill in the 102d Congress, the economically devastating effects of the Endangered Species Act continue to dominate headlines in our Nation's press.

I am sure that all of us believe in clean air, clean water, and protecting our environment. However, we have gone beyond the point of reason. Some of us have come to the conclusion that protecting a single species of plant or animal is more important than protecting human life. If we do not take sensible precautions, we will continue to destroy the livelihoods of thousands of humans, prevent the development of safe roads and affordable housing, and permanently depress the economy for entire regions of the Nation.

We all support steps taken to protect and preserve habitat for endangered species. However, under the current application of the Endangered Species Act, we have limited ourselves to policies that destroy human lives. How can you tell a family in southern Utah that the protection of habitat for the Mexican Spotted Owl, of which sightings have been limited to a national park in the area, is the reason that their family can no longer make a living?

To provide moderation to the Endangered Species Act—ESA, I am reintroducing the Human Protection Act along with 14 Members of Congress. The bill would amend the ESA to provide flexibility to the act. It would allow economic and social consequences to be considered in the listing of threatened or endangered species, allow adverse consequences to humans to take precedence over plants and animals and require that regulatory actions minimize the encroachments on private property rights.

The Human Protection Act provides flexibility to the act, but it does not limit, eliminate, or repeal protection for threatened and endangered species. The ESA will remain a viable method to protect those species that have become threatened or endangered because of man's influence. Like the National Environmental Policy Act, the Human Protection Act merely refines the process which will be used to list a threatened or endangered species or its habitat and ensure that all relevant factors are considered during the listing process.

Presently, the Secretary of Interior, and in certain instances, the Secretary of Commerce decide whether to list a species as endangered or threatened. The listing of a species triggers certain duties that place prohibitions or limitations on certain actions that may be taken. These actions may range from building a needed dam to shutting down logging in an entire region.

The ESA requires that the Secretary base his determinations regarding the listing of a species solely on the basis of scientific data. This prevents the consideration of social and economic consequences that follow from the listing of a species. The Human Protection Act would allow for the consideration of socioeconomic factors to be considered as part of the listing process.

The second part of the Act prohibits the taking of any action for which the potential economic benefits to society do not outweigh the potential economic costs as they are determined by Executive Order 12.291. This section of the bill requires that regulatory objectives shall be chosen to maximize the net benefits to society. This would aid in strengthening economic considerations in the listing of a species and the establishment of critical habitat.

The last section of the bill requires that the Federal regulatory agency do a "taking implications assessment" prior to promulgating new regulations, and to obtain certification from the Attorney General proving compliance with Executive Order 12.630, which requires agencies to assess the potential for the taking of private property in the course of Federal activity.

This section is vital in the protection of private property. Many estimate that in the establishment of critical habitat, millions of acres of private property is impacted adversely which many constitutional scholars believe implies a taking.

The ESA has impacted the entire Nation. From increasing the cost of affordable housing, to destroying the economic viability of entire regions.

I contend that we cannot continue to place the protection of human beings below that of plants and animals. The time has come to make the ESA more flexible. I urge all my House colleagues to stand up and protect the livelihood of the American family by joining us in cosponsoring this important legislation.

LEGISLATION EXTENDING TARIFF SUSPENSION FOR TAB

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to extend the tariff suspension for the chemical compound, tetra amino biphenyl or TAB. The suspension expired on December 31, 1992, and my bill would extend the suspension to the end of 1995. A similar bill proposing to extend the tariff suspension on TAB is being introduced into the Senate by Senator THURMOND. I urge the House to give its speedy approval to this bill which is critical to several hundred of my constituents. If Congress does not quickly reinstate the duty suspension, the manufacturer may be forced to stop production of the product which uses TAB and many jobs in my district will be wiped out.

This bill is not controversial. Since my election to Congress several years ago, I have offered two virtually identical bills both of which have easily passed the Congress and been enacted into law. In 1991, I introduced an identical bill which passed the House as part of H.R. 4318, the miscellaneous tariff bill. Unfortunately, H.R. 4318 failed to receive Senate approval because of unrelated issues and the duty suspension ended. There is no domestic source of TAB which means it must be imported from Germany. Because it is not made in the United States, an extension of the duty suspension does not cause injury to any American businesses or workers. Despite the fact that it is not controversial, passage of the bill is critical in keeping open a factory in my district which depends on a regular supply of TAB at a moderate price. TAB is a specialty chemical used solely for the production of a high performance fiber called PBI. PBI has proven to be one of the most effective products on the market in protecting people against dangerous exposure to fire, heat, and toxic chemicals. Commercial applications for PBI include protective fire gear for our military personnel, including pilots, and crash rescue gear.

The only commercial factory in the world manufacturing PBI is located in Rock Hill, SC, in the heart of my district. From the time it began producing PBI and until recently, the company which owns the Rock Hill plant had been losing money on PBI. Just a couple of years ago, the company for the first time turned a small profit on the product. The profit margin has been very narrow, however. Now that the duty has been reinstated, a shadow has been cast over the future of this product. Since the suspension ended, the company has stopped earning a profit from the product and may even be losing money. The extra duty cost simply makes TAB commercially unfeasible. A shutdown in production would force the layoff of several hundred workers in my district and the loss of approximately $20 million in salary and revenue which now come into South Carolina. It would also mean the end of an important fire resistant product which has proved very helpful in saving lives and reducing injuries to thousands of people in hazardous occupations.

Given the importance of this bill in saving U.S. jobs and given the fact that it will not harm any domestic business or workers, I urge my colleagues to give this bill their speedy support.

THE ASSAULT WEAPONS ACT OF 1993

HON. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, today, my colleague from California, Congressman PETE

STARK, and I introduced the Assault Weapons Act of 1993.

This legislation is a comprehensive effort to ban military weapons based on their characteristics, rather than by their names. It is identical to legislation we introduced in the 102d Congress, H.R. 3104.

If H.R. 3104 had passed last year, it would have prevented the sale of the AK–47 police think Mir Aimal Kansi used to kill two people outside the CIA headquarters in Langley, VA. It could also have helped prevent the stockpiling of weapons by the Branch Davidian Sect in Waco, TX.

The recent bombing of the World Trade Center in New York showed once again that the American public can, without notice, be at the mercy of the whims of terrorists and criminals who today have every right and ability to purchase military weapons designed solely for soldiers in battle. We must remove these weapons from our streets.

The Assault Weapons Act would ban the manufacture and importation of firearms designed to accept a silencer, bayonet, grenade launcher, flash suppressor or folding stock. It would also ban the manufacture of all semiautomatic shotguns with fixed magazines of more than 7 rounds—like the 12-round riot shotgun designed for crowd control in South Africa.

In addition to these guns, the bill would ban magazines, belts, feed strips or similar devices which hold more than 10 rounds of ammunition. Finally, the bill would impose a mandatory minimum Federal prison sentence of 10 years for the use of these firearms in a crime of violence or drug trafficking.

Weapons with these features are designed to kill people not wild game. They are used by criminals, not hunters, and have no place on our streets.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join us and the more than 35 other Members who have cosponsored this legislation.

THE INDIAN DAMS SAFETY ACT OF 1993

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Indian Dams Safety Act of 1993. The Federal Government has a trust responsibility to provide for safe working dams on Indian lands to supply irrigation water; to provide flood control; to supply water for municipal, industrial, domestic, livestock, and recreation uses, as well as for fish and wildlife habitats. This bill helps to ensure that the trust obligation of the U.S. Government to Indian tribal governments is fulfilled with regard to the safety of dams. The measure establishes a dam safety operation and maintenance program within the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Under this program, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is required to bring dams identified as unsafe up to satisfactory levels. The bill is to provide for only operation and maintenance and not to provide additional conservation or storage capacity or for developing benefits beyond those provided for by the original dams. Under the measure, the Secretary may obtain technical assistance from other Federal departments and agencies. The Secretary is authorized under the bill to contract with Indian tribes under the Indian Self-Determination Act to carry out dam safety operation and maintenance duties.

Mr. Speaker, a 1989 Inspector General's report and a 1992 General Accounting Office report make it clear that the Bureau of Indian Affairs needs to be given some direction in the area of dam safety. Although the suggestion has been made by the previous administration that the Bureau of Reclamation take over this responsibility, it is my position that the Bureau of Indian Affairs needs to retain these responsibilities. I believe this measure will provide the Bureau of Indian Affairs with the guidance necessary to significantly improve its performance in the operation and maintenance of Indian dams and to drastically improve the conditions of dams on Indian reservations.

The Subcommittee on Native American Affairs of the Committee on Natural Resources will be holding hearings on this important measure. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MUSEUM OF THE SOUTHWEST

HON. LAMAR S. SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to take a moment to observe a significant event in my home district.

This April we celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Museum of the Southwest's move to its permanent location in the Turner Mansion in Midland, TX.

Incorporated in September of 1965 thanks to the financial support of the Junior League of Midland, the museum was created to focus on history, science, and art.

It was housed briefly in two separate locations before settling for good in 1968 in the Turner Mansion, a move made possible by the generosity of the heirs of Fred and Juliette Turner, who built the home in 1934. The site is now listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Over the years, expansions to the museum complex have included additional gallery space, meeting facilities, the Blakemore Planetarium, and a childrens' museum.

An invaluable facility for the education of Midland's youth, the museum regularly offers a wide variety of displays, exhibits, and community learning activities designed to preserve and promote culture, education, and the arts.

FAIR TAX RELIEF FOR WORKING OLDER AMERICANS

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 1413, which will eliminate the unfair earnings penalty imposed on working older Americans. Older Americans, aged 65 to 69, who earn more than $10,560 annually, are currently penalized with a severe reduction in their social security benefits. This penalty, including Federal taxes, takes away 56 percent of an older worker's marginal income dollars, effectively twice the tax rate on millionaires. The working penalty doesn't affect wealthy seniors who receive most of their income from stocks and investments; it only hurts the working seniors who are attempting to remain financially independent. At a time when many older Americans are struggling from paycheck to paycheck, this punitive tax burden is simply just not fair.

H.R. 1413 eliminates this unfair working penalty. No longer will our Government sanction discrimination against an American merely because of his or her age. No longer will our Government reject the value of our older American's experience and dependability.

H.R. 1413 is cost effective. It allows millions of seniors to return to the work force, thereby expanding the tax base and increasing the amount of tax revenues the Government receives. It also saves the Government over $200 million which is currently wasted in bureaucratic costs by the Social Security Administration to enforce the working penalty. According to one estimate done by two former Treasury Department economists, abolishing the working penalty on seniors would result in a net increase in Federal revenues of $140 million in the first year.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to put a stop to this swindle of senior citizens being perpetrated by the Federal Government. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, to abolish the penalty on working older Americans.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD G. WILLIAMS

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Edward G. Williams, a good friend and great American who recently passed away.

Ed Williams and I both came fro the same neighborhood—the Kensington section of Philadelphia. A prolific amateur boxer, he served his country in the U.S. Army Air Corps in the Panama Canal Zone from 1944 to 1948. In 1954, he became a policeman for the city of Philadelphia, serving in the 6th Police District, Juvenile Aid Division, and as a county detective. He also served as commander of the Police AmVet Post and as a trustee and lifetime member of the Fraternal Order of Police Executive Board.

Although he left the police department in 1968 on a medical disability pension, Ed continued to pursue a career in public service. In 1972, he became Democratic ward leader of the 33d ward in the Juniata and Kensington sections of Philadelphia. During this time, Ed also served as the chief investigator for the Philadelphia School Board Revenue Department.

In 1977, I had the honor and pleasure of serving with Ed in the Pennsylvania General Assembly, where served the 177th District of Philadelphia. Ed retired with his wife in 1980 to Wildwood on the Jersey shore, where he continued to serve his fellow neighbors as a member of the Philadelphia Police Retirees of South Jersey.

Ed died on January 31, 1993. he is survived by his wife Marge, two children, Sharon and Ed Jr., and four grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I join Ed's family, friends, and former colleagues from the Pennsylvania General Assembly in paying tribute to Ed Williams. He will always be remembered for his 36 years of dedicated public service, particularly on behalf of his beloved 33d ward.

THE ANIMAL MEDICINAL DRUG USE CLARIFICATION ACT

HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the Animal Medicinal Drug Use Clarification Act. Unfortunately, a draft version of the bill language was inadvertently introduced on March 2, 1993. Although there is nothing specifically wrong with the language in H.R. 1178, it is not the version I had asked my colleagues to cosponsor earlier this year.

The most direct way to rectify the situation is to simply reintroduce the bill with the intended language. In so doing, I will ask that the names of all of the cosponsors be removed from H.R. 1178.

I appreciate the understanding of my colleagues and regret any confusion this may have caused.

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTINE MAUMBILA AND STELLA MAXWELL

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn today, I would like to recognize two young ladies from Terrell, TX, who were the recent winners of an essay contest in Forney, TX. I attended the Kaufman County Red Ribbon Campaign Kick-Off in Forney where I read the winning essays and presented savings bonds to Christine Maumbila and Stella Maxwell.

Christine Maumbila is a 13-year-old seventh grader at Terrell Middle School. She is the daughter of Frank and Irma Maumbila of Terrell, TX. Christine's essay regarding drug abuse prevention reads as follows:

Many children of America are influenced by not only the good but the bad.

Drugs are one of the biggest influences on our children today. Our own kids are caught in the crossfire and only the ways to say no to drugs can save their lives. Most drug happenings can be stopped. Several ways are useful, but the most effective way to stop drugs starts in the family.

A family should be able to talk to one another about problems they have. Families should also learn how to discipline their children. Have your child know the consequences of using drugs. By telling them about drugs and consequences they will most likely not deal drugs. If you spoil a child and let them get away with numerous mischiefs they will probably sample drugs. Parents should be firm about their rules.

Our elders must help the younger generation. They must guide you in the right ways, and tell you right from wrong. Children of all ages respect their parents and their decisions. Parents who deal drugs should be away from their children when doing it. If a child sees a father or mother using drugs, the child will respect it and begin to experiment with drugs. When a child is raised in a home with high standards, the child will not be a dope dealer, as in a family with low expectations.

Children who use drugs usually are not involved in extracurricular activities. To stay off drugs parents and teachers should provide recreation centers. Rec centers are a place to have fun. A crack house is not. With schooling and a Rec center, you should be much too busy to hang out with the wrong kind of kids. People must understand that things will go bad in life and drugs are not an escape route.

Self confidence and self-esteem also play a big role. Finding your self confidences, or just your positive points can help you stay off drugs. For example, let's say you're a great basketball player. If you try to improve it and get better and better you won't need drugs. Taking drugs to get better at something only makes you worse. Peers, teachers, parents, grandparents and even little brother or sister can boost your self-esteem. You should always try to get positive notes. Negative remarks, some not all are good. Some negative remarks can save your life.

As a result, you can see that the children of America are influenced by not only the good but the bad.

Stella Maxwell, also a winner of the essay contest at the Kaufman County Red Ribbon Campaign, is the daughter of Robert Maxwell. Stella is 13 years old and is a seventh grader at Terrell Middle School. Miss Maxwell's winning essay also addresses the drug problem and her solution to the problem.

YOUTH SUPPORT GROUPS

Drugs. This is a common word that many kids push into the backs of their minds thinking, "I don't use or deal them, so why should I worry?" Unfortunately, a lot of these kids end up using drugs very dangerously, but this can be prevented. One of the most effective ways to prevent it is by joining a youth support group. Schools, churches, and communities hold these. Students are influenced by youth support groups for many reasons.

Support groups for young people give kids a chance to state their own opinion. In some cases, young people don't have the nerve or chance to speak up. Other times, students try to say something, but the adults make them be quiet. In youth support groups, students get to say what they think. This makes children and teens of all ages feel more wanted.

One of the most important reasons that kids join youth support groups is that young people get information that is information on drugs that is interesting and understandable to them and is also given to them in fun ways. They can play games, have guest speakers, and have group discussions. Students have fun doing these things and then more and more kids want to join the support groups. These are some of the reasons that youth support groups influence the kids of today not to use drugs.

Although support groups do a lot for these people, there is still much more that needs to be done. The drug program at our school, D.A.R.E., is not very big, but a lot of fun and educational. I think that we should make it into a community project. D.A.R.E. (Drug Awareness Resistance Education) should still be at schools, but we should make a public club for ages 8–17 and we could meet every month at a public building somewhere. It could be just like the program at school, but bigger. We could also do fundraisers, make posters for the public, and have parties and trips. This will be better for the children and teenagers who don't have a chance to be in the program at school.

If we build a club to influence students to stand up to drugs, it will reduce the chances of kids using drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to recognize these two special young ladies and their winning essays on drug abuse prevention.

THE NEED FOR AN EFFECTIVE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman SHAYS and I are introducing the Assault Weapons Act of 1993 with 42 bipartisan cosponsors. If enacted, our bill will go a long way toward getting military weapons off the streets.

Despite what the National Rife Association [NRA] would have us believe, poll after poll show that most Americans favor sensible restrictions on these weapons of war. The latest demonstration of the public's opposition to assault weapons on demand policy happened earlier this week. The New Jersey Senate voted unanimously to uphold the State's ban on assault weapons despite the $364,000 the NRA spent to defeat the New Jersey ban.

Over and over we find that these guns are the weapons of choice for the kinds of criminals and psychopaths who should not have access to guns at all.

The American people know that the vast majority of people who use these guns are not sportsmen and hunters but gangs, drug dealers, and psychopaths. Statistics from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms [ATF] have shown that although these weapons make up less than 3 percent of the 200 million guns owned by Americans, they account for 6 to 10 percent of guns used in crimes.

Episodes like the standoff between law officials and the Branch Davidians in their Waco, TX, compound and the recent slayings at the CIA headquarters in Langley, VA, only repeat the tragic history of assault weapons' misuse.

It's past time for the Federal Government to do something to get these weapons off the streets.

The Assault Weapons Act of 1993 is a direct approach to controlling a diverse category

of weapons. Rather than listing brand names of weapons to be outlawed, our bill outlaws the generic features which characterize military weapons. Specifically, the bill bans guns and attachments designed to facilitate silencers, bayonets, grenade launchers, flash suppressers, with large fixed magazines, or folding stocks.

An AK–47 by any other name, would kill just as efficiently. Banning by feature rather than name eliminates a dangerous loophole which would allow manufacturers to continue making the same weapon under a different brand name.

Our bill also bans weapons and attachments designed to fire an excessive number of rounds in short periods of times. We specifically would outlaw shotguns with fixed magazines of 7 rounds or more—sport shotguns usually hold only 4 to 5—and all ammunition feeders or magazines which hold more than 10 rounds of ammunition.

Finally, the bill increases the penalties and sentences for people who use these military weapons in violent crimes or drug dealing. Our bill makes very clear that the Nation has no tolerance for people who abuse these weapons.

The Assault Weapons Act would not affect police and law enforcement agencies. The Gun Control Act of 1968 specifically exempts police and law enforcement agencies and makes specific exemptions for their guns. As an amendment to that act, our bill would not include police guns.

As chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health, I offer my colleagues one final compelling reason to support the Assault Weapons Act: deficit reduction.

The costs of treating assault weapon victims makes health care cost more for us all. The Journal of the American Medical Association [JAMA] estimated in November 1988, that gunshot wounds cost the Nation more than $1 billion in 1984. A study in the April 1991 Journal of Texas Medicine estimated that firearm injuries costs the State of Texas $1.7 billion a year.

The JAMA study also pointed out that shooting victims disproportionately add to our public health spending. Since shooting victims are extremely likely to be poor and young, they rarely have health insurance. As a result, JAMA found that the Government usually paid 85.7 percent of gunshot victims' hospital costs.

By reducing the supply of these weapons, which are frequently used by drug dealers in poor neighborhoods, we can begin to reduce the amount our Government health care system pays for treating gun related injuries. By reducing these health care costs, we reduce our health-related deficit spending.

For this and all the other good reasons I have mentioned, I urge my colleagues to join me, Representative SHAYS, and the original cosponsors of the Assault Weapons Act of 1993.

INTRODUCTION OF CO-OP EQUITY ACT

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce legislation that will end an inequity affecting certain individuals who belong to land cooperatives and yet own their own homes.

Developments where a collective membership owns the property on which homes are built, while the homes themselves belong to individual members of the cooperative, are rare in the United States. Most of these situations occurred because of the housing shortage in the post-World War II era and were the result of a gradual buildup of homes on vacant land that was later sold to a collective ownership. One development where this situation occurs is the Edgewater Park cooperative, which is located in my district.

Unfortunately, because of this unusual ownership arrangement, the residents are not permitted to deduct the cooperatives's mortgage interest and local taxes from their individual taxes, as is the case with other cooperative residents. My legislation would amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that individuals who live in land-only cooperatives will be accorded the same treatment as other cooperative tenant-stockholders.

The residents of the Edgewater Park cooperative are hard-working people who play by the rules. This bill would ensure that they receive the fair tax treatment they deserve.

THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to make special note of an important anniversary in our Nation's rich natural resource heritage. It was 90 years ago this week that President Theodore Roosevelt, in an act of great forethought and stewardship, established the Pelican Island Refuge along the east coast of Florida—the first of 51 refuges created during his Presidency—thereby laying the cornerstone for today's expansive National Wildlife Refuge System.

Since the creation of Pelican Island Refuge in 1903, our National Wildlife Refuge System has expanded to 485 refuges comprising a total of over 90 million acres in all 50 States and several territories. The only network of Federal lands managed principally for fish and wildlife, the refuge system is host to a rich diversity of plants and animals including over 220 mammals, 250 amphibians and reptiles, and 200 fish species. Among these are 168 species which are currently listed as threatened or endangered under the provisions of the Endangered Species Act.

While little more than three acres in size, Pelican Island stands tall as a testament to the wisdom of looking ahead—for the benefit of future generations—and setting aside land to provide essential habitat for the preservation of wildlife. As many know, the refuge system has been the site of numerous success stories, with species such as the key deer and whooping crane brought back from the brink of extinction thanks in large part to the role of refuges in protecting their critical habitat. In total, 30 refuges have been established specifically for the purpose of recovering endangered or threatened species.

Coincidentially, the celebration of the important legacy of Pelican Island coincides this year with the reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act. This is an opportune time for us to take a step back and look at the refuge system as a whole to determine whether these lands are contributing as effectively as possible to the goal of preserving our Nation's rich biodiversity. We must ask ourselves whether this network of lands is being used to its fullest potential to prevent declines in species and their habitats, and to contribute to the recovery of species that have already become endangered. Moreover, does it serve as a model for managing wildlife needs on all our Federal lands? If the answers to these questions are "No" we must identify the steps that can be taken to reach those goals.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in the vast tracts of land that have been set aside in our refuge system, both of their infinite beauty and for the promise they hold for the future. Each refuge is, in fact, an island of life—an invaluable touchstone for the future. As such, we owe it to ourselves and to generations to come to ensure that these lands are managed in the most ecologically and environmentally sound manner possible.

SPEECH OF GEORGE McGOVERN

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn today, I wish to share with you a speech given by former Presidential candidate George McGovern, and reported as a guest editorial by the Wall Street Journal. It relates the true confession of a former ultraliberal leader who has learned the facts of life about free enterprise only after he himself became an employer. I think it is appropriate to quote Justice Frankfurtur who said, "Wisdom too often never comes, and so one ought not to reject it merely because it comes late." This guest editorial was submitted to me by one of my constituents, Mr. Gordon Campbell of Tyler, TX.

The guest editorial by George McGovern from the Wall Street Journal reads as follows:

It's been 11 years since I left the U.S. Senate, after serving 24 years in high public office. After leaving a career in politics, I devoted much of my time to public lectures that took me into every state in the union and much of Europe, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America.

In 1988, I invested most of the earnings from this lecture circuit acquiring the leasehold on Connecticut's Stratford Inn. Hotels, inns, and restaurants have always held a spe-

cial fascination for me. The Stratford Inn promised the realization of a longtime dream to own a combination hotel, restaurant and public conference facility— complete with an experienced manager and staff.

In retrospect, I wish I had known more about the hazards and difficulties of such a business, especially during a recession of the kind that hit New England just as I was acquiring the inn's 43-year leasehold. I also wish that during the years I was in public office, I had had this firsthand experience about the difficulties business people face everyday. That knowledge would have made me a better U.S. Senator and a more understanding presidential contender.

Today we are much closer to a general acknowledgement that government must encourage business to expand and grow. Bill Clinton, Paul Tsongas, Bob Kerrey and others have, I believe, changed the debate of our party. We intuitively know that to create job opportunities we need entrepreneurs who will risk their capital against an expected payoff. Too often, however, public policy does not consider whether we are choking off those opportunities.

My own business perspective had been limited to the small hotel and restaurant in Stratford, Conn., with an especially difficult lease and a severe recession. But my business associates and I also lived with federal, state and local rules that were all passed with the objective of helping employees, protecting the environment, raising tax dollars for schools, protecting our customers from fire hazards, etc. While I never have doubted the worthiness of any of these goals, the concept that most often eludes legislators is: "Can we make consumers pay the higher prices for the increased operating costs that accompany public regulation and government reporting requirements with reams of redtape?" It is a simple concern that is nonetheless often ignored by legislators.

For example, the papers today are filled with stories about businesses dropping health coverage for employees. We provided a substantial package for our staff at the Stratford Inn. However, were we operating today, those costs would exceed $150,000 a year for health care on top of salaries and other benefits. There would have been no reasonable way for us to absorb or pass on these costs.

Some of the escalation in the cost of health care is attributed to patients suing doctors. While one cannot assess the merit of all these claims, I've also witnessed firsthand the explosion in blame-shifting and scapegoating for every negative experience in life.

Today, despite bankruptcy, we are still dealing with litigation from individuals who fell in or near our restaurant. Despite these injuries, not every misstep is the fault of someone else. Not every such incident should be viewed as a lawsuit instead of an unfortunate accident. And while the business owner may prevail in the end, the endless exposure to frivolous claims and high legal fees is frightening.

Our Connecticut hotel, along with many others, went bankrupt for a variety of reasons, the general economy in the Northeast being a significant cause. But that reason masks the variety of other challenges we faced that drive operating costs and financing charges beyond what a small business can handle.

It is clear that some businesses have products that can be priced at almost any level. The price of raw materials (e.g.; steel and glass) and life-saving drugs and medical care are not easily substituted by consumers. It is only competition or antitrust that tempers price increases. Consumers may delay purchases, but they have little choice when faced with higher prices.

In services, however, consumers do have a choice when faced with higher prices. You may have to stay in a hotel while on vacation, but you can stay fewer days. You can eat in restaurants fewer times per month, or forgo a number of services from car washes to shoeshines. Every such decision eventually results in job losses for someone. And often these are the people without the skills to help themselves—the people I've spent a lifetime trying to help.

In short, "one-size-fits-all" rules for business ignore the reality of the marketplace. And setting thresholds for regulatory guidelines at artificial levels—e.g., 50 employees or more, $500,000 in sales—takes no account of other realities, such as profit margins, labor intensive vs. capital intensive businesses, and local market economics.

The problem we face as legislators is: Where do we set the bar so that it is not too high to clear? I don't have the answer. I do know that we need to start raising these questions more often.

As we adjourn today, I hope this editorial will be of interest to you, and I appreciate the opportunity to share it with you. It reflects, as a Wall Street author evaluated Senator McGovern's speech, that a politician's dream is a businessman's nightmare.

THE BITTERSWEET BALLAD OF BILLY ECKSTINE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the Nation recently mourned the loss of one of its most gifted and talented entertainers, Billy Eckstine. On March 8, 1993, the renowned singer and band leader passed away at the age of 78. As the first black male vocalist to routinely land ballads on the pop charts and to gain an international audience; the first black singer to make the cover of Life magazine and a mentor of the big band sound, Billy Eckstine has distinguished himself in the musical history of our Nation.

William Clarence "Billy" Eckstine was born in Pittsburgh and later moved to Washington, DC where he attended Howard University. He won his first of many talent shows at the age of 19 at the Howard Theater and in 1939, began his career as a vocalist with the Grand Terrace Orchestra under the direction of Earl Hines. In the ensuing years, he would launch a solo act, organize his own big band and produce such hit records as "A Cottage for Sale," "Prisoner of Love," "I Surrender, Dear," "Everything I Have Is Yours," "Blue Moon," "My Foolish Heart," "Caravan," "Body and Soul", and "I Apologize."

Mr. Speaker, many consider Billy Eckstine the greatest male vocalist of our time. Unfortunately, as a result of the pervading racism in this country, Eckstine was never accorded the awards, movie contracts and exclusive recording contracts that he warranted. Instead, he watched as Frank Sinatra and other white singers garnered the honors and accolades that he so deserved. Billy Eckstine was another great talent who had to endure the fate of being black in a racist society yet he never let this deter him from writing and singing some of the most beautiful songs ever recorded.

I will fondly remember Billy Eckstine as a friend whom I respected and admired greatly. A real gentleman, Billy Eckstine always held himself in a dignified manner as to bring pride to his race. He was a role model and a mentor to his many admirers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues several articles which appeared in the Washington Post announcing the passing of Billy Eckstine. I ask that my colleagues join me in paying tribute to him as we recognize his musical genius.

THE BITTERSWEET BALLAD OF BILLY ECKSTINE

A VOICE THAT SHOULD HAVE HAD NO LIMITS

(By Richard Harrington)

Blessed with matinee-idol looks and a wonderfully rich baritone, Billy Eckstine was the singer of romantic ballads in the late '40s and early '50s. Songs like "My Foolish Heart," "I Apologize" and "My Destiny" turned Eckstine, who died yesterday at age 78, into a national heartthrob, the first black singer to become an American sex symbol.

As the first black male vocalist to routinely land sensuous ballads on the national pop charts, Eckstine offered a new, powerfully resonant image to a country in which color was an often insurmountable barrier to success. Indeed, despite his outstanding talent and looks, Eckstine never developed the kind of movie career his peer, Frank Sinatra, had. Eckstine was sometimes called "the Sepia Sinatra," but in reality, Sinatra should have been called "the White Eckstine."

"They never let him become the sex symbol he could have been," Quincy Jones said a few years ago. "If he'd been white, the sky would have been the limit."

Instead, the limit was a long recording career—one of Eckstine's finest albums was a 1986 collaboration with saxophonist Benny Carter—and constant touring on the supper club and jazz festival circuit. He also earned a hallowed place in American music history, not only for his vocal work, but for his mentoring of the big band that incubated the be-bop movement in jazz.

That band, which existed from 1944 to 1947, featured Charlie Parker, Dizzy Gillespie, Art Blakey, Dexter Gordon, Fats Navarro and Sarah Vaughan. Eckstine used his burgeoning popularity to fund the band, which was clearly ahead of its time and therefore both commercially and critically ignored.

By the mid-'40s, Eckstine was already known as "Mr. B" (Duke Ellington simply called him "the sonorous B"), having established himself as the singer with the Earl Hines Orchestra on such bluesy hits as "Stormy Monday" and "Jelly Jelly," a million-seller that Eckstine wrote himself. He also shone on ballads like "Somehow," "You Don't Know What Love Is" and "Skylark." And that was the emotional terrain he explored in subsequent years.

Ironically, in the very early '40s, Eckstine (then billed as Billy X-tine) had been critically slammed in a major music magazine for his "shattering tremolo and a pompousness in phrasing not unlike that of operetta performance." A few years later, when his voice deepened and accrued a persistent vibrato, he was voted top male singer in poll

after poll. Eckstine could drop his voice down basso, or send it skyward tenor, but it was that mellifluous, mesmerizing baritone that seduced a nation.

The man's beauty didn't hurt. Neither did his urbane fashion sensibility—you couldn't pay enough to sound like Mr. B, but you could probably afford to look like him—particularly by wearing shirts with Mr. B rollcollars and draping your jacket over your shoulders. He was the original sharp-dressed man, the embodiment of hip elegance.

Though born in Pittsburgh, Eckstine came to Washington in time to attend the fabled Armstrong High School and Howard University, though eventually the pull of the Howard Theater would prove far greater. He won amateur contests with dead-on impersonations of Cab Calloway; years later, singers like Arthur Prysock and Johnny Hartmann would build careers imitating Eckstine. After a four-year stint with Hines ended in 1943, and after laying his popularity on the line with his big band, Eckstine focused on a solo career utilizing what Ellington dubbed the "sensuous semantics" of highly stylized songs like "Prisoner of Love," "Everything I Have Is Yours" and "Fool That I Am."

Still, even though he made the cover of Life magazine, a black magazine had warned in the '50s that "a racial stop sign looms between [Eckstine] and a first class future." In fact, the singer's nonexistent film career was Eckstine's own choice, for at the height of his popularity, he had turned down roles that were racially demeaning. At the time, those were about the only roles available to black Americans in Hollywood. Eckstine also knew that blatant Jim Crow South, and the more subtle discrimination of the North. And while he was not an activist on a level with some of his peers, Eckstine was very much a symbol of intelligence, talent and pride—and thus proved a barrier-breaker as well as a trend-setter.

The years were kind to Billy Eckstine's voice, just as that voice had been kind to generations of song lovers. Dizzy Gillespie once said of that '40s heyday, "No other band like [Eckstine's] existed in the world." He could just as easily have been talking about Mr. B.

SINGER-BANDLEADER BILLY ECKSTINE DIES

Billy Eckstine, 78, the singer-bandleader whose warm baritone graced a string of post-World War II hits such as "Fools Rush In" and "Everything I Have Is Yours," died March 8 while undergoing treatment at Montefiore Hospital in Pittsburgh.

Mr. Eckstine, who lived in Las Vegas, recently had suffered a stroke.

Known as Mr. B, he established a new and romantic style of singing, delivering ballads in a strong, vibrant baritone, with impeccable diction. One of America's most popular vocalists in the late 1940s and early 1950s, he drew bigger audiences at New York's Paramount theater in 1950 than record-setter Frank Sinatra. The same year, touring with the George Shearing Quintet, he had two sold-out concerts at Carnegie Hall in one day. There were said to be 80,000 Eckstine fan clubs in the United States, Canada and England.

Billy Eckstine was the first black singer to make the cover of Life magazine and the first to develop an international appeal through his interpretation of love songs. He had a host of imitators, set trends in fashion and was pursued by bobbysoxers. Hip young men copied the elegant singer's style of dress—shirts with rolled collars and jackets draped off the body.

His hit records included "A Cottage for Sale," "Prisoner of Love," "I Surrender, Dear," "Everything I Have Is Yours," "Blue Moon," "My Foolish Heart," "Caravan," "Body and Soul" and "I Apologize."

His career took a pounding late in the 1950s as rock-and-roll gained to popularity. But he rebounded with a series of hit albums for Mercury Records and was in great demand on the nightclub circuit. His last big hit was "Passing Strangers," a duet with Sarah Vaughan.

Mr. Eckstine, who also played valve trombone, directed a band that at one time or another included Dizzy Gillespie, Fats Navarro, Miles Davis, Gene Ammons, Dexter Gordon, Charlie Parker, Sonny Stitt, Art Blakey and Lucky Thompson, as well as Vaughan.

Unlike most swing bands that accompanied singers, the Eckstine band played powerful, thick chords and rhythmically complex figures. It is credited with being the first big bop band.

He was born William Clarence Eckstein—he changed the spelling of his name when he was an adult—in Pittsburgh, where he lived until he was a teenager. He then moved to Washington and attended Armstrong High School, where his sister taught. He also studied physical education at St. Paul Normal and Industrial School in Lawrenceville, VA., and attended Howard University.

During his student years, Mr. Eckstine was more interested in football than in music. But at age 19, he won the first of many amateur shows and a week's engagement with the band at Washington's Howard Theater. Mr. Eckstine won the $10 price by imitating Cab Calloway, singing a nursery rhyme lyric with interpolated scatting.

He went on to work at small clubs and theaters in Washington and Pittsburgh, then sang for two years at the De Lisa Club in Chicago.

He was hired as vocalist with the Grand Terrace Orchestra of Earl "Fatha" Hines in 1939. Three years later, Mr. Eckstine heard Vaughan at an amateur show and encouraged Hines to hire her. While with Hines, Mr. Eckstine taught himself to play trumpet and valve trombone. He recorded as vocalist on two blues hits, "Jelly, Jelly" and "Stormy Monday."

In the 1930s and 1940s, the heyday of radio, music publishers who wanted to plug their new songs would take them to orchestras with national broadcasting contracts.

"They usually wouldn't give the songs to black singers because they thought black singers didn't have clear-enough diction," Mr. Eckstine recalled in a 1974 interview. "This was in the day of 'race records.' They gave blues to black singers. But Earl fought against that. I was given plug songs by the bid publishers. I did 'Skylark,' and my version outsold Bing Crosby's."

Mr. Eckstine left Hines in 1943 and spent a year as a solo nightclub act before founding his own big band, which featured the then-emerging be-bop style.

The band was active only three years during the mid-1940s, but had pivotal influence on be-bop. While Mr. Eckstine's focus on love songs pushed him to wider stardom, he continued to believe in bop.

It influenced his own records, and he gave work and encouragement to many of its players. He also wrote a few tunes of his own. John Coltrane was so fascinated by one of them, "I Want to Talk About You," that he recorded it several times.

Mr. Eckstine was twice divorced. His survivors include seven children, four grandchildren and a great-grandchild. A son, Ed, is president of Mercury Records, and another son, Guy, heads Mercury's jazz division. A daughter, Gina, is a singer in Las Vegas and toured with her father in the 1980s.

THE SHIPBUILDING TRADE REFORM ACT OF 1993

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1993

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. shipbuilding and ship repair industry is at a crossroads. In the past 12 years, over 60,000 jobs have been lost, and more than 40 shipyards forced to close. If we do not act now, our industrial base will be endangered and we will risk the loss of an additional 180,000 shipyard and related jobs by 1998. The bill we are introducing today is a first step. It provides remedies against the unfair trade practices of foreign nations that plague the international commercial shipbuilding and repair industry and siphon jobs from U.S. yards.

The 1981, the U.S. Government stopped direct assistance to domestic commercial shipbuilding but did nothing to discourage foreign governments from continuing massive subsidy programs to bolster their commercial shipyards. Since then, our shipbuilding industry has become almost entirely dependent on construction for the U.S. military. Planned reductions in Navy ship orders mandate that U.S. shipyards enter the international commercial shipbuilding market, and that they do so now. Unless American yards are given the chance to compete for commercial ship contracts in an unsubsidized world, we will only have one or two yards left in this country.

Let me give you just one example to illustrate where we are today. In my own district, the Fore River Shipyard once churned out ship after ship. During its peak in 1943, the shipyard employed 32,000 people—that very same shipyard now employs fewer than 50.

In 1989, recognizing that subsidies provided a major impediment to the reentry of American shipyards into the commercial marketplace, the Shipbuilders Council of America sought the intervention of the U.S. Trade Representative. However, multilateral negotiations through the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development proved fruitless, and were broken off in April 1992.

It is up to Congress to take the initiative. The jobs that would be lost in the collapse of the shipbuilding industry are irreplaceable. The skills of highly trained designers, engineers, and builders are essential to the maintenance of a strong industrial base that is capable of responding to our national security needs.

Last year, the House passed the Shipbuilding Trade Reform Act of 1992 twice, only to see it sink in the Senate. That was then. This is now. I sincerely hope that the seachange that has swept through all of Washington has made our Capitol a more hospitable venue for legislation to save our shipyards.

American shipyards must be given the opportunity to compete. We can not allow the policies of foreign countries to destroy a vitally important industry and with it many thousands of American jobs.