HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, March 31, 1993*

The House met at 2 p.m.

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

We are grateful, O God, for the gifts of life and we offer this our thanksgiving:

For the gifts of knowledge and the blessings of wisdom,

For the gifts of friendship and tolerance and respect,

For the gifts of family and friends and colleagues and their nurture to us in so many ways,

For the gifts of freedom and the blessings of liberty,

For the gifts of leadership and responsibility,

For the gifts of unity and the blessings of common purpose,

For the gifts of healing and the blessings of reconciliation, and

For the gifts of faith and hope and love.

For all these gifts and the opportunities of this day, we offer this our prayer of thanksgiving. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. 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 255, nays 159, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—255

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 (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Cantwell
Cardin
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
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
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inglis
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—159

Allard
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clay
Coble
Collins (GA)
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
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
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy
Nussle
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shuster
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
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—16

Barton
Brown (CA)
Byrne
Carr
Clayton
Fingerhut
Ford (TN)
Henry
LaFalce
Maloney
Nadler
Parker
Quillen
Sanders
Shepherd
Whitten

□ 1430

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, on today's Journal vote, rollcall No. 123, I was unavoidably detained and unable to reach the Chamber before the vote was closed.

I would have voted "yes."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EVERETT] will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 5) 32

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. EVERETT 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.

REQUEST TO DISPENSE WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON TODAY

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with today, Wednesday, March 31, 1993.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman from New Mexico tell us what items are on the Calendar Wednesday that could possibly be acted on if Calendar Wednesday were to proceed forward?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to do that if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, on the House Calendar there are no eligible measures.

On the Union Calendar there are only three bills. H.R. 1430 was not laid over. H.R. 235 and H.R. 720 have seen their corresponding Senate measures passed in the House earlier this week.

Mr. WALKER. Could the gentleman tell us what the subject matters of those bills are?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I certainly will.

H.R. 235 is to provide for certain land exchanges in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

H.R. 320 is the bill of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] to authorize the adjustment of the boundaries of the South Dakota portion of the Sioux Ranger District of Custer National Forest.

The third bill, H.R. 1430, as I mentioned, has not been laid over. That is the debt limit bill. And as the Speaker announced earlier, that is being worked on right now.

Mr. WALKER. So further reserving the right to object, two of the measures, as I understand it, are measures that were already acted on, Senate bills, and so we have already acted, so they have been rendered rather moot, so we would not take those up. But the only eligible bill for possible consideration under the Calendar Wednesday would be the debt limit bill, and as I understand it, because we are going to bring up the budget bill a little bit later that contains now the debt limit, that that would be the reason for not raising that under the Calendar Wednesday. Is that correct?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico and I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Calendar Wednesday.

The Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk called the committees.

EXTENDING SUSPENDED IMPLEMENTATION OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS OF FOOD STAMP PROGRAM ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 284) to extend the suspended implementation of certain requirements of the food stamp program on Indian reservations and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, and yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, to explain the legislation.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is the Senate bill which delays until January 31, 1994, this coming January, the implementation of regulations that would implement the Food Stamp Act on Indian reservations.

Now they are not required to have staggered issuance of food stamps, and also they have monthly requirements of reporting of income, and there is some concern expressed in a GAO report that has been issued on that item. So all this bill does is to delay the implementation until January 31 in order to accommodate further study.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 284, a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to delay until January 31, 1994, first, the implementation of an exemption from the requirement of households residing on Indian reservations to file periodic reports of income and household circumstances, and second, the requirement for staggered issuance of coupons on Indian reservations.

The Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act Amendments of 1991—Public Law 102–237—requires that on April 1 of this year, State agencies issue food coupons on a staggered basis. On that same date, State agencies are also required to exempt households residing on Indian reservations from monthly reports.

The requirement of staggered issuance on Indian reservations in the current law was intended to discourage retail stores from increasing their food prices on the day that food stamps are issued. The monthly reporting exemption was intended to overcome the problems many Indian households have in completing the monthly reporting requirements.

However, comments from the General Accounting Office [GAO] as well as comments from State agencies and several Indian reservations indicate differing views on the merits of the current provisions of law.

Mr. Speaker, the delay in implementation of these provisions will allow the Committee on Agriculture additional time to obtain more in-depth information on the pros and cons of staggered issuance and monthly reporting requirements on Indian reservations. Meanwhile, the Committee on Agriculture, both majority and minority members, support prompt passage of S. 284.

The Congressional Budget Office advises us the legislation has no direct spending impact on the Federal budget.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his explanation on this legislation, which is concurred in full by the minority.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 284, a bill that extends the suspension of the implementation of certain provisions concerning food stamp families living on Indian reservations.

Recently I received a letter from the secretary of the Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services regarding the Food Stamp Program and two provisions, originally included in the 1990 farm bill, affecting Indian reservations. These provisions exempt families living on Indian reservations from the program's periodic income-reporting requirements and require States to stagger issuance of food stamp benefits throughout the month for these families.

They were originally included in the 1990 Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act. However, Congress subsequently delayed implementation of the provisions until April 1, 1993, and required the General Accounting Office to report on the effect of these provisions.

The GAO report provided the comments of 13 State agencies, including Kansas, responsible for administration of the Food Stamp Program and 2 Indian organizations, all of which opposed implementation of the provisions. The reasons cited include increases in the complexity and the cost of the Food Stamp Program for both administrators and families receiving benefits.

The bill under consideration today further delays the requirement that States implement these two provisions on April 1, 1993. It suspends implementation until January 31, 1994.

I support S. 284 and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 284

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REPORTING AND STAGGERED ISSUANCE FOR HOUSEHOLDS ON RESERVATIONS.

Section 908(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act Amendments of 1991 (Public Law 102-237; 7 U.S.C. 2015 note and 7 U.S.C. 2016 note) is amended by striking "April 1, 1993" both places it appears and inserting "January 31, 1994".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANAGEMENT POLICY NEEDED FOR GULF OF MEXICO

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation along with Senator BOB KRUEGER of Texas that will promote economic development and environmental protection in and around one of our Nation's most important natural resources—the Gulf of Mexico.

The Gulf of Mexico is a vital economic and environmental resource for our Nation. Yet the Federal Government has no coordinated policy with the coastal States to monitor the growing pollution and development pressures being experienced along the gulf.

Mr. Speaker, the residents and the environment along the gulf deserve better.

Our proposal will establish a framework by which Federal and State agencies can work together to better manage and coordinate both the economic development and the protection of natural resources of the gulf region. Our proposal is modeled after the Federal-State partnerships in place for the Chesapeake Bay and the Great Lakes.

Establishment of a Gulf of Mexico Commission will help all levels of government foster sustainable development. And it will provide a means of dealing with the gulf's pollution problems in a more coordinated and cost-effective manner.

In addition, this legislation will require the Secretary of Agriculture to compile an inventory of all Federal and State laws and regulations affecting the use of wetlands for agricultural production. This information will help the Secretary formulate recommendations for wetlands policy across the United States, with a particular emphasis on the economic and environmental interests of the Gulf of Mexico and the prudent use of agriculture lands in the coastal States.

Finally, creation of a Gulf of Mexico Commission will also complement and enhance the administration's efforts to negotiate a supplemental agreement on the environment with Mexico in conjunction with the proposed North American Free-Trade Agreement.

I have urged the administration to ensure that this side agreement includes a bilateral framework to deal with the problems of the Gulf of Mexico—in reality, our other border with Mexico—and I have been assured the administration is committed to that goal.

I encourage my colleagues here in the House to review the legislation Senator KRUEGER and I are introducing today and to join us in cosponsoring the Gulf of Mexico Act.

THE NEW CLINTON LEXICON

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

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, want to congratulate President Clinton and my Democrat colleagues for being able to manipulate the media by using terminology that is kind of new to Americans. They came up with the term "gridlock," which was picked up, and on gridlock there is a difference of opinion between the Democrats and the Republicans on how we run this economy, and they have been very successful through the media in getting their point across.

PORK BARREL PROJECTS

Billions of dollars of pork is put in the so-called economic stimulus package. It is not called pork but it is called job creation and it is called economic stimulus.

Now today we heard on the news that President Clinton's package is going to reduce the deficit by $504 billion over the next 5 years. The fact of the matter is that it is going to have $244 billion in new spending in there, and it is going to add over $1 trillion to the debt. Never mind that, though. The media picks up what he wants them to pick up, and they have been selling his program.

Well I have a couple of terms that I would like to add to the lexicon today, and those two are Clintonomics, Clintonomics, and Clintastrophe that is going to occur when we pass his package.

□ 1440

WHAT A DIFFERENCE AN ELECTION MAKES

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, the House today is set to pass the largest deficit reduction package in our Nation's history. What a difference an election makes.

It may seem like an eternity, but less than 1 year ago, our deficit was growing like kudzu vine at a pace of $11,000 per second. Partisan gridlock and inertia shackled Congress from doing anything at all to keep spending under control.

We had a President blithely convinced that our economy was the envy of the free world, while Americans flocked to the unemployment office. Now, Congress is about to make a historic vote on a far more specific and gutsy deficit reduction package than anyone could have imagined 1 year ago.

It began with President Clinton's visionary proposal which, defying all expectations, was improved upon by the Congress. The plan cuts an unprecedented $500 billion from the deficit. Not a single penny of new taxes or mandatory savings is used for new spending. It adheres to the strict discretionary spending caps in the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act. And it finally reorders our spending priorities away from the cold war and to the productivity war.

Mr. Speaker, it is not that someone might not have done it better, but that it has been done at all. Fiscal responsibility begins, and gridlock ends, today with a "yes" vote on the budget.

CUT SPENDING, NOT RAISE DEBT CEILING

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, here we go raising the debt limit again, without passage of either a balanced budget constitutional amendment or a line-item veto, that would be to surrender the fight against big government's big spending.

What we need is, of course, a balanced budget amendment, with a tax-limitation provision to ensure the budget gets balanced by reducing government, not by increasing taxes.

We also need a line-item veto that gives the President a tool to cut waste immediately.

It makes no sense to raise the debt limit again and again, without addressing the real reason Congress finds it necessary to raise the limit—more spending.

Mr. Speaker, what we have to do is to get the Government spending under control. Let us be honest with the American people: If we want to continue spending, perhaps we should remove the ceiling forever and admit that Congress has no plans, no plans at all, to control big government's appetite.

IT IS JOBS, STUPID

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the only humane measure of the economy is jobs. It is the number of people unemployed and the number of people em-

ployed that matters most. It is not the profits for the greedy. It is not the set of complicated statistics. It is jobs, stupid.

We need the full stimulus package to create jobs.

In New York State and in New York City, unemployment is above 10 percent and still climbing. In my district, unemployment is above 15 percent and climbing.

According to the New York Times, in a suburb 50 miles from New York, IBM yesterday began the layoff of 4,000 employees, and the same thing is happening across the Nation. Across the Nation there are many more thousands of layoffs to come.

Let us pass the stimulus package now. We need the jobs. We need the jobs in the summer program; this summer we need the jobs in the community development block grant. We need the jobs. That is the most important thing about the economy.

It is jobs, stupid.

ROCK CHALK, JAYHAWK, KU

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

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, not only is it my privilege to represent the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the NCAA, headquartered in Overland Park, KS, my hometown, I am honored to represent the University of Kansas, the Kansas Jayhawk basketball team, and Coach Roy Williams.

In an unabashed spirit of partisanship, I have made a somewhat friendly bet with our distinguished colleague, Mr. DAVID PRICE, the gentleman from North Carolina who represents the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Naturally, I fully expect to collect the North Carolina barbecue which Mr. PRICE has so generously wagered. As much as I would like to promote Kansas beef in North Carolina, it is my hope that Mr. PRICE will have to settle for the mouthwatering thought of eight Kansas steaks.

It is an interesting sidelight that Dean Smith, the TarHeels coach, was born in Emporia, KS, and was a member of the Jayhawks' 1952 NCAA championship team. And, Coach Williams was born in Asheville, NC, and served as an assistant to Dean Smith.

Mr. Speaker, I fail to see how Kansas can lose. Rock Chalk, Jayhawk, KU!

UNC TAR HEELS VERSUS KANSAS JAYHAWKS

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, March madness is upon us. This weekend four of the Nation's premier college basketball teams will tip off in the final four round of the NCAA tournament in New Orleans. The gentlewoman from Kansas and I do share a special interest in this contest, not only do we proudly represent the districts which UNC Chapel Hill and the University of Kansas call home, but as she mentioned, our rivalries are intensified given the fact Tar Heel Coach Dean Smith, a native of the Sunflower State, will be facing his protege, Jayhawks Coach Roy Williams—a former Tar Heel assistant coach and a North Carolinian by birth.

I commend my colleague from across the aisle for her loyalty and her optimism. However, while the Jayhawks may have wings, they do not have a prayer in this game, for as we all know, the skies above New Orleans are and will always be Carolina blue. And I am looking forward to those fine Kansas steaks±.

HEALTH CARE REFORM DEPENDS ON CAMPAIGN REFORM

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I had not come to the well to talk about basketball but about campaign reform. But I do not want to disappoint too bitterly my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE], and my friend, the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], and my friends from Michigan, but the University of Kentucky Wildcats from my home State of Kentucky are going to win it all down in the Big Easy this coming weekend.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, this morning I heard from a pollster some very disquieting information. While the American people want health care reform and are generally in favor of paying for it, they do not believe that health care reform will be passed by the Congress, because they do not think Congress can extricate itself from the thralls of the special interests who have an interest in health care legislation.

It leads me to say, Mr. Speaker, once again, that underlying reform of health care or anything on our docket for the remainder of this Congress is changing the campaign finance laws to limit PAC's, political action committees, limit the amount of overall spending, limit bundling and soft money.

Mr. Speaker, again, before we can reform anything, we have to reform the campaign finance law.

CUT SPENDING FIRST

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, very soon we will be asked to vote to once again increase our national debt.

We are already over $4 trillion in the hole.

This country would be booming economically today if we were not so deeply in debt.

The overwhelming majority of the American people do not want us to go further into debt.

The people would vote against raising this debt limit any further, yet a majority in this House will probably go against their wishes and vote for this bill.

The American people are saying, loud and clear, cut spending first.

Yet, with the exception of the Defense Department, almost every agency is asking for large increases in spending.

I do not know of a single agency or department in the executive or judicial branches of our Government that is voluntarily reducing its budget at all.

If we could significantly cut Federal spending, and balance our budget, it would hurt some bureaucrats.

But it would help millions of regular people by strengthening our economy.

If we keep on increasing spending and going further into debt, we are going to face very severe economic problems in this Nation in the years ahead.

□ 1450

IN SUPPORT OF AN EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF STIMULUS FUNDS

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I wish to applaud my colleagues in Congress for the progressive action that this body has taken in regards to the President's budget proposal and stimulus package. We must begin to rebuild our economy by directing our attention to our Nation's infrastructure which is in dire need of investment.

I am particularly concerned about those areas which have not adequately rebounded from the resurgence of the economy. Often, these areas have not been appropriately considered on the Federal, State, and local levels. Consequently, I have introduced a resolution before Congress which calls for an equitable distribution of stimulus funds to encompass the needs of distressed rural and urban regions. This resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 72, addresses means by which ambiguous stimulus package funds are to be distributed. Furthermore, this measure places emphasis on those areas which are most desperate due to neglect or specific economic dislocation.

Mr. Speaker, I know that reductions in the USDA budget as well as other related rural programs will have a prominent impact on rural America. For the

month of February, the national unemployment rate hovered around 7 percent. This translated into real terms means that almost 9 million people are still unemployed. Meanwhile, distressed regions scattered across the country face lethargic economies, and many have their problems compounded by military base closures.

My desire is that stimulus funds be properly directed to take into account specific levels of distress. I urge my colleagues to join me in this task.

BTU TAX SHOULD NOT BE APPROVED

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

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, on the campaign trail, candidate Clinton said that middle-class Americans had had enough in taxes, that it was time to give them some relief. I agreed with this sentiment at the time, and I still do. Unfortunately, President Clinton does not agree with candidate Clinton, and the result is that the President now proposes to increase rather than decrease taxes on the middle class by implementing a Btu tax.

The President says that his primary motivation for the Btu tax is deficit reduction and that we will raise $73 billion for this purpose over 5 years. But the President also recognized how aggressive this energy tax is and proposes to respend $37 billion to ease the impact. This will not ease the impact on my constituents, whose average income is $14,000. It certainly is a tax that will discriminate against areas like the State of Maine and the New England area because oil will be taxed twice as much.

So my constituents will bear a disproportionate burden of this tax. I would ask the Members of the House to support the resolution of the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] and myself to oppose the energy tax.

NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO'S REPORTING SHOULD BE BALANCED

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

Mr. CANADY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice concern over the lack of balanced reporting on the Middle East by national public radio which receives a major portion of its funding from the American taxpayers.

I would direct my colleagues' attention to a report published in a recent issue of Commentary magazine.

Based on a study of NPR stories over 6 months in 1991, the media watchdog group CAMERA, identified a disturbing trend.

For instance, according to CAMERA's study, out of 278 stories on Israel and the Arab-Israeli conflict, not a single story reported on the balance of military power or the threat posed to Israel by weapons of mass destruction.

But numerous stories did assail Israel's policies without providing appropriate context.

The report cites many lapses in NPR's news judgment or objectivity.

As a recipient of taxpayer funding, NPR should be strictly objective and balanced.

It is a travesty for tax dollars to be used to support propaganda against the State of Israel.

I found CAMERA's report disturbing, and I am sure many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will share my concerns.

I would urge national public radio to carefully consider the findings of this report, and to rectify the imbalance in its coverage of the Middle East.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDITS SHOULD APPLY ONLY TO AMERICAN-MADE PRODUCTS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, American workers, and IBM workers, too, had their taxes raised in 1981 to pay for tax credits given to American companies who bought computers made in Japan and Germany. Today, 4,000 IBM workers who build computers lost their jobs. Last year there were 45,000 of those IBM workers, and there are 25,000 more scheduled this year.

And, guess what: Congress is right now coming back with another investment tax credit program. I say it should be illegal for the Congress to give tax credits for the purchase of computers or any goods made overseas. The tax credit should only be given when an American product is made.

I guarantee you one thing: IBM workers should be furious over a Congress that targeted their jobs back as far as 1981.

I guarantee you another thing: Mr. Speaker, the Japanese and the Germans are not offering to pay unemployment benefits for those workers in New York: You can bet your sweet job on it.

INTRODUCTION OF THE EQUITABLE HEALTH CARE FOR SEVERE MENTAL ILLNESSES ACT OF 1993

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

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I join with my colleague, Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR, in introducing the Equitable Health Care for Severe Mental Illnesses Act of 1993. A companion bill was introduced yesterday in the other body.

Our bill reasserts that mental illness is real, an illness in need of medical treatment.

For too long our health care system has tolerated unconscionable cutbacks, through insurance companies and employer sponsored plans denying coverage for serious mental illness.

Our bill will make certain that any health care reform plan undertaken by Congress includes equitable coverage for persons with severe mental illnesses. This means an end to health care discrimination and the rationing—I stress rationing—of mental health treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to stress that care for the mentally ill is preventive medicine, and can reduce the costs to society that are being paid in other ways, such as SSI payments, and the countless numbers of homeless people on our streets who are mentally ill and cannot afford treatment.

All of these costs are spread across the American taxpayer, and the American health care delivery system. So to those who would say we cannot afford to cover treatment for these severe mental illnesses, I say we cannot afford not to.

Our bill is good health policy, good family policy, and good fiscal policy, and I urge my colleagues' support of this critical legislation.

IBM LAYOFFS

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

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times includes a story that details the disturbing layoff of over 5,000 IBM jobs in upstate New York.

Ironically, today's New York Times also carries a story that outlines the compensation package for the new CEO of IBM—a base salary of $2 million, a one-time compensation of $5 million for leaving his former job, and stock options that add up to millions more.

How can any business justify a $7 million salary to one executive while simultaneously shattering the lives of over 5,000 hard working employees?

Mr. Speaker, such corporate irresponsibility is an affront to every working-class American that has been sacrificing and struggling through a persistent economic recession.

Big business must do more to protect working-class citizens and less to add to the rolls of Livestyles of the Rich and Famous.

RAISING THE DEBT CEILING AND THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, it does not surprise me that this administration has found another catch phrase to disguise its habit to spend. There is a flaw, however, to using the term temporary as a reference to increasing the debt ceiling: The term has been used before, and we know that in the end, the word can hardly be distinguished from the term permanent.

Yes; that is right. This week, this body will attempt, yet again, to increase the debt ceiling. Mr. Bentsen says we have to increase the national debt by $225 billion, but he also says it will only be on a temporary basis until September 30. The word temporary might appear to reduce the danger of such governmental spending, but what Bentsen really means is that a longer lasting extension of the Government's borrowing ceiling is expected to be included in a major deficit reduction legislation next year.

In one decade, from May 1980 through November 1990, this body voted to increase the debt ceiling 32 times. Eleven of the thirty-two times, Congress called its debt-ceiling increase only temporary; six additional times, this body voted to permanently increase that which had previously been termed temporary. All in all, more than half of the votes to increase the debt ceiling were in the name of a temporary, increase; it led to a debt ceiling increase from approximately $935 billion to approximately $3 trillion. Today it stands at over $4 trillion.

The only way to stop this irresponsibility is by voting for the balanced-budget amendment. Double speak should not fool us. The American people have asked us to genuinely cut spending, and this is what we have to do.

□ 1500

THE LINE-ITEM VETO

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to begin making a small dent in the armor of the Federal budget deficit.

Today we have an opportunity to say no to pork barrel spending and yes to common sense in our budget process.

Today we have an opportunity to say yes to an important weapon that can help our President eliminate spending that helps only a few of us, so that the Congress can concentrate on solving the problems that affect all of us.

We can take this small step by saying yes to line-item veto legislation.

In the past 2 weeks we have considered the budget resolution, the stimulus package, the debt ceiling.

We have debated where we are going to find the funds to finance important, meaningful programs. We have debated our need to eliminate some programs that do not work or are not needed.

Well, these discussions are important.

But we need to do more than just talk.

We need to take action—and this is our opportunity.

I urge my colleagues to take a step that is action, not talk, and support strong line-item veto legislation.

WHERE ARE THE BIG SAVINGS?

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

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Speaker, today marks the last day for the House select committees.

For many Members, their support for shutting down the committees was a tough decision, but one they made in order to make Congress share in the sacrifice necessary for deficit reduction.

But, Mr. Speaker, without sounding like a commercial for long distance telephone service, I want to ask my colleagues: "Where are the big savings?"

Almost $2.7 million for the select committees have been appropriated for this year and remain unspent—and if we do not take action, it will simply be spent elsewhere and not 1 dime will go to deficit reduction.

Likewise, just yesterday, the House passed a committee funding resolution which claimed to cut committee budgets by 5 percent, but when you read the fine print, you will find that virtually none of the cuts came from the remaining committees.

Again, I ask: "Where are the big savings?"

Mr. Speaker, it is time for some truth in budgeting around here. And it is time to really save the taxpayer's money.

That is why I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring H.R. 1428 which would require that all leftover money from the select committees be used for deficit reduction.

The committees are gone. So now let us put our money where our mouth is.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair would point out that the gallery will not applaud.

COSPONSOR THE EQUITABLE HEALTH CARE FOR SEVERE MENTAL ILLNESSES ACT OF 1993

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, may I ask our colleagues to please join with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], my very capable and distinguished colleague, and myself in sponsoring important health legislation that puts treatment of severe mental illness on a par with that of other major physical illnesses.

The Equitable Health Care for Severe Mental Illnesses Act of 1993 will put the Congress and the executive branch on record as seeking to end discrimination in the health care system against those with severe mental illnesses. The legislation directs that health care coverage, both public and private, provide commensurate coverage for severe mental illness as it does for other major physical illnesses.

The personal and societal costs of severe mental illness are tremendous. Millions of individuals and their families are in dire financial straits due to inequitable coverage. On top of this, they also suffer from a lack of access and affordability of treatment.

During this Decade of the Brain, it is time we respond to the marvelous breakthroughs of modern medicine.

Passage of this bill will also save our Nation over $2.2 billion annually by treating the illnesses, rather than providing for income support to affected individuals.

Please join us.

PRESIDENT CLINTON USING DEFENSE BUDGET AS HIS OWN LITTLE PIGGY BANK

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton is fortunate to have our former colleague, Les Aspin, as Secretary of Defense. Secretary Aspin is a recognized expert on defense policy, a man who has spent years analyzing America's defense needs.

Secretary Aspin was before the Armed Services Committee yesterday to discuss the $120 billion of defense cuts that President Clinton has proposed.

I asked the Secretary, "Les, where did this figure come from? Did it come from your bottom-up review of U.S. defense?" No.

"Did it come from the Pentagon's civilian staff?"

No.

"Did it come from the Joint Chiefs of Staff?"

No.

Well, then perhaps it came from a threat assessment of the problem areas around the world. No again.

It came from that well-known defense study group, the White House Office of Management and Budget, pulled

out of the air. That is the number they said to Les Aspin. "Now go and make the cuts, but don't get into any detail. That is bad politics."

The Clinton defense cuts are not being made in a rational way with a eye toward the needs of our military and our national security. President Clinton is simply using the defense budget as his own little piggy bank, a convenient place to find money to pay for his new big-government programs. Perhaps that tells us something very strongly about this administration's opinion of our men and women who wear the uniform of our great Nation.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. SABO submitted the following conference report and statement on the current 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.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 103-48)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to 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, having met, after full and free conferences have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the resolution and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994.

(a) DECLARATION.—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).

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994.
Sec. 2. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 3. Debt increase as a measure of deficit.
Sec. 4. Display of Federal retirement trust fund balances.
Sec. 5. Social security.
Sec. 6. Major functional categories.
Sec. 7. Reconciliation.
Sec. 8. Sale of Government assets.
Sec. 9. Deficit-neutral reserve fund in the Senate.
Sec. 10. Social security fire wall point of order in the Senate.
Sec. 11. Sense of the House regarding tax revenues and deficit reduction.
Sec. 12. Enforcement procedures.
Sec. 13. Sense of the Senate provisions.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—(A) For purposes of comparison with the maximum deficit amount under sections 601(a)(1) and 606 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and for purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

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

Fiscal year 1994: $905,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $973,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,037,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,093,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,143,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $27,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $40,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $58,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $73,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $73,200,000,000.

(iii) The amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: $90,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $98,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $104,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $109,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $114,000,000,000.

(B) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund)—

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

Fiscal year 1994: $812,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $858,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $926,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $976,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,020,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $21,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $28,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $44,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $59,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $57,600,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—(A) For purposes of comparison with the maximum deficit amount under sections 601(a)(1) and 606 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and for purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: $1,223,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,289,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,347,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,409,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,474,500,000,000.

(B) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund), the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: $1,136,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,192,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,239,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,290,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,341,800,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—(A) For purposes of comparison with the maximum deficit amount under sections 601(a)(1) and 606 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and for purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: $1,218,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,280,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,323,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,371,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,435,900,000,000.

(B) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund), the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: $1,133,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,184,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,216,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,252,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,303,600,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—(A) For purposes of comparison with the maximum deficit amount under sections 601(a)(1) and 606 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and for purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: $312,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $306,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $285,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $278,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $292,700,000,000.

(B) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund), the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: $320,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $315,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $299,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $275,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $282,900,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $4,731,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $5,097,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $5,453,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $5,812,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $6,182,400,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $11,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $14,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $21,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $31,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $38,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1994: $149,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $146,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $144,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $138,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $136,100,000,000.

SEC. 3. DEBT INCREASE AS A MEASURE OF DEFICIT.

The amounts of the increase in the public debt subject to limitation are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: $372,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $366,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $355,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $359,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $369,700,000,000.

SEC. 4. DISPLAY OF FEDERAL RETIREMENT TRUST FUND BALANCES.

The balances of the Federal retirement trust funds are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: $1,056,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $1,171,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $1,294,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,420,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,544,600,000,000.

SEC. 5. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: $336,289,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $356,423,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $375,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $393,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $410,528,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and

311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 1994: $274,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $286,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $297,401,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $308,456,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $319,408,000,000.

SEC. 6. 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, $263,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $262,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $253,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $248,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $253,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.

(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, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $18,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $17,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $17,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $17,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $17,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,700,000,000.

(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.
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.
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.
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.
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.

(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, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary 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, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $5,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $5,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $5,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary 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, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $22,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $22,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $22,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $22,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary 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, $600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $13,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $12,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,100,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $16,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $78,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $16,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $80,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $82,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $9,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$10,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $84,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $10,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$7,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $86,300,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $40,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $41,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $42,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $43,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $44,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $8,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $8,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $8,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $9,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,600,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $55,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $59,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $62.800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $65,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $20,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $67,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $26,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $119,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $133,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $131,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $148,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $163,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $162,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $180,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $500,000,000.
(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.
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.
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.
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.
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.
(13) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act, Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund:
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $51,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $61,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $63,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $71,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $80,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $211,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $210,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $222,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $223,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $237,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $232,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $252,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $243,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $253,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) 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.
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.
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.
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.
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.
(16) 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, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $23,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $35,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $36,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $36,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $36,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,400,000,000.
(17) 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.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $15,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $15,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $16,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) 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.
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.
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.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $13,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary 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.
(19) 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.
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.
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.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $297,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $315,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $315,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act, Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, $250,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, $271,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $271,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $289,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $289,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $305,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $305,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $321,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $321,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(21) The corresponding levels of gross interest on the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 1994: $307,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 1995: $327,744,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: $347,046,,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $364,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $381,401,000,000.
(22) 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.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$6,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$0,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$0,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$9,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$13,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(23) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, −$30,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$31,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$31,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$32,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary 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.
(24) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act, Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1994:
(A) New budget authority, −$28,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$29,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, −$29,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$30,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$29,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$30,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$29,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$30,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$29,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$30,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

SEC. 7. RECONCILIATION.

(a) COMMITTEES ON WAYS AND MEANS AND FINANCE.—Not later than April 2, 1993, the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance shall submit to their respective Houses reconciliation legislation containing recommendations to change laws to increase the statutory limit on the public debt to not more than $4,370,000,000,000.

(b) SENATE COMMITTEES.—Not later than June 18, 1993, the committees named in this subsection shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY.—The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit $118,000,000 in fiscal year 1994 and $3,170,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit $128,000,000 in fiscal year 1994 and $2,361,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(3) COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit $401,000,000 in fiscal year 1994 and $3,131,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(4) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.—The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit $1,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1994 and $7,405,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(5) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit $118,000,000 in fiscal year 1994 and $737,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(6) COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.—The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit $13,000,000 in fiscal year 1994 and $1,254,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(7) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—(A) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays $2,346,000,000 in fiscal year 1994 and $35,157,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(B) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase revenues $27,293,000,000 in fiscal year 1994 and $272,105,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(C) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws to increase the statutory limit on the public debt to not more than $4,900,000,000,000.

(8) The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisidction to reduce the deficit $5,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(9) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit $77,000,000 in fiscal year 1994 and $10,638,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(10) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Senate Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit $345,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(11) COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES.—The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit $4,571,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(12) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit $266,000,000 in fiscal year 1994 and $2,580,000 for the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(c) HOUSE COMMITTEES.—Not later than May 14, 1993, the committees named in this subsection shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the House of Representatives a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit as follows: $98,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $119,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $515,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $1,041,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $1,177,000,000 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.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The House Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $128,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $292,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $457,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $643,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $841,000,000 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.

(3) COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS.—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: $338,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $346,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $550,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $769,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $789,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in an increase of outlays as follows: $5,000,000 in fiscal year 1994; and result in a reduction of outlays as follows: $18,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $127,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $227,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $260,000,000 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.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.—The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays by $118,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, and to reduce outlays as follows: $72,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $792,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $2,173,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $2,898,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(5) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—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: $4,342,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $7,491,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $13,422,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $17,518,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $21,744,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(6) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $0 in fiscal year 1994, $1,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $1,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $1,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $2,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(7) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—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.

(8) COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES.—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.

(9) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: $131,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $157,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $543,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $569,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $591,000,000 in fiscal year 1998.

(10) COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE.—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: $77,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, $491,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, $2,669,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $3,709,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and $3,697,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: $2,903,000,000 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.

(11) COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION.—The House Committee on Public Works and Transportation shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit, 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.

(12) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—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.

(13) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit, as follows: by $29,441,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, by $41,415,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, by $61,912,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, by $81,794,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and by $85,209,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and changes in laws to increase the statutory limit on the public debt to not more than $4,900,000,000,000.

(14) DIRECT SPENDING.—For purposes of this subsection, 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. 8. 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 asset 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 this concurrent resolution and 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.

(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. 9. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.

(a) INITIATIVES TO IMPROVE THE HEALTH AND NUTRITION OF CHILDREN AND TO PROVIDE FOR SERVICES TO SUPPORT AND PROTECT CHILDREN, AND TO IMPROVE THE WELL-BEING OF FAMILIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees for legislation that increases funding to improve the health and nutrition of children and to provide for services to support and protect children, and to improve the well-being and self-sufficiency of families and reduce dependency, including initiatives to expand childhood immunization and family preservation and support services, within such a committee's jurisdiction if such a committee or the committee of conference on such legislation reports such legislation, if, to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the enactment of such legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(A) fiscal year 1994; and

(B) the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(2) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to paragraph (1), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this subsection. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The appropriate committee may report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to sections 302(b) and 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(b) ECONOMIC GROWTH INITIATIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees for legislation that increases funding for economic recovery or growth initiatives, including unemployment compensation, a dislocated worker program, job training, or other related programs within such a committee's jurisdiction if such a committee or the committee of conference on such legislation reports such legislation, if, to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the enactment of such legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(A) fiscal year 1994; and

(B) the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(2) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to paragraph (1), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this subsection. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The appropriate committee may report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to section 302(b) and 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(c) CONTINUING IMPROVEMENTS IN ONGOING HEALTH CARE PROGRAMS AND COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE REFORM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees for legislation that increases funding to make continuing improvements in ongoing health care programs, to provide for comprehensive health care reform, or to control health care costs within such a committee's jurisdiction if such a committee or the committee of conference on such legislation reports such legislation, if, to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the enactment of such legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(A) fiscal year 1994; and

(B) the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(2) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to paragraph (1), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this subsection. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The appropriate committee may report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to sections 302(b) and 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(d) INITIATIVES TO IMPROVE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDIVIDUALS AT THE EARLY CHILDHOOD, ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, OR HIGHER EDUCATION LEVELS, OR TO INVEST IN THE HEALTH OR EDUCATION OF AMERICA'S CHILDREN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees for direct spending legislation that increases funding to improve educational opportunities for individuals at the early childhood, elementary, secondary, or higher education levels, or to invest in the health or education of America's children within such a committee's jurisdiction if such a committee or the committee of conference on such legislation reports such legislation, if, to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the enactment of such legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(A) fiscal year 1994; and

(B) the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(2) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to paragraph (1), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this subsection. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The appropriate committee may report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to paragraph (1), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this subsection. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(e) INITIATIVES TO PRESERVE AND REBUILD THE UNITED STATES MARITIME INDUSTRY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees for direct spending legislation that increases funding to preserve and rebuild the United States maritime industry within such a committee's jurisdiction if such a committee or the committee of conference on such legislation reports such legislation, if, to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the enactment of such legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(A) fiscal year 1994; and

(B) the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(2) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to paragraph (1), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this subsection. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The appropriate committee may report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to sections 302(b) and 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(f) INITIATIVES TO REFORM THE FINANCING OF FEDERAL ELECTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees for direct spending legislation that increases funding to reform the financing of Federal elections within such a committee's jurisdiction if such a committee or the committee of conference on such legislation reports such legislation, if, to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the enactment of such legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(A) fiscal year 1994; and

(B) the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(2) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to paragraph (1), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this subsection. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The appropriate committee may report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to sections 302(b) and 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(g) TRADE-RELATED LEGISLATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees and the revenue aggregates may be reduced for legislation to implement the North American Free Trade Agreement and any other trade-related legislation within such a committee's jurisdiction if such a committee or the committee of conference on such legislation reports such legislation, if, to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the enactment of such legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(A) fiscal year 1994; and

(B) the period of fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

(2) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to paragraph (1), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this subsection. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The appropriate committee may report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to section 302(b) and 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

SEC. 10. SOCIAL SECURITY FIRE WALL POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) ACCOUNTING TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, for the purpose of allocations and points of order under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the levels of social security outlays and revenues for this resolution shall be the current services levels.

(b) APPLICATION OF SECTION 301(i).—Notwithstanding any other rule of the Senate, in the Senate, the point of order established under section 301(i) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall apply to any concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year (as reported and as amended), amendments thereto, or any conference report thereon.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TAX REVENUES AND DEFICIT REDUCTION.

It is the sense of the House of Representatives 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.

SEC. 12. ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The Senate declares that it is essential to—

(1) ensure compliance with the deficit reduction goals embodied in this resolution;

(2) extend the system of discretionary spending limits set forth in section 601 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(3) extend the pay-as-you-go enforcement system;

(4) prohibit the consideration of direct spending or receipts legislation that would decrease the pay-as-you-go surplus that the reconciliation bill pursuant to section 7 of this resolution will create under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985;

(5) adopt as part of this concurrent resolution such of the enforcement procedures set forth in this subsection as this concurrent resolution may constitutionally include; and

(6) enact, during this session of Congress, such of the enforcement procedures set forth in this subsection as only statute may constitutionally include.

(b) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—

(1) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, for the discretionary category, the term "discretionary spending limit" means—

(A) with respect to fiscal year 1996:

$519,142,000,000 in new budget authority and $547,263,000,000 in outlays;

(B) with respect to fiscal year 1997:

$528,079,000,000 in new budget authority and $547,346,000,000 in outlays; and

(C) with respect to fiscal year 1998:

$530,639,000,000 in new budget authority and $547,870,000,000 in outlays;

as adjusted for changes in concepts and definitions, changes in inflation, and emergency appropriations.

(2) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1995, 1996, 1997, or 1998 (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such a resolution) that would exceed any of the discretionary spending limits in this section.

(B) This subsection shall not apply if a declaration of war by the Congress is in effect or if a joint resolution pursuant to section 258 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 has been enacted.

(c) ENFORCING PAY-AS-YOU-GO.—At any time after the enactment of the reconciliation bill pursuant to section 7 of this resolution, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, that would increase the deficit in this resolution for any fiscal year through fiscal year 1998 or would increase the deficit for any other fiscal year through fiscal year 2003, as measured by the sum of—

(1) all applicable estimates of direct spending and receipts legislation applicable to that fiscal year, other than any amounts resulting from—

(A) full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990; and

(B) emergency provisions as designated under section 252(e) of that Act; and

(2) the estimated amount of savings in direct spending programs applicable to that fiscal year resulting from the prior year's sequestration under that Act, if any (except for any amounts sequestered as a result of a net deficit increase in the fiscal year immediately preceding the prior fiscal year).

(d) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(e) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the concurrent resolution, bill, or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(f) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(g) EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.—The Senate adopts the provisions of this section—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules (so far as they relate to the Senate) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the Senate.

SEC. 13. SENSE OF THE SENATE PROVISIONS.

The following subsections are set forth as the sense of the Senate:

(a) ASSUMPTIONS.—The levels and amounts set forth in this resolution are based on the following assumptions:

(1) REVENUES.—(A) There shall not be an increase in inland barge fuel taxes beyond those increases already scheduled in current law.

(B) The Finance Committee will make every effort to find alternative sources of revenues before imposing new taxes on the benefits of Social Security beneficiaries with threshold incomes (for purposes of the taxation of Social Security benefits) of less than $32,000 for individuals and $40,000 for married couples filing joint returns.

(C) Consistent with the position of the Administration, the BTU tax will be imposed at the same rate on all fuels purchased by households for home heating purposes, and therefore the supplemental tax on oil will not be imposed on such fuels.

(D) Any energy tax enacted during the One Hundred Third Congress should provide such relief to the agriculture industry as is necessary to ensure that the industry does not absorb a disproportionate impact of that tax.

(2) NATIONAL DEFENSE (FUNCTION 050).—(A) If the estimates for inflation for fiscal years 1994 through 1998 used in the President's fiscal year 1994 budget request and this concurrent resolution are too low, the amounts for budget authority and outlays for the National Defense (050) and other budget functions should be increased to offset the adverse effects of the higher inflation.

(B) If Congress does not enact legislation freezing Federal pay levels for fiscal year 1994 and reducing the rates of increase in Federal pay levels for fiscal years 1995 through 1997, as assumed for the President's fiscal year 1994 budget request and this concurrent resolution, there should be appropriate increases in the amounts of budget authority and outlays for the National Defense (050) and other budget functions in this concurrent resolution to allow the departments and agencies of the Federal Gov-

ernment to meet the resulting increases in costs for pay.

(C) Appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for the programs, projects, activities, and authorities under budget functional category 050 (National Defense) should be made at the levels of budget authority and outlays that are provided for in this concurrent resolution for such functional category for such fiscal year.

(D) If the appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for such programs, projects, activities, and authorities are less than the levels of budget authority and outlays that are provided for in this concurrent resolution for such functional category for such fiscal year, the savings resulting from the lesser levels of appropriations should be used only for reducing the deficit in the budget of the United States.

(E) The Congress should promptly reconsider the amounts determined and declared by the Congress in this resolution to be the appropriate levels of new budget authority, outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1994 through 1998 for the National Defense (050) functional category, in the event of material change in situations affecting the security interests of the United States.

(3) GENERAL SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY (FUNCTION 250).—The budget authority and outlay figures for function 250 in this resolution do not assume any amounts for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for any fiscal year from 1994 through 1998 in excess of the amounts proposed by the President for such fiscal year.

(4) NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT (FUNCTION 300).— (A) Fees charged for domestic livestock grazing on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior in western States should be set at an amount that permits the ranching industry to remain viable and reflects the economic realities of the industry, rather than at an amount that meets arbitrary revenue targets.

(B) Royalty fees charged for hardrock mining should be set at an amount that permits the mining industry to remain viable in the United States and reflects the economic realities of the industry, rather than at an amount that meets arbitrary revenue targets.

(5) EDUCATION, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT, AND SOCIAL SERVICES (FUNCTION 500).—(A) The Head Start program will be funded at the level requested by the President for fiscal year 1998.

(B) The education reform and initiatives will be funded at the level requested by the President for fiscal year 1998.

(C) The defense conversion programs will be funded at the level requested by the President for fiscal year 1998.

(6) HEALTH (FUNCTION 550).—(A) The Committee on Labor and Human Resources will make every effort to embark upon a sustained investment strategy in health research and development over the next 5 years and support for the continuum of medical research should be a central feature in any plan to reform the United States health care system.

(B) The vast majority of rising mandatory program costs is due to increasing Federal health care costs, and these costs are assumed in the levels set forth in this resolution.

(C) Health care reform is essential to curb the escalating costs of health entitlement programs to reduce the deficit.

(D) The reduction in health costs in this budget resolution should be augmented by further savings in Federal health outlays as a part of comprehensive health care reform which will be reflected in future budget resolutions.

(E) Comprehensive health reform will result in long term savings both for the public and private sectors of the American economy, and reduce the deficit levels set forth in this resolution at an ever increasing pace.

(F) Health care reform legislation should receive priority attention by the United States Congress with a target date of enactment of such legislation being no later than September 30, 1993.

(7) INCOME SECURITY (FUNCTION 600).—The Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) program will be funded at the level requested by the President for fiscal year 1998.

(8) ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE (FUNCTION 750).—(A) The Community Policing ("Cops on the Beat") program will be funded at the level requested by the President for fiscal year 1998.

(B) Funds to reduce the availability and use of illegal drugs will be shifted over the next 5 years so that the allocation shall be equally distributed between the so-called "supply side" (interdiction, law enforcement, and international supply reduction efforts) and the so-called "demand side" (education, rehabilitation, treatment, and research programs).

(b) DEBT LIMIT IN RECONCILIATION.—(1) Any concurrent resolution on the budget that contains reconciliation directives shall include a directive with respect to the statutory limit on the public debt.

(2) Any change in the statutory limit on the public debt that is recommended pursuant to a reconciliation directive shall be included in the reconciliation legislation reported pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for that fiscal year.

(3) Except as provided in paragraph (4), the Senate shall not consider any bill or joint resolution (or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that increases the statutory limit on the public debt during a fiscal year above the level set forth as appropriate for that fiscal year in the concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year agreed to under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(4) The prohibition of paragraph (3) shall not apply to a reconciliation bill or reconciliation resolution reported pursuant to section 310(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 during any fiscal year (or any conference report thereon) that contains a provision that—

(A) increases the statutory limit on the public debt pursuant to a directive of the type described in section 310(a)(3) of that Act; and

(B) becomes effective on or after the first day of the following fiscal year.

(c) DEFICIT REDUCTION ACCOUNT.—It is assumed that the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives should report legislation to—

(1) establish a separate account in the Treasury into which all of the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenue should be increased would be deposited;

(2) ensure that any revenues deposited in such account would not be available for appropriation; and

(3) provide that any such revenues deposited in such account would be used to retire outstanding debt obligations of the United States Government.

(d) LINE-ITEM VETO AUTHORITY INCLUDING APPROPRIATIONS AND TAX EXPENDITURES.—The President should be granted line-item veto authority over items of appropriation and tax expenditures and that line-item veto authority should expire at the conclusion of the One Hundred Third Congress.

(e) USE OF SAVINGS FROM GOVERNMENT STREAMLINING.—Any amounts saved through the efforts of the National Performance Review Task Force headed by the Vice President and as a result of any other reorganization and streamlining of the Federal Government should be applied to offset the cost of any economic stimulus package enacted in fiscal year 1993, and any amounts saved in excess of those necessary to offset the cost of any such economic stimulus should be applied to reduce the Federal budget deficit and for no other purpose.

And the Senate agree to the same.

MARTIN O. SABO,
RICHARD GEPHARDT,
DALE E. KILDEE,
ANTHONY C. BEILENSON,
HOWARD L. BERMAN,
ROBERT E. WISE, Jr.,
JOHN BRYANT,
CHARLES W. STENHOLM,
BARNEY FRANK,
LOUISE SLAUGHTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JIM SASSER,
FRITZ HOLLINGS,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the Senate and the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the text of the resolution struck out all of the House resolution after the resolving clause and inserted a substitute text.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for the House resolution and the Senate amendment.

EXPLANATION OF CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

The following tables show the functional allocations and budget aggregates included in the conference agreement over 5 years. In addition, a table follows that breaks out credit amounts by function.

HOUSE-PASSED—TOTAL BUDGET

[In billions of dollars]

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Budget authority	1,505.8	1,579.6	1,639.5	1,708.0	1,787.7
Outlays	1,495.0	1,563.2	1,610.2	1,662.6	1,744.5
Revenues	1,241.5	1,326.4	1,406.1	1,478.9	1,546.0
Deficit (−)/surplus (+)	−253.5	−236.8	−204.1	−183.7	−198.5
Debt subject to limit	4,715.3	5,076.8	5,428.4	5,776.3	6,141.4

HOUSE-PASSED—TOTAL BUDGET—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
050 National defense:					
Budget authority	263.2	262.0	253.1	247.6	253.4
Outlays	276.5	271.9	264.2	248.4	251.9
150 International affairs:					
Budget authority	19.7	18.9	17.9	17.7	17.5
Outlays	18.9	18.3	17.5	17.1	17.0
250 General science, space and technology:					
Budget authority	18.1	19.3	20.1	20.8	21.3
Outlays	17.6	18.6	19.6	20.4	21.1
270 Energy:					
Budget authority	4.8	5.9	5.5	5.6	5.8
Outlays	3.8	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.4
300 Natural resources and environment:					
Budget authority	20.6	22.6	22.2	22.4	22.3
Outlays	20.8	20.7	21.5	21.8	21.8
350 Agriculture:					
Budget authority	15.1	13.6	12.4	11.7	11.6
Outlays	14.4	12.2	10.5	10.0	10.0
370 Commerce and housing credit:					
Budget authority	21.6	17.7	14.2	10.9	12.8
Outlays	11.0	13.1	1.2	−11.2	−6.8
400 Transportation:					
Budget authority	40.3	40.9	41.7	43.0	44.2
Outlays	36.5	37.7	39.2	39.9	40.1
450 Community and regional development:					
Budget authority	8.9	8.6	8.8	9.0	9.2
Outlays	8.8	8.3	8.1	8.3	8.6
500 Education, training, employment and social services:					
Budget authority	56.0	60.4	62.1	63.8	66.9
Outlays	52.2	55.3	54.5	61.1	64.3
550 Health:					
Budget authority	119.2	133.7	148.1	163.3	180.5
Outlays	118.1	132.1	146.7	161.7	178.7
570 Medicare:					
Budget authority	151.2	171.6	184.2	201.6	221.5
Outlays	149.8	167.3	183.0	201.0	221.1
600 Income security:					
Budget authority	209.9	218.5	229.9	243.2	249.3
Outlays	210.6	219.1	224.3	234.0	243.2
650 Social Security:					
Budget authority	323.1	339.3	355.6	372.6	390.0
Outlays	321.7	338.0	354.2	371.0	388.3
700 Veterans benefits and services:					
Budget authority	34.7	35.4	36.0	36.2	36.8
Outlays	36.3	35.5	34.6	36.4	36.9
750 Administration of justice:					
Budget authority	15.1	15.6	15.9	16.1	16.6
Outlays	15.3	15.8	16.0	16.2	16.5
800 General government:					
Budget authority	13.0	12.8	13.2	13.3	13.5
Outlays	13.1	14.2	13.9	13.8	13.9
900 Net interest:					
Budget authority	208.7	226.0	241.2	253.8	266.0
Outlays	208.7	226.0	241.2	253.8	266.0
920 Allowances:					
Budget authority	0.0	−5.3	−4.0	−5.0	−10.8
Outlays	0.0	−5.3	−4.0	−5.0	−10.8
950 Undistributed offsetting receipts:					
Budget authority	−37.4	−37.9	−38.6	−39.6	−40.7
Outlays	−39.1	−39.7	−40.3	−40.6	−41.7

HOUSE-PASSED—ON BUDGET

[In billions of dollars]

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Budget authority	1,222.1	1,288.2	1,337.4	1,393.9	1,461.2
Outlays	1,217.7	1,276.7	1,315.1	1,355.0	1,424..8
Revenues	905.3	970.2	1,030.6	1,086.0	1,135.6
Deficit (−)/surplus (+)	−312.4	−306.5	−284.5	−269.0	−289.2
Debt subject to limit	4,715.3	5,076.8	5,428.4	5,776.3	6,141.4
050 National Defense:					
Budget authority	263.2	262.0	253.1	247.6	253.4
Outlays	276.5	271.9	264.2	248.4	251.9
150 International affairs:					
Budget authority	19.7	18.9	17.9	17.7	17.5
Outlays	18.9	18.3	17.5	17.1	17.0
250 General science, space and technology:					
Budget authority	18.1	19.3	20.1	20.8	21.3
Outlays	17.6	18.6	19.6	20.4	21.1
270 Energy:					
Budget authority	4.8	5.9	5.5	5.6	5.8
Outlays	3.8	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.4
300 Natural resources and environment:					
Budget authority	20.6	22.6	22.2	22.4	22.3
Outlays	20.8	20.7	21.5	21.8	21.8
350 Agriculture:					
Budget authority	15.1	13.6	12.4	11.7	11.6
Outlays	14.4	12.2	10.5	10.0	10.0
370 Commerce and housing credit:					
Budget authority	16.9	17.0	13.9	9.9	10.4
Outlays	8.5	13.1	3.5	−10.4	−7.2
400 Transportation:					
Budget authority	40.3	40.9	41.7	43.0	44.2
Outlays	36.5	37.7	39.2	39.9	40.1
450 Community and regional development:					
Budget authority	8.9	8.6	8.8	9.0	9.2
Outlays	8.8	8.3	8.1	8.3	8.6
500 Education, training, employment and social services:					
Budget authority	56.0	60.4	62.1	63.8	66.9
Outlays	52.2	55.3	54.5	61.1	64.3
550 Health:					
Budget authority	119.2	133.7	148.1	163.2	180.5
Outlays	118.1	132.1	146.7	161.7	178.7

HOUSE-PASSED—ON BUDGET—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
570 Medicare:					
Budget authority	151.2	171.6	184.2	201.6	221.5
Outlays	149.8	167.3	183.0	201.0	221.1
600 Income security:					
Budget authority	209.9	218.5	229.9	243.2	249.3
Outlays	210.6	219.1	224.3	234.0	243.2
650 Social Security:					
Budget authority	6.1	6.7	7.3	7.9	8.6
Outlays	8.9	9.6	10.3	11.0	11.7
700 Veterans benefits and services:					
Budget authority	34.7	35.4	36.0	36.2	36.8
Outlays	36.3	35.5	34.6	36.4	36.9
750 Administration of justice:					
Budget authority	15.1	15.6	15.9	16.1	16.6
Outlays	15.3	15.8	16.0	16.2	16.5
800 General government:					
Budget authority	13.0	12.8	13.2	13.3	13.5
Outlays	13.1	14.2	13.9	13.8	13.9
900 Net interest:					
Budget authority	239.9	260.8	280.1	297.4	314.7
Outlays	239.9	260.8	280.1	297.4	314.7
920 Allowances:					
Budget authority	0.0	−5.3	−4.0	−5.0	−10.8
Outlays	0.0	−5.3	−4.0	−5.0	−10.8
950 Undistributed offsetting receipts:					
Budget authority	−30.6	−30.8	−31.0	−31.6	−32.1
Outlays	−32.3	−32.6	−32.7	−32.6	−33.1

HOUSE-PASSED—OFF-BUDGET

[In billions of dollars]

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Budget authority	283.7	291.5	302.2	314.1	326.5
Outlays	277.3	286.5	295.1	307.6	319.7
Revenues	336.2	356.3	375.6	392.9	410.4
Deficit (−) / surplus (+)	58.9	69.8	80.5	85.3	90.7
Debt subject to limit	4,715.3	5,076.8	5,428.4	5,776.3	6,141.4
050 National defense:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
150 International affairs:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
250 General science, space and technology:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
270 Energy:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
300 Natural resources and environment:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
350 Agriculture:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
370 Commerce and housing credit:					
Budget authority	4.7	0.7	0.3	1.0	2.4
Outlays	2.5	0.0	−2.3	−0.9	0.4
400 Transportation:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
450 Community and regional development:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
500 Education, training, employment and social services:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
550 Health:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
570 Medicare:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
600 Income security:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
650 Social security:					
Budget authority	317.0	332.7	348.4	364.7	381.4
Outlays	312.8	328.4	343.9	360.1	376.6
700 Veterans benefits and services:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
750 Administration of justice:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
800 General government:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
900 Net interest:					
Budget authority	−31.2	−34.8	−38.9	−43.6	−48.7
Outlays	−31.2	−34.8	−38.9	−43.6	−48.7
920 Allowances:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
950 Undistributed offsetting receipts:					
Budget authority	−6.8	−7.1	−7.6	−8.0	−8.6
Outlays	−6.8	−7.1	−7.6	−8.0	−8.6

FUNCTION TOTALS IN CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

[In billions of dollars]

		1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
FUNCTION						
050: National Defense	BA	263.4	262.4	253.6	248.1	253.9
	OT	277.0	272.1	264.7	248.9	252.4
150: International Affairs	BA	19.7	18.9	17.9	17.7	17.5
	OT	18.9	18.3	17.5	17.1	17.0
250: Space, science and technology	BA	18.1	19.3	20.1	20.8	21.3
	OT	17.6	18.6	19.6	20.4	21.1
270: Energy	BA	4.8	5.9	5.1	5.2	5.4
	OT	3.8	4.1	4.0	4.2	4.1
300: Natural resources	BA	20.6	22.6	22.3	22.5	22.5
	OT	20.8	20.8	21.5	21.9	21.9
350: Agriculture	BA	5.2	13.8	12.9	12.6	12.6
	OT	14.4	12.4	10.9	10.7	10.9
370: Commerce and housing credit	BA	21.6	17.6	14.0	10.6	12.8
	OT	11.1	13.1	1.1	−11.4	−6.7
On-budget	BA	16.9	16.9	13.7	9.6	10.4
	OT	8.6	13.1	3.4	−10.5	−7.1
Off-budget	BA	4.7	0.7	0.3	1.0	2.4
	OT	2.5	0.0	−2.3	−0.9	0.4
400: Transportation	BA	40.6	41.0	42.2	43.7	44.9
	OT	36.5	37.5	39.2	40.7	42.0
450: Community and regional development	BA	9.0	8.6	8.8	8.9	9.2
	OT	8.8	8.3	8.1	8.3	8.6
500: Education, training, employment, and social services	BA	55.8	59.2	62.8	65.1	67.4
	OT	52.1	54.8	54.9	62.1	64.8
550: Health	BA	119.0	133.1	148.2	163.7	180.6
	OT	118.1	131.7	146.8	162.1	178.8
570: Medicare	BA	151.2	171.6	184.2	201.6	221.5
	OT	149.8	167.3	183.0	201.0	221.1
On-budget [1]	BA	151.2	171.6	184.2	201.6	221.5
	OT	149.8	167.3	183.0	201.0	221.1
Off-budget	BA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	OT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
600: Income Security	BA	211.1	222.8	237.8	252.2	258.4
	OT	210.8	223.4	232.2	243.0	252.3
650: Social Security	BA	323.1	339.4	355.7	372.6	390.0
	OT	321.7	338.0	354.2	371.1	388.3
On-budget [1]	BA	6.1	6.7	7.3	7.9	8.6
	OT	8.9	9.6	10.3	11.0	11.7
Off-budget	BA	317.0	332.7	348.4	364.7	381.4
	OT	312.8	328.4	343.9	360.1	376.6
700: Veterans benefits	BA	34.7	35.4	36.0	36.2	36.8
	OT	36.3	35.5	34.6	36.4	36.9
750: Administration of justice	BA	15.0	15.3	15.7	16.1	16.7
	OT	15.3	15.6	15.9	16.1	16.5
800: General government	BA	13.0	12.8	13.2	13.3	13.5
	OT	13.1	14.2	13.9	13.8	13.9
900: Net interest	BA	208.7	226.0	241.2	254.1	266.6
	OT	208.7	226.0	241.2	254.1	266.6
On-budget	BA	239.9	260.8	280.1	297.7	315.3
	OT	239.9	260.8	280.1	297.7	315.3
Off-budget	BA	−31.2	−34.8	−38.9	−43.6	−48.7
	OT	−31.2	−34.8	−38.9	−43.6	−48.7
920: Allowances	BA	0.0	−6.0	−2.7	−0.7	−9.9
	OT	0.0	−4.2	−4.0	−0.3	−13.2
On-budget	BA	0.0	−6.0	−2.7	−0.7	−9.9
	OT	0.0	−4.2	−4.0	−0.3	−13.2
Off-budget	BA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	OT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
950: Undistributed offsetting receipts	BA	−37.5	−38.6	−39.3	−40.3	−40.7
	OT	−39.2	−40.4	−41.0	41.5	−41.7
On-budget	BA	−30.7	−31.5	−31.7	−32.3	−32.1
	OT	−32.4	−33.3	−33.4	−33.3	−33.1
Off-budget	BA	−6.8	−7.1	−7.6	−8.0	−8.6
	OT	−6.8	−7.1	−7.6	−8.0	−8.6
TOTALS						
Unified total	BA	1,507.1	1,581.1	1,649.7	1,724.0	1,801.0
	OT	1,495.6	1,567.1	1,618.3	1,678.9	1,755.6
On-budget	BA	1,223.4	1,289.6	1,347.5	1,409.9	1,474.5
	OT	1,218.3	1,280.6	1,323.2	1,371.3	1,435.9
Off-budget	BA	283.7	291.5	302.2	314.1	326.5
	OT	277.3	286.5	295.1	307.6	319.7
Revenues	Rev	1,241.8	1,330.2	1,413.3	1,486.3	1,553.7
On-budget	Rev	905.5	973.8	1,037.6	1,093.3	1,143.2
Off-budget	Rev	336.3	356.4	375.7	393.0	410.5
Deficit	Def	253.8	236.9	205.0	192.6	201.9
On-budget deficit	Sur	312.8	306.8	285.6	278.0	292.7
Off-budget surplus	Def	−59.0	−69.9	−80.6	−85.4	−90.8
Memo: Stimulus	OT	8.6	3.0	0.9	0.6	0.0
Total deficit with stimulus	Def	262.4	239.9	205.9	193.2	201.9

[1] Discretionary administrative costs are on-budget for purposes of caps and budget distribution.

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

SENATE-PASSED—FUNCTION TOTALS

[In billions of dollars]

		1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
050: National defense	BA	263.5	262.6	253.8	248.4	254.1
	OT	277.3	272.3	264.9	249.1	252.6
150: International affairs	BA	19.1	19.1	18.4	18.3	18.5
	OT	19.0	18.4	17.9	17.8	17.9
250: Space, science and technology	BA	18.4	18.8	20.1	21.4	21.8
	OT	17.8	18.6	19.4	20.6	21.5
270: Energy	BA	4.7	5.5	4.9	5.1	5.1
	OT	3.8	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.8
300: Natural resources	BA	21.2	23.0	23.6	24.6	24.5
	OT	21.6	21.9	22.6	23.3	23.5
350: Agriculture	BA	15.3	14.0	13.1	12.9	12.8
	OT	14.5	12.5	11.1	11.0	11.1
370: Commerce and housing credit	BA	21.7	18.7	14.1	10.8	13.0

SENATE-PASSED—FUNCTION TOTALS—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

		1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
	OT	11.2	13.5	1.5	−10.9	−6.6
400: Transportation	BA	40.9	41.6	43.0	44.7	46.0
	OT	36.8	38.1	40.0	41.8	43.2
450: Community and regional development	BA	9.0	8.7	8.9	9.1	9.4
	OT	8.9	8.5	8.2	8.5	8.7
500: Education, training, employment, and social services	BA	54.9	56.4	60.1	62.9	68.0
	OT	51.8	53.5	51.2	59.2	64.1
550: Health	BA	118.7	131.7	146.7	163.4	181.6
	OT	117.9	130.9	145.1	161.0	179.1
570: Medicare	BA	151.3	171.7	184.3	201.7	221.6
	OT	149.9	167.4	183.1	201.1	221.2
600: Income Security	BA	211.8	220.2	236.2	252.6	260.0
	OT	213.3	221.8	231.2	243.9	253.7
650: Social Security	BA	323.1	339.3	355.6	372.6	390.0
	OT	321.8	338.1	354.4	371.4	388.7
700: Veterans benefits	BA	35.3	36.2	37.3	38.2	39.0
	OT	36.8	36.2	35.9	28.2	39.0
750: Administration of justice	BA	15.5	16.1	16.8	17.5	18.3
	OT	15.7	16.4	16.9	17.4	18.0
800: General government	BA	13.7	13.6	14.5	15.1	15.5
	OT	13.8	14.9	14.9	15.3	15.7
900: Net interest	BA	208.7	225.2	240.0	252.6	265.3
	OT	208.7	225.2	240.0	252.6	265.3
920: Allowances	BA	−3.9	−6.8	−8.3	−10.4	−10.6
	OT	−3.4	−6.5	−8.0	−10.0	−10.7
950: Undistributed offsetting receipts	BA	−37.4	−37.9	−38.6	−39.6	−40.7
	OT	−39.1	−39.7	−40.3	−40.6	−41.7
GRAND TOTALS						
Unified total	BA	1,505.3	1,577.7	1,644.6	1,722.0	1,813.3
	OT	1,498.0	1,566.0	1,613.8	1,674.7	1,768.1
Revenues	Rev	1,250.5	1,336.2	1,418.1	1,488.2	1,554.7
Deficit	Def	247.5	229.8	195.7	186.5	213.4
Off-budget surplus	Sur	−59.0	−69.7	−80.5	−85.3	−91.1
On-Budget Deficit	Def	306.5	299.5	276.2	271.8	304.5
Debt Subject to Limit		4,723.7	5,082.5	5,428.8	5,780.8	6,161.4

Note: Details may not add to total due to rounding.

CREDIT TOTALS IN 1994 BUDGET RESOLUTION—BY FUNCTION

[In billions of dollars]

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Function 050:					
Direct loans	0	0	0	0	0
Guaranteed loans	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5
Function 150:					
Direct loans	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.9
Guaranteed loans	16.9	17.3	17.8	18.2	18.7
Function 270:					
Direct loans	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8
Guaranteed loans	0	0	0	0	0
Function 300:					
Direct loans	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1
Guaranteed loans	0	0	0	0	0
Function 350:					
Direct loans	.6	.6	.6	.7	.7
Guaranteed loans	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.1	7.1
Function 370:					
Direct loans	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.9
Guaranteed loans	78.1	80.1	82.1	84.1	86.3
Function 400:					
Direct loans	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1
Guaranteed loans	0	0	0	0	0
Function 450:					
Direct loans	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.3
Guaranteed loans	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.6
Function 500:					
Direct loans	.4	3.3	10.1	20.1	26.2
Guaranteed loans	20.7	19.6	13.7	5.0	0
Function 550:					
Direct loans	0	0	0	0	0
Guaranteed loans	.4	.4	.5	.5	.5
Function 600:					
Direct loans	0	0	0	0	0
Guaranteed loans	0	0	0	0	0
Function 700:					
Direct loans	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1
Guaranteed loans	23.7	19.5	20.1	20.8	20.4
Grand total:					
Direct loans	11.6	14.5	21.6	31.9	38.1
Guaranteed loans	149.7	146.9	144.2	138.8	136.1

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT: RECONCILIATION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE

[In millions of dollars]

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1994–98 Total
AGRICULTURE						
Deficit reduction	−98	−119	−515	−1,041	−1,177	−2,950
Authorization:						
REA	−42	−86	−133	−172	−194	−627
Food stamps	565	1,610	1,660	1,705	1,745	7,285
Subtotal, authorization	523	1,524	1,527	1,533	1,551	6,658
ARMED SERVICES						
Direct spending	−128	−292	−457	−643	−841	−2,361

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT: RECONCILIATION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1994–98 Total
Authorization: Military pay	−2,012	−3,231	−4,117	−5,103	−5,800	−20,263
BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS						
Direct spending:						
Bank exam fee, FDIC	−192	−200	−208	−216	−224	−1,040
GMA REMICs	−146	−146	−146	−146	−146	−730
HUD/IRS income verification	0	0	−196	−407	−419	−1,022
Subtotal, direct spending	−338	−346	−550	−769	−789	−2,792
Revenue increase: Bank exam fees, Fed. Reserve	−63	−65	−68	−70	−73	−339
Authorization: HUD/IRS income verification	5	−18	−127	−227	−260	−627
EDUCATION AND LABOR						
Direct spending:						
Direct student loan program	118	102	485	−1669	−2331	−4,265
States share FFEL default costs	0	−24	−57	−106	−118	−305
Enhance identification of Medicare/caid 3d-party payers	0	−150	−250	−398	−449	−1,247
Subtotal, direct spending	118	−72	−792	−2,173	−2,898	−5,817
ENERGY AND COMMERCE						
Direct spending:						
Medicare	−2,462	−4,318	−9,604	−14,026	−17,940	−48,350
Medicaid & other health	−180	−1,373	−1,740	−2,103	−2,402	−7,799
Auction FCC spectrum licenses	−1,700	−1,800	−1,700	−1,000	−1,000	−7,200
Reauthorize NRC user fee	(1)	(1)	−378	−389	−402	−1,169
Subtotal, direct spending	−4,342	−7,491	−13,422	−17,518	−21,744	−64,518
FOREIGN AFFAIRS						
Direct spending: Foreign service retirement	0	−1	−1	−1	−2	−5
JUDICIARY						
Direct spending: Patent and trademark fees	0	0	−111	−115	−119	−345
MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES						
Direct spending: Extend tonnage fees	0	0	−67	−68	−70	−205
NATURAL RESOURCES						
Direct spending:						
Recreation fees, DoI	−21	−34	−39	−45	−50	−189
Recreation fees, CoE	−13	−18	−18	−18	−18	−85
Recreation fees, DoA	−7	−11	−12	−13	−13	−56
Resulting payments to states	1	2	3	3	3	12
Extend 50 percent receipt sharing	−35	−39	−41	−42	−44	−201
Hardrock mining holding fees	−40	−40	−40	−40	−40	−200
Irrigation water surcharge	−10	−10	−10	−15	−15	−60
Reauthorize NRC user fee	(1)	(1)	−378	−389	−402	−1,169
No. Mariana Islands agreement	−6	−7	−8	−10	−12	−43
Subtotal, direct spending	−131	−157	−543	−569	−591	−1,991
POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE						
Direct spending:						
FEHB medicare limits	−11	−16	−19	−21	−24	−91
FEHB postal service liability	0	−116	−116	−116	0	−348
CSRS postal service liability	0	−231	−231	−231	0	−693
Survivors' annuities	−30	−61	−93	−127	−162	−473
Child-survivor benefits	−5	−10	−15	−20	−25	−75
End lump-sum payments	0	0	−2,119	−3,113	−3,382	−8,614
CSRS retirement COLAs	−31	−56	−75	−80	−102	−344
FSRS retirement COLAs	0	−1	−1	−1	−2	−5
Subtotal, direct spending	−77	−491	−2,669	−3,709	−3,697	−10,643
Authorization: Civilian employee pay	−2,903	−4,660	−5,825	−7,169	−8,164	−28,721
PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION						
Deficit reduction:						
Recreation fees, CoE	−13	−18	−18	−18	−18	−85
Aircraft registration fee	−18	−31	−44	−58	−60	−211
Subtotal, deficit reduction	−31	−49	−62	−76	−78	−296
VETERANS' AFFAIRS						
Direct spending	−266	−364	−382	−405	−1,163	−2,580
WAYS AND MEANS						
Deficit reduction	−29,441	−41,415	−61,912	−81,794	−85,209	−299,771
Offsets to multiple assignments: Direct spending	2,481	4,559	10,365	15,005	19,144	51,554
Grand total:						
Direct spending & revenues	−32,316	−46,303	−71,186	−93,946	−99,307	−343,059
Authorization	−4,387	−6,385	−8,542	−10,966	−12,673	−42,953

[1] Not applicable.

ALLOCATIONS AMONG COMMITTEES

Sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. §§633(a) & 665(a) (Supp. III 1991)) require the joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on a concurrent resolution on the budget to include an allocation, based upon that concurrent resolution as recommended in the conference report, of the appropriate levels of total outlays, total new budget authority, entitlement authority (for the House only), and Social Security outlays (for the Senate only) among each committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives that has jurisdiction over legislation providing those amounts. Section 602 further requires this allocation to include all years covered by the resolution, as well as the total for all those years. These allocations provide the basis for congressional enforcement of the resolution through points of order under the Congressional Budget Act. The Senate allocation follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT BUDGET YEAR TOTAL: 1994

[In millions of dollars]

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Appropriations	$773,585	$802,521		
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	11,649	9,769	$16,527	$6,973
Armed Services	39,990	39,901		
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs	15,872	4,688		
Commerce, Science, and Transportation	2,543	(1,536)	537	535
Energy and Natural Resources	1,434	1,243	37	37
Environment and Public Works	23,818	1,680		
Finance	529,934	527,947	139,738	139,422
Foreign Relations	13,716	14,161		
Governmental Affairs	50,498	49,116	100	100
Judiciary	2,899	2,639	180	179
Labor and Human Resources	5,160	5,095	5,175	4,705
Rules and Administration	50	16		
Veterans Affairs	1,315	1,198	17,516	18,839
Select Indian Affairs	587	574		
Small Business	187	(292)		
Not Allocated to Committees	(249,923)	(240,415)		
Total	1,223,314	1,218,305	179,810	170,790

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT 5-YEAR TOTAL: 1994–98

[In millions of dollars]

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	47,705	33,366	83,570	38,960
Armed Services	210,630	210,173		
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs	66,517	(11,372)		
Commerce, Science, and Transportation	13,080	(6,855)	3,005	2,990
Energy and Natural Resources	8,148	7,665	188	188
Environment and Public Works	120,358	7,264		
Finance	3,064,919	3,053,795	849,886	848,862
Foreign Relations	61,506	65,188		
Governmental Affairs	276,829	267,231	100	100
Judiciary	11,781	11,050	996	991
Labor and Human Resources	14,679	10,503	26,557	24,393
Rules and Administration	235	205		
Veterans Affairs	4,948	5,009	91,118	90,900
Select Indian Affairs	2,732	2,675		
Small Business	294	(1,212)		

SENATE COMMITTEE REVENUE AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 301(a) AND 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR 1994–98

[In millions of dollars]

	1994	5-year 1994–98
Outlays:		
Finance Committee	318,847	1,758,240
Unassigned to committee	(44,034)	(271,705)
Subtotal, outlays	274,813	1,486,535
Revenues	336,289	1,871,986

REPORT LANGUAGE

The conferees intend that, to the extent that this conference report does not modify it, language in the reports of the House and Senate Committees on the Budget on the concurrent resolution on the budget (H.R. Rep. No. 31, 103d Cong., 1st Sess. (1993); S. Rep. No. 19, 103d Cong., 1st Sess. (1993)) remains as a source of legislative history on the drafers' intent on the concurrent resolution.

TRANSPORTATION

The conferees note that enactment of deficit-neutral legislation to preserve and rebuild the United States maritime industry could be accommodated within the totals set by the resolution, and express their support for the enactment of such legislation.

ALLOWANCES (FUNCTION 920)

The conferees believe that the pay restraint set in place in 1994 should be equitable and apply to both civilian and military employees. The conferees note that the Administration and the Congress agree to work together to find savings so that locality pay shall be implemented in fiscal year 1994.

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

The conference agreement is based on the following economic assumptions:

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

	Calendar year—					
	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Real GDP	2.8	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.4	2.0
GDP deflator	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.2
Inflation (CPI)	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
Unemployment rate	7.1	6.6	6.2	6.0	5.8	5.7
3-mo Treasury bill	3.1	3.7	4.4	4.7	4.8	4.9
10-yr Treasury bond	6.7	6.6	6.6	6.5	6.5	6.4

LANGUAGE PROVISIONS

DISPLAY OF ALTERNATIVE MEASURES OF THE DEFICIT

Following the form of the resolution for fiscal year 1993, the Senate amendment sets forth a number of alternative deficit displays. Section 3 of the Senate amendment sets forth the increase in the debt. Section 4 of the Senate amendment shows retirement trust fund balances. Section 5 of the Senate amendment displays, for enforcement purposes in the Senate, the levels of Social Security revenues and outlays. Section 6(21) of the Senate amendment shows the levels of gross interest consistent with the levels of net interest shown in major functional category 900, which appear in section 6(19) and 6(20) of the Senate amendment. Finally, the Senate amendment follows the pattern of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1993 in terms of demonstrating its compliance with the maximum deficit amount and its display of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund. The House resolution contains none of these additional displays. The conference agreement follows the form of the resolution for fiscal year 1993 for the reasons set forth in that conference report. *See* H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 529, 102d Cong., 2d Sess. 58–60 (1992).

RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

Section 4 of the House resolution sets forth reconciliation instructions for changes in direct spending, revenues, deficit reduction, and programs. Section 7 of the Senate amendment sets forth reconciliation instructions for changes in direct spending, revenues, deficit reduction, and the debt. The conference agreement contains reconciliation instructions for changes in direct spending, revenues, programs, deficit reduction, and the debt.

ASSET SALES

Section 5 of the House resolution and section 8 of the Senate amendment are provisions on asset sales that are very similar to those in every budget resolution since that for fiscal year 1988. The conference agreement contains such a provision.

DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS

Section 9 of the Senate amendment provides for "reserve funds" allowing consideration of deficit-neutral legislation in the Senate addressed to seven specified priority areas: (1) to improve the health and nutrition of children and to provide for services to support and protect children, and to improve the well-being of the families; (2) economic recovery or growth initiatives, including unemployment compensation, a dislocated worker program, or other related programs; (3) to make continuing improvements in ongoing health care programs, to provide com-

prehensive health care reform, or to control health care costs; (4) to improve educational opportunities for individuals at the early childhood, elementary, secondary, or higher education levels, or to invest in health or education of America's children; (5) to preserve and rebuild the United States maritime industry; (6) to reform the financing of the Federal elections; and (7) to implement the North American Free Trade Agreement and any other trade-related legislation. The House resolution has no such provision. The conference agreement contains reserve fund language for the Senate similar to that in the Senate amendment.

SOCIAL SECURITY "FIRE WALL" POINT OF ORDER

Section 10 of the Senate amendment repeats two provisions from last year's budget resolution that reinforce the Social Security "fire wall" point of order in the Senate to ensure that 60-vote hurdles impede legislation that would worsen the Social Security Trust Fund balances. The House resolution has no such provision. The conference agreement contains the Senate provisions.

ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

Section 11 of the Senate amendment contains new enforcement procedures to extend the system of discretionary spending limits as they apply to budget resolutions in the Senate for fiscal years 1996, 1997, and 1998, and prohibit the consideration of direct spending or receipts legislation that would decrease the pay-as-you-go surplus that the reconciliation bill will create. This section also calls on Congress to enact, during this session of Congress, the enforcement procedures for these purposes that only a statute may constitutionally include. Section 6 of the House resolution states the sense of the Congress that net tax increases called for in this resolution should not be counted against the pay-as-you-go system, so that no pay-as-you-go surplus would be created. The conference agreement contains the enforcement procedures insofar as they apply to the Senate and restates the House language as sense of the House of Representatives.

SENSE OF THE SENATE PROVISIONS

The Senate amendment contains 22 sense of the Senate and similar provisions. The provisions cover: the debt limit in reconciliation, the barge tax, the Head Start program, the Community Policing program, grazing fees, hardrock mining royalty fees, the effects of inflation on national defense, appropriations for the national defense, the WIC program, defense conversion programs, education reform and initiatives, Social Security taxes, home heating fuel, the use of savings from Government streamlining, relief from energy tax for the agriculture industry, medical research, comprehensive health care reform, line item veto authority, enhanced rescission authority, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and drug supply reduction programs and drug demand reduction. The House resolution contains no such provisions.

Section 24 of the Senate amendment calls for the creation of a deficit reduction account (similar to section 6 of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1988) into which the proceeds of the revenue increases directed by the resolution would be placed. The House resolution contains no such provision; however, the report on the House resolution suggested that proposals to wall off and clearly identify program savings or new revenue, such as creation of a Deficit Reduction Account, should be examined in light of the deficit reduction included in the resolution.

The conference agreement contains one provision stating the sense of the Senate on these matters.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT IN THE HOUSE

Rule XLIX of the Rules of the House of Representatives sets forth a procedure for changing the statutory limit on the level of the public debt.

This concurrent resolution sets forth the appropriate level of the public debt for the coming fiscal year, 1994. Under the rule, upon final passage by both bodies of a concurrent resolution on the budget, the public debt level for fiscal year 1994 set forth in the resolution would be incorporated into the text of a joint resolution.

Pursuant to the rule, the text of the joint resolution would be as follows:

"That subsection (b) of section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking out the dollar limitation contained in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof $4,731,900,000,000."

Under the rule, that joint resolution is then deemed passed by the House and sent to the Senate for its consideration. If the Senate approves the joint resolution without amendment, the joint resolution is sent to the President for his signature. (If the Senate were to amend the joint resolution, the measure would be returned to the House for further action.)

Legislative jurisdiction over the public debt remains in the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule does not preclude that committee from originating public debt bills whenever necessary.

MARTIN O. SABO,
RICHARD GEPHARDT,
DALE E. KILDEE,
ANTHONY C. BEILENSON,
HOWARD L. BERMAN,
ROBERT E. WISE, Jr.,
JOHN BRYANT,
CHARLES W. STENHOLM,
BARNEY FRANK,
LOUISE SLAUGHTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JIM SASSER,
FRITZ HOLLINGS,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

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

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, many Americans do not know most child pornography originates outside of the United States and is smuggled in.

Therefore, in the late 1980's, the Customs Service established the child pornography and exploitation unit.

In 1991 it was integrated into the larger smuggling division.

Although Customs claims their efforts to eliminate this scourge have been maintained, their own numbers indicate it has been cut to barely one-fourth of previous levels.

This is particularly inexcusable given that in the past few years child pornographers have invented a devious system for smuggling, collecting, and sharing their disgusting materials—computer bulletin boards—which can be difficult to track.

Therefore, I recently introduced House Concurrent Resolution 29 which calls on Customs to reestablish this important unit.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and show they are serious about putting an end to child pornography.

I say to my colleagues, you could be saving your own child or grandchild. Cosponsor House Concurrent Resolution 29.

CREATING NEW JOBS

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

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, let me just tell you about one aspect of President Clinton's economic stimulus plan. Let me just say this. He is going to take $850 million out of the 1994 appropriations and move it into 1993 to allow that we can proceed with transferring that money to the State revolving funds to allow them to be able to start work on the waste water treatment facilities, and within this they are going to waive the States' 20-percent matching funds. This will allow local communities to start work now and it will help to create 50,000 jobs.

Let me tell you this. With a district that has 14 percent unemployment, and most of Ohio is upward of 10 percent unemployment, this is going to come as a welcome passage of dollars to help us.

So I am saying, do not just arbitrarily say that you are going to vote against this. You had better think about the rest of the country.

EVEN THE VICE PRESIDENT SAID IT IS WRONG TO SPEND FEDERAL FUNDS FOR THE TAKING OF A HUMAN LIFE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Bill Clinton, the abortion President, is attempting to turn back the clock to the days when every taxpayer in America was forced to fund abortions on demand. Over the past 16 years we have incrementally moved away from encouraging the killing of unborn babies toward nurturing and caring for their kids and their moms. Now the abortion President wants to change all of that.

For 16 years, under Democrat President Jimmy Carter and Republican Presidents Reagan and Bush, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has chosen not to pay for abortions and not to pay the abortionists of unborn babies, not to pay them for ripping apart the fragile bodies of unborn babies or for chemically poisoning these helpless children.

In like manner, Mr. Speaker, 37 States, including Maine, Texas, Missouri, Ohio, and Arkansas, have enacted policies to stop Medicaid payments for abortion. All of those State

laws would be superseded by Mr. Clinton's proposal to scrap the Hyde amendment.

Mr. Speaker, even AL GORE has recognized the repugnance of Americans to the grisly abortion procedure. A few years ago he wrote, and I quote:

> It is wrong to spend Federal funds for what is arguably the taking of a human life.

Mr. Speaker, AL GORE was right; it is wrong.

SPECIAL TREATMENT OF GAYS AND LESBIANS IN MILITARY—AN IRRATIONAL APPROACH

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe allowing citizens to serve their country regardless of their race, gender, or sexual orientation is a simple matter of fairness. I do not question the sincerity of those who oppose lifting the ban, but I do not think their arguments will stand the test of honest debate.

I had hoped that the Senate's hearings would be the first part of that debate. Unfortunately, the testimony and questioning alike have been disappointingly one-sided. On the first day of the hearings, for instance, we heard supposedly neutral experts on military law suggest that homosexuals would have to be given affirmative action preferences if they were allowed to serve openly.

Promotion boards do not currently give preferences to ethnic or racial minorities, so I have no idea why homosexuals would be entitled to special treatment simply because they were no longer officially persecuted. Gays and lesbians simply want the same rights—and responsibilities—as any other citizen. The idea that this controversy is about special treatment turns the real issue on its head. The real issue is equal treatment for everyone, equal treatment that is now denied to gays and lesbians for no rational reason.

CLINTON'S ECONOMIC PLAN WON'T WORK

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, several recent polls show that President Clinton's job approval rating is lower than any recent President.

The more the American people find out about the administration's economic plan, the more they don't like it.

They are right. It won't work. Even under the most optimistic estimates, the deficit is still going to be over $200 billion in 4 years. The defense cuts are going to cost one-half million jobs. And the heaviest tax hike in history is going to put a lid on the economy.

The administration's economic plan doesn't put people first, it punishes people first. Senior citizens, middle-income earners, everyone who turns on a lightbulb or drives a car, and successful businesses are specifically targeted to be hit by new taxes.

Last year, candidate Clinton promised $3 in spending cuts for every $1 in new taxes. Now it's reversed. There's more than $3 in new taxes for every $1 in spending cuts.

To reduce the deficit, we need to eliminate the $250 billion in new spending before we raise taxes one penny±.

THE TRAGIC DEATH OF NAVY LT. PATRICK J. ARDAIZ

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with pain and sorrow at the news of the tragic death of Navy Lt. Patrick J. Ardaiz, a native of Towson, MD, and one of my constituents.

Lieutenant Ardaiz, a jet navigator of only 28 years of age, was killed Thursday with four other young Americans when their E-2C Hawkeye radar plane crashed while returning to an aircraft carrier in the Ionian Sea after monitoring airdrops of humanitarian relief supplies into Bosnia.

A graduate of Calvert Hall High School and the University of Maryland, Lieutenant Ardaiz also was a veteran of the gulf war and received numerous awards and citations during his brief but heroic career.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for this entire body when I extend my deepest, heartfelt sympathy to Lieutenant Ardaiz's family, especially after Patrick's father, Dr. Jose Ardaiz, a man of notable praise himself, died just a month earlier. Lt. Patrick Ardaiz is survived by his mother, Sheila Ardaiz and two younger brothers.

As of yet, the Navy has not determined the cause of the crash. However, if as many suspect, the plane was shot down, the perpetrators of this heinous act must be searched out and punished to the fullest extent of the law.

U.S. ARMED FORCES HISTORY MONTH—MAY 1993

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we are today introducing a joint resolution to designate the month of May 1993 as U.S. Armed Forces History Month.

Now this is not just a gesture of sentimentality. With what the men and women of the Armed Forces today are going through, and trying times they are, we owe it to them to set aside a period of our current year to review the history of their predecessors in armed conflict across the two centuries of our history for there is no portion of our American history that is not overlapped by military action in defense of our Nation.

So, Mr. Speaker, while we are wrestling with base closings, and shrinking dollars for the Pentagon and for retirements and benefits for our veterans and veterans hospitals, now is the time, in May 1993, to review the history of our Armed Forces and see whether or not, as I know my colleagues will find with me, that the history of our soldiers, and sailors and marines in the Armed Forces is the history of our country.

IDEAS DO HAVE CONSEQUENCES

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

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I admire the President for trying to reduce our deficit. But I have some specific, serious concerns about the defense budget.

For the last 2 years we have had the Secretary of Defense and the CNO brief our Committee on Armed Services about the extent that we are going to see our military reduced as a result of this particular budget.

In fact, as Richard Weaver, a famous author, said, ideas do have consequences. Candidate Clinton said he wanted to reduce the defense budget $60 billion below the baseline. President Clinton is going to reduce, over the 5-year period, 1993 through 1997, the defense budget, $122 billion. In 1996 and 1997, in those 2 years alone we are going to take $62 billion out of our defense budget and ask the soldiers and sailors who have performed so well for this country to take cuts in pay because of their freeze, to be sent home with no particular job, and I think it is, frankly, wrong. They deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the American people take note of this.

THREE MONTHS OF CLINTON AND COLLAPSING CONSUMER CONFIDENCE

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, the headlines today read, "Third Straight Month of Declining Consumer Confidence." Of course this is also coincidentally the third straight month of the Clinton Presidency, and the more the American people learn about President Clinton's largest tax increase plan in American history, the less they like

it. It is understandable with the President reaching further into taxpayers' pockets to finance ever-new Government programs, proposed income tax hikes, new energy taxes and taxes on Social Security benefits to name just a few, and they all tell the American people. "Don't buy," and they tell the American businesses, "Don't hire new employees."

The prescription for maintaining the current 21-month economy expansion, which began back under the Bush administration, is to generate private investment in job creation, not pork barrel Government spending, and I say to the President, "Mr. President, avoiding taking more money out of the American taxpayers' pockets is the surest way to increase consumer confidence."

□ 1520

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The Chair will remind Members not to address any other party but the Chair.

GET RID OF CLOSED RULES

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of the House, people often ask me what is it that surprises me the most about the U.S. Congress. After having been here 3 months, I guess I could say one thing, and that is voice vote, or the closed rule. It is the practice of basically not allowing debate on the House floor.

I have come from a legislature where bills can be amended on the House floor. They can be changed and perfected, they can be sent back to committee, questions can be asked by any member of the legislature and any member can speak on a bill without having permission from the committee chairman or the ranking member. It is a free debate.

But not so on the floor of the U.S. Congress. There is no such quest for truth, because of the closed rule.

I am a Republican, but I know that the Republican Party does not have the franchise on all the right answers. It is a two-party system. We should combine the best ideas of the Democrat Party with the best ideas of the Republican Party, and we should work together as Americans for the good of the country, not by party rules.

Mr. Speaker, let us end voice law, let us get rid of closed rules, let us open up debate, and do what is best for the United States of America.

DEBT LIMIT: HOW MUCH HIGHER?

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, how high is up? Are we trying to use the debt ceiling to find out? Treasury Secretary Bentsen wants us to add another almost $¼ trillion to the $4-plus trillion national debt between now and the end of September. This is a real poke in the eye with a sharp stick to the millions of Americans asking us to reduce the national debt. It means adding $1.2 billion a day every day for the next 183 days. In his letter, the Treasury Secretary gave us a friendly reminder that if we do not increase the debt limit right away, then Social Security recipients will be unable to cash their monthly checks in April. Now that is some scare tactic. Instead of causing anxiety for our seniors, why not cut some pork spending? The 5-year deficit reduction of $500 billion being touted by the Clinton administration does not cut the national debt—it projects raising it to more than $6 trillion in 1998. I ask, when is Democratic leadership going to allow us to start lowering the debt ceiling?

REINTRODUCTION OF THE SAVE THE FLORIDA BAY ACT OF 1993

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing bipartisan legislation entitled "The Save the Florida Bay Act of 1993." For my colleagues who have never had the pleasure of visiting this magnificent body of water, Florida Bay is located off the southern tip of Florida, between the Everglades National Park and the Florida Keys. Florida Bay serves as the principal nursery for Florida's largest commercial fishery, and its warm, clear tropical waters have attracted visitors from all over the world.

Unfortunately, today Florida Bay is a dying body of water. Its clear waters are turning murky, and the sea life which was once abundant is now disappearing at an alarming rate. The coral reefs off the Florida Keys, the only living coral reefs in the Nation, are being threatened by the changes occurring in Florida Bay.

Poor decisions and poor planning by the Government years ago are the principal reasons for the decline of Florida Bay, and we must now take immediate action to reverse this trend before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, we can save Florida Bay, but we must act now. I urge my colleagues to do in the Florida delegation in supporting this effort by becoming a cosponsor of the Save the Florida Bay Act.

AMERICA DISARMING IN TIME OF CRISIS

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the Communist Chinese are building war bases in the South China Sea, North Korea is building nuclear weapons, the Yeltsin government is reeling in the Soviet Union, Bosnia is blowing up, and President Clinton is disarming America.

BASEBALL AND REFORM

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, spring training is coming to an end and opening day for baseball is almost here.

As we consider the budget conference report today, I cannot help but think about baseball.

This conference report, which Republicans haven't even seen yet, will contain a multibillion-dollar debt limit increase.

President Clinton says he has hit a home run with his budget. But as the American people examine his package closely, that supposed home run looks more and more like a foul ball.

His economic stimulus plan is really more pork barrel Democrat spending. And he will pay for this new spending by raising the debt limit by billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, the President has not hit a home run with his economic plan. He has not hit a triple, a double, or even a simple base hit, either.

He has hit a long, foul ball. And after all the specifics come out, I believe the Clinton plan will eventually strike out with the American public.

KEEP AMERICA'S DEFENSE STRONG

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today about base closures. My district in San Diego will pick up an additional 6,000 to 13,000 jobs because of the base closures, and I should be happy. But in the State of California, with my Members on the other side, all of us realize that the State of California is decimated by over 100,000 jobs being lost. So when they start cutting our educational programs, our police forces, our border patrol, and even social services, let us take a look at why we are cutting defense.

It is not only jobs, but it is the defense of this country. Our two Senators from California stood up and said,

"Don't close our bases in California. It is not economically sound." But yet those two Members last week in the Budget Committee voted to cut an additional $127 billion from defense.

How do those two Senators think it will affect the economy of San Diego in coming years? We brought our troops back from Desert Storm not in body bags because we had a strong defense. Let us keep it that way.

BENTSEN FAMILY SAVINGS AND LOAN RECEIPTS

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, for the last couple of days I have listened in vain for some Democrat to come forward who was among those who criticized Neil Bush for his problems with the RTC to raise some criticism about Secretary Bentsen's son, whom we now find out had $20 million of forgiveness from the RTC as a failed savings and loan.

The Bentsen family got $20 million in benefits, and yet not one Democrat who excoriated Neil Bush for weeks on this floor, in fact called for criminal charges to be leveled against him, has come to the floor yet to suggest that something is wrong in the $20 million of benefits that the Bentsen family got. Strange.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1994, AND AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF SUCH CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BEILENSON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-49) on the resolution (H. Res. 145) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany 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, and against consideration of such conference report, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING A REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF A CERTAIN RESOLUTION

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 142 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 142

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to a resolution reported on the legislative day of March 31, 1993, providing for consideration of a conference report to accompany 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 142 waives clause 4(b) of rule XI of the House of Representatives only for today and only for a rule providing for consideration of a conference report on the budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 64.

Clause 4(b) of rule XI provides that, in the event a rule is considered on the same day it is reported to the floor from the Committee on Rules, a two-thirds majority vote is required for passage. This resolution that we are considering today would simply waive the two-thirds requirement.

Mr. Speaker, the conference committee has reached a settlement on the differences in the House and Senate versions of the budget plan, and we are all aware that we are making every effort to move the congressional budget resolution as expeditiously as possible.

□ 1530

Adoption of this rule would allow the orderly consideration by the House of the conference report today, and I urge my colleagues to adopt the rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the standing rules of the House require a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day that it is reported from the Rules Committee.

This rule waives the two-thirds vote requirement, so that we can consider the budget resolution conference report rule today instead of tomorrow or some other day.

I do not intend to ask for a recorded vote on this resolution, but I want the record to be perfectly clear that I am opposed to the provisions of this budget resolution conference report, as is every single Republican and a bunch of Democrats besides.

Mr. Speaker, during the budget process, a number of alternative proposals were offered which would have allowed for fewer taxes, less spending, more deficit reduction, and more taxpayer relief—the real keys to any kind of economic recovery. Unfortunately, these proposals were defeated because the Members of this House could not stand up for the people and vote against their own porkbarrel and own self-interest. And that is a shame.

Now we have another chance, the American people, through you, their representatives have another opportunity to voice their opinions on $336 billion in new taxes almost all of which fall on the backs of middle-class America, and on the $231 billion in new spending which all but wipes out any meaningful deficit reduction. Mr. Speaker, regardless of political ideology, Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative, the American people must be listened to.

This budget resolution before us today does not reflect the American people's ever increasing opposition to more taxing and more spending.

And that is exactly what this budget does. It proposes a huge increase in the tax burden forced on the backs of the American people. The domestic spending increases are greater, listen to this, they are greater than the domestic spending cuts. The spending increases in this budget are greater than the spending cuts. The huge tax increases take effect long before any substantive spending cuts occur, if they ever do occur, and there are practically none even for the first 2 years. And that is not responsible.

The amount of deficit reduction claimed is unlikely ever to be realized. And even by the terms of this conference agreement, the projected deficit level starts to go up again in the final year covered by this budget resolution.

We raise taxes $336 billion on the American people, and the deficit is going to go up in the fifth year. This clearly is not fiscally responsible budgeting, my colleagues. What it is is an antigrowth, antibusiness, antijobs budget that will hurt rather than help the American economy. What are we doing here?

Mr. Speaker, this is not the kind of change that the American people voted for in the last election. We can and should do better. And my colleagues all know it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the deputy whip.

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

It will probably come as no surprise to Members to find out that I am a little disturbed about what is happening here.

If I understand correctly, the rule that we now have before us is to basically waive the two-thirds requirement; is that correct?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, that is the reason for this rule. There will be another rule following in a few minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the reason for the two-thirds requirement is to give Members an opportunity to understand the legislation on which they are voting. In other words, if we are going to run something out to the floor without 1 day's notice, so that Members have a chance to familiarize themselves with the legislation, we are supposed to have to pass it with a two-thirds vote to put a larger onus on actually passing the legislation; is that not correct?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. WALKER. What we are doing in this rule is doing a bypass of the ability of Members to understand what is in the legislation coming down the pike; is that not the purpose behind this rule?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, it is. And even worse, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the next rule that we will be debating in a few minutes, which will actually bring the budget onto the floor, waives a 3-day layover.

We were, when we went into session about an hour and a half ago, for the first time handed this report which we are going to be expected to vote on without having read it.

Mr. WALKER. And it is my understanding, and if the gentleman can tell me whether this is right or wrong, that this whole thing was basically agreed to in a late-night session with absolutely no Republicans in the room; is that not correct? That this is a deal that was cut amongst the Democrats and that the budget document that we will have before us, that none of us had a chance to see, our Members were not even invited in the room to negotiate on; is that not correct?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. And these pages are not numbered, so I cannot refer to the middle of the document. But there are handwritten notes, which no Republican has ever seen, which deal with bringing up two reconciliation bills, one today which deals with a debt of $4,359,600,000,000.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I noticed that, too. And the copy that I got actually has one figure crossed out and another figure put in, which I understand that the figure that was put in was not the figure that was in the committee last night when they passed the document out, that that was added during the course of the Committee on Rules meeting that brought this rather silly rule to the floor; is that correct?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, that is right. Now the Committee on Rules is writing budgets.

Mr. WALKER. So, in fact, what we have is a situation where late last night, a handful of Democrats got together, came up with a budget, no Republican was allowed in the room to deal with the budget. They handwrote material into it. They are in the process of changing that, as we go through this process.

They have already, with one change, taken the public debt, understand this, with one little change this way, one little sweep of the pen, they took the debt from $4,359,000,000,000 to $4,370,000,000,000. With one sleight of the hand they added $11 billion to the debt.

Yet we are not supposed to be given a chance to look through this document further to find out what else they might have done by sleight of hand. For all we know, buried down in all of these figures, and there are literally dozens and dozens, I mean, as I flip through here, every one of these pages has figures on it, how do we know what is in some of these figures? We have absolutely no idea what is down in this document that a few Democrats concocted in a closed room late last night and then want to bring to the floor and waive the two-thirds rule in order to bring it out here.

My guess is that if there is ever one document that we ought to be taking a look at, it is this. This is hundreds of billions of dollars in spending and hundreds of billions of dollars in debt. And they are adding to the debt. And by one little sleight of hand, with one red pen, down in the middle of this, they just add $11 billion to the debt that no one knows where it came from. And we are going to waive the rules in order to have this go on.

I have got to tell my colleagues, this is another example of everything that the American people believe is wrong with the Congress.

When middle-class America is upset with the Congress, of adding to their debt, adding to the $17,000 per person in debt that we have already accumulated in their name, this is the kind of sleight of hand that they are particularly concerned about, because what they are concerned about that goes on in the Congress is, in dark rooms somewhere there are people adding up trillions of dollars in spending and then adding with red pens along the way billions of dollars more in debt. And no one knows what is going on.

My guess here is that the reason why they do not want us to look carefully at this document is, they have no idea what we might find written down in it.

□ 1540

We might find some other figures in here that do not match with the rhetoric.

Let me explain one other thing. The other day when we came before the House of Representatives with an instruction to the conferees about this bill, unanimously, unanimously the House of Representatives said that we ought to eliminate the tax on Social Security recipients. It was unanimous in this House. Everybody in the House of Representatives voted for it.

In the dead of night when this document was prepared, guess what, the Social Security tax stayed. The unanimous vote of the House of Representatives was absolutely ignored. Once again, we do not want people to have too much of a chance to look at this, because they may find out what is really in it.

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely right. Not only does this waive the 3-day layover, the following rule that will follow this, but it also waives the violation of scope for the conference reports. That will indicate that we have no idea what happened when they adjourned at 9 o'clock last night, and what they will change, as the gentleman has indicated, where they wrote in some additional figures. This allows them to go beyond the scope of either the House or the Senate bill.

Mr. WALKER. Just so middle-class America understands what that means, in other words, we might have decided that only $100 could be spent in the one area, and the Senate might have decided that only $120 could be spend in that area. Under that scope they could not go above $120 because that was the highest figure, but these guys behind closed doors in the dead of night with only Democrats in the room could decide to go to $150 of spending, despite the fact that no one in the House or the Senate had approved that level of spending.

I would ask the gentleman, is that not correct?

Mr. SOLOMON. It is, and I do not want to frighten the gentleman in the well, but it does something even worse. It also waives the requirements that 602(a) allocations be included in the joint explanatory statement of managers.

Normally when the budget is adopted each committee gets a 602(a) allocation. Those do not exist. They are not in the report. They are going to be put in at a later date.

Mr. WALKER. I would say to the gentlemen, wait a minute. Wait a minute. The only thing the budget resolution is supposed to do is assign the spending categories to these various committees so they have limits. The gentleman is saying that this is a budget document without limits?

Mr. SOLOMON. I do not mean to laugh, Mr. Speaker, because it is not funny, but the gentleman is right.

Mr. WALKER. In the dead of the night, with only Democrats in the room, the Democrats decided to prepare a budget that increases massively the national debt, and are even now writing as we speak new numbers for

the new national debt, and they decided then to put absolutely no limits on this, that there are no appropriation limits on the bill?

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. WALKER. Incredible. Incredible.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if he still has no further speakers.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that we have acquired a speaker. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule, but I will oppose the budget resolution. I oppose more taxes in America, period. If tax increases were the answer, the budget would already be balanced.

I am a Democrat. No one worked harder to elect President Clinton and the Vice President than I did. I am sure I will support him 99 percent of the time, but taxes are smothering America, and this new tax increase, the biggest in American history, will become known as the mother of all smothers. It is not going to do one thing but cause us to lose more jobs.

Congress must start to incentivize the tax code to create jobs. It is jobs, Congress; not taxes, jobs.

Let me say this. We should only be incentivizing the tax code for the purchase of American-made products. Just call the workers in New York at IBM and talk to them about the tax credits given for the purchase of Japanese computers. It is time we reward investment in America, purchasing in America, made by American workers with American hands.

I have a question today. The question is very simple: What happened to the third, fourth, and fifth year of the last 5-year deal in 1990? And what happened to the 5-year deal that the 1990 5-year deal replaced? And what about the 5-year deal that was modified by the revised 5-year deal that the first 5-year deal was supposed to accomplish?

The truth of the matter is we should be in the third year of the last fifth year 5-year deal.

The truth of the matter is all of the big savings are going to come in the fourth and fifth years. The truth of the matter is, under the Republicans, we have never seen it, and I am not going to be hypocritical, now the Democrats are not showing it to us, either.

I am saying to the Congress: My district is suffering. It is time we incentivize the tax code to create jobs. We are not doing that. We are smothering America, and we will continue to smother America with these taxes.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman, as bad as they were, the one thing we can say about the Soviet commissars was, at least they stuck with their 5-year deals.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is actually right. The Soviet Union is now some flea market, the Berlin Wall is a speed bump, and they had 5-year plan after 5-year plan after 5-year plan.

Here we are closing military bases, losing jobs hand over fist. Why do we not close the military bases overseas, cut some foreign aid, incentivize the tax code, create some jobs, and start to straighten our country out? I know that sounds too simplistic, but I have to agree with my Republican colleagues that the biggest tax increase in America's history will certainly not balance our budget. In fact, it may take America from chapter 11, which we are in now, to stone cold dead chapter 7 bankruptcy.

I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that the President agrees to incentivize the tax code for the purchase of American-made products and for investment in American-made goods and services. If we do that we have a shot. If we do not, and I am sure this will fall on dead ears, then we will be on another 5-year plan, 5-year after 5-year after 5-year.

To close, I was sort of anxious to see what the third, fourth, and fifth year would do in the last 5-year deal. I am not too crazy about starting another one.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend that Mike Ditka, my hero, would be very proud of his former quarterback, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, because he has risen above partisan politics to point out one of the real problems that the Democrats have in their budget. It is not just the largest tax increase in American history, it is more than double the largest tax increase in American history.

This has not even been studied by most of the Members of Congress. They want to waive the 3-day rule so we do not know what is in this thing, and it is going to add to the deficit and it is not going to solve our economic problems.

One of the reasons I am going to object and vote against this rule is because they are asking us to waive this two-thirds majority rule to allow them to bring this to the floor right away, when they continually gag the Republican minority on issue after issue after issue and bill after bill. We cannot even bring amendments to this bill to the floor because they gag us. We had some alternative budgets that did not increase the taxes of the American people by $400 billion, when we include the fees that they are adding in, $400 billion when we add in the taxes and the fees and the other things they are calling spending cuts.

They would not allow us to bring a bill to the floor that would allow us to get a balanced budget in 5 years without any tax increase by limiting the growth in Government spending to no more than 2 percent per year for the next 5 years.

We could do that, America, but they do not allow it to the floor because they want to tax and spend, tax and spend, because that is their solution to everything.

I would just like to say to my colleagues, we are not going to stand still for this. We are going to call vote after vote on rule after rule, and keep people here late in the evening until we get some kind of fairness in this place. The American people do not want to see the economy go down the tubes. The last tax increase we had, which was one of the largest in history, in 1990, caused us to go into a recession.

This is well more than double that. It is going to take jobs out of America. It is going to close down American industries and it is going to hurt unemployment. We are going to have 1.4 million fewer jobs, according to most economists, if this plan passes.

□ 1550

And yet, this is their economic stimulant, recovery budget. And they are going to follow this, ladies and gentlemen, with a $16 billion jobs bill, they call it, and it contains billions and billions of dollars of pork barrel projects that we have been talking about on this floor.

These are things that we cannot in good conscience support, nor will we support. And we will be fighting this day. And I want to congratulate once again my colleague from Ohio, Mr. TRAFICANT, for having the guts to stand up and point out the deficiencies in the Democratic plan.

The American people want to cut Government spending first, take a meat ax to it before we even start talking about taxes, and yet time after time after time they come down here with more taxes. And this one is more than double the largest tax increase in American history.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, last fall we heard an awful lot of discussion during the campaign about budget deficits and the national debt. We all know the national debt is over $4 trillion.

President Clinton came here about 6 weeks ago and promised that there would be no more smoke and mirrors,

that we were going to have real numbers, and we were going to do something significant about dealing with the budget deficit.

Well, when this budget resolution that we are going to consider today, left the House after a $365 billion proposed increase over the next 5 years, let me read to Members what the budget resolution from the House side indicated in terms of the deficits for the next 5 years. Fiscal year 1994, $312 billion; fiscal year 1995, $306 billion; fiscal year 1996, $284 billion; fiscal year 1997, $269 billion; and fiscal year 1998, $289 billion. This is on top of a $310 billion deficit this year.

Now we are going to have the budget resolution, the conference committee report. We have cut our deals in the back room, and here is what the deficits are going to be over the next 5 years: $312 billion in fiscal year 1994, $306 billion in fiscal year 1995, $285 billion in fiscal year 1996, $278 billion in fiscal year 1997, and $292 billion in fiscal year 1998. This conference committee report actually increases the budget deficit more than when it left here.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we want to do something about reducing the budget deficits in this country, and this budget resolution does nothing, absolutely nothing to reduce the huge budget deficits that we have had. We are going to do nothing more than increase the Federal debt by some $1.5 trillion over the next 5 years.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I noticed a few minutes ago that the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] came to the floor. And since I was raising questions earlier about the figure that was in the agreement last night about the public debt, I am wondering if I could get his attention about maybe answering a question about what the figure was that was passed out of the committee last night.

I would ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], I was wondering if I could find out, since we have a copy here with some handwritten information in it from your negotiations last night about the public debt, and it appears as though there are at least three different figures here, two of which have been scratched out. Can the gentleman tell us what the figure was that was agreed to last night for the public debt? It is on page 57 of O-gin-gin-93.284SLC.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will give me a second and then yield?

Mr. WALKER. That would be very helpful, and I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, which line is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. WALKER. There is a handwritten figure. We have some handwritten material here.

Mr. SABO. It is 43,700,000. That is for the short-term debt. That mirrors the bill that has passed out of the House.

Mr. WALKER. What I am puzzled by is that if that was agreed to last night, how come when this document came to the Rules Committee it had 43,596, and too many zeros to keep talking about, and then that was scratched out and we ended up with the 43,700 figure?

Mr. SABO. Frankly, it was a clerical mistake. It should have been the final number.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], my former classmate of 15 years ago.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, the people of America should understand that this is the Democrat budget. It can all be summed up in just nine words: Tax, tax, tax, spend, spend, spend, borrow, borrow, borrow.

This bill is an insult to the American taxpayer. It is an insult because the bill increases spending when the Federal Government is already $400 billion in the red; $1 out of the $3 spent by this Congress is borrowed money.

This bill is an insult because under this bill the $4.1 trillion Federal debt will get worse, much worse.

The Federal debt is so bad that $1 out of every $5 that the American taxpayer sends to Washington goes for nothing but interest payments on a national debt. And now the Democrats in this Congress are going to increase the national debt. Under this bill, things will only get worse.

It is an insult to the American people because the Democrats in this House are raiding the Social Security reserves and other trust funds to the tune of $100 billion a year. Let me repeat that. The trust funds in our country are being raided to the tune of $100 billion a year to cover the big spending that the Democrats are pushing through this Congress. And under this bill, Social Security will be raided even more. Yes, Social Security is being taxed under this bill.

And the worst insult of all is that the Democrats in this House want working families, middle-class taxpayers, and remember that tax cut they were promised, America's senior citizens are going to pay even more taxes.

The American people should understand that under this bill the Democrats will increase taxes on your Social Security benefits. The Democrats will tax Social Security and will tax Social Security benefits, because the Democrats in this House cannot control their big spending habits.

We Republicans are opposed to taxing Social Security. On February 10, the House Republican Study Committee and the House Republican Research Committee jointly held a congressional forum on the Social Security tax. We revealed the damage that this bill will do to millions of senior citizens. We detailed the unfairness of taxing benefits that average people earn through their lifetime of work, just because the Democrats in this House cannot say "no" to the special interest groups.

It is not only that they are spending money that upsets me. It is that it is a payoff to the special interest groups.

Yesterday, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the State-by-State impact that this tax will have on senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats' budget bill is an insult to the American people, and it should be, it must be rejected.

But if this budget passes, the American people will know who is responsible for raising their taxes, because the big spenders, the Democrats who control everything, the House, the Senate, the White House, the bureaucracy, all of the agencies, are now marching on a new banner, or I should say the same old banner: Tax, tax, tax, spend, spend, spend, borrow, borrow, borrow, which is the battle cry of the Democrats in this House.

□ 1600

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, a very good member.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, you know, we have often heard the old joke of Washington as being Disneyland on the Potomac. I can tell you right now this afternoon where we are, we are on Fantasy Island.

To begin with, I think it is most amazing that the rules of this House that would say that a bill that did not sit over requires a two-thirds majority, but that rule can be overruled by a simple majority. Now, to me, the sense of fairness and of fair play, full disclosure and everything else, this makes absolutely no sense to all.

But then, look at this budget carefully. Look at the tax, the extra tax on Social Security. The President and most Democrats, I would say, would say, "We will never raise taxes on the middle-class people." What are we talking about? We are talking about people who make $25,000 a year. We are raising their taxes on Social Security. If you are married and have $32,000 a year income, we are raising your taxes on Social Security.

The President answers that in typical Fantasy Island fashion by saying, "No. That is a cut."

Mr. President, are you cutting Social Security? My friends, you cannot have it both ways. Today with your vote, you are either going to reject that failed fantasy policy or you are going to do one of two things, either raise taxes on the middle class or cut Social Security. You cannot have it both ways. That is the choice that you have to make today.

So I say to my colleagues, think carefully about this vote. This rule is wrong, and it should be rejected. This budget is foul, and it should be rejected.

This is nothing less than the double cross of 1993.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER].

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, for 6 or 7 years this body, the Democrats in it, have been trying to put in jail various members of the Republican administration for lying to Congress, Ollie North, John Poindexter, "Cap" Weinberger. They said a lie to Congress is against the law.

And yet Congress lies to a much higher authority every day we sit here. We are lying to the American people. We lied when we said it was an emergency spending bill, the stimulus package. We lied when we said it would not break the caps. Forty-five minutes later right after that promise was made, we found out it did. We lied when we defined deficit reduction. We all know now that it is going to increase the deficit, and we are lying to the American people when we say we would require a two-thirds vote to bring this to the floor, and now you are going to waive that with a simple majority vote.

Mr. Speaker, we are lying to the very people on whom we depend for moral support and moral authority, and it is time to stop our lying.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], a member of the Committee on Rules, a very valuable member.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I cannot say that I have not seen the document. I have seen it. It is over there. It is that big 100-plus-page document with annexes to it.

I can say that I am probably in a better position than some members, Republican members, of the Committee on the Budget, because I do not think they have had a chance to see it at all. Some of them have not. I think we got it first; I saw it first; I saw it about 2 hours ago.

The point of this is we are talking about a document that over the next 5 years is going to raise our national debt at least $2 trillion, and some think much more.

We now hear some saying this is great, let us have a little applause, because we are not going to sin quite as much every year. We are going to have some sinning going on here, no doubt about it; we are going to have big annual deficits, but they are not going to be quite as bad as they might have been. Now, that is a great way to exercise fiscal responsibility in our country.

I think it is a little early for the applause for this.

I think the gentleman from Ohio did a very excellent job of talking about the out years. The deficit savings, $42 billion the first year, $65 billion the second year, $96 billion the third, and then in the fourth and fifth years, way out there, 135 billion dollars, worth of savings, 159 billion dollars, worth of savings. It is sort of a trust-me program.

I remember October 1990, and I think a lot of other Americans do, the famous budget deficit reduction act. You will recall in that it was "Trust us, we are going to reduce the budget deficit." Well, we added a big tax bite, and the deficit has gone up every since, and we never fixed the process.

We have no restraints. Nothing binds us. We have no balanced budget amendment. We have no line-item veto. We have still got a system of budgeting and appropriating that does not bring us into anywhere near balance.

In 1998, when all is said and done with this program, if it gets that far, after 5 years of sacrifice and higher taxes, we are still going to have a deficit of $200 billion that year, and it is going to be climbing. We are going to have a national debt of $6.5 trillion or more. Every man, woman, and child in this country is going to owe more than $20,000 to Uncle Sam to start out their day.

This is not a good program.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALKER) there were—ayes 8, noes 17.

Mr. BEILENSON. 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 248, nays 171, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—248

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
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 (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
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
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
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—171

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer

Callahan	Hobson	Paxon
Calvert	Hoekstra	Petri
Camp	Hoke	Pombo
Canady	Horn	Porter
Castle	Houghton	Pryce (OH)
Clinger	Huffington	Quinn
Coble	Hunter	Ramstad
Collins (GA)	Hutchinson	Ravenel
Combest	Hyde	Regula
Cox	Inglis	Ridge
Crane	Inhofe	Roberts
Crapo	Istook	Rogers
Cunningham	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
DeLay	Kim	Roth
Diaz-Balart	King	Roukema
Dickey	Kingston	Royce
Doolittle	Klug	Santorum
Dornan	Knollenberg	Saxton
Dreier	Kolbe	Schaefer
Duncan	Kyl	Schiff
Dunn	Lazio	Sensenbrenner
Emerson	Leach	Shaw
Everett	Levy	Shays
Ewing	Lewis (CA)	Skeen
Fawell	Lewis (FL)	Smith (MI)
Fields (TX)	Lightfoot	Smith (NJ)
Fish	Linder	Smith (OR)
Fowler	Livingston	Smith (TX)
Franks (CT)	Machtley	Snowe
Franks (NJ)	Manzullo	Solomon
Gallegly	McCandless	Spence
Gallo	McCollum	Stearns
Gekas	McCrery	Stump
Gilchrest	McDade	Sundquist
Gillmor	McHugh	Talent
Gilman	McInnis	Taylor (NC)
Gingrich	McKeon	Thomas (CA)
Goodlatte	McMillan	Thomas (WY)
Goodling	Meyers	Torkildsen
Goss	Mica	Upton
Grams	Michel	Vucanovich
Grandy	Miller (FL)	Walker
Greenwood	Molinari	Walsh
Gunderson	Moorhead	Weldon
Hancock	Morella	Wolf
Hansen	Myers	Young (AK)
Hastert	Nussle	Young (FL)
Hefley	Oxley	Zeliff
Herger	Packard	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—11

Barton	Henry	Nadler
Conyers	Kasich	Quillen
Ford (TN)	LaFalce	Shuster
Hall (OH)	McCloskey	

□ 1626

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Nadler for, with Mr. Quillen against.

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.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON 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 145 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 145

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany 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. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The conference report shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 2. The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may submit for printing in the Congressional Record not later than April 1, 1993, the allocations required by section 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The allocations so submitted shall be considered to be the allocations otherwise required to be included in the joint explanatory statement of the managers on the conference report to accompany a concurrent resolution on the budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS). 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 New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 145 is the rule providing for the consideration of the conference report accompanying House Concurrent Resolution 64, the concurrent resolution on the budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate on the conference report to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Budget Committee. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. Finally, the rule authorizes the Budget Committee chairman to submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, by April 1, 1993, the committee allocations required under section 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The printed allocations will be considered to be the allocations submitted pursuant to section 602(a).

□ 1630

House rule XLIX provides that upon adoption of the conference report, the Clerk is directed to engross a joint resolution which incorporates the debt limit number for the budget year fiscal year 1994 from the budget resolution. The effect of adopting the conference report today, therefore, will be to send to the Senate a joint resolution raising the debt limit from $4.15 to $4.7319 trillion.

In addition, the conference report includes reconciliation directives to the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee to report to their respective Houses by April 2 a bill that will raise the debt ceiling to $4.37 trillion, which is sufficient to get us through September 30 of this year, 1993. It is our understanding that the House will vote separately on this short-term debt limit bill, even though House Rule 49 is in effect.

Finally, the conference agreement also directs the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee to report a long-term debt limit increase as part of the larger budget reconciliation bill which is to be reported to the Budget Committee by May 14, and it will be considered by the full House shortly thereafter.

I wish to commend the chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], for his efforts in working with the Senate to come to an agreement on a budget resolution that cuts an additional $50 billion from the President's budget plan over the 5-year period from fiscal year 1994 through fiscal year 1998. In all, implementation of the conference report will reduce the Federal deficit by $42 billion in fiscal year 1994 and by $496 billion over the next 5 years.

The conference report represents real, substantive spending cuts. As under the original House-passed budget resolution, discretionary spending will be frozen, with no increase for inflation, for the next 5 years. Thus, this plan calls for less spending, in actual dollars, on discretionary programs in every year from 1994 through 1998 than we spent in 1993, and it will exceed the savings required by the fiscal year 1994 and fiscal year 1995 discretionary spending caps contained in the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

The remainder of the $496 billion in deficit reduction is achieved through reconciliation. The conference report instructs 13 House committees to report legislation reducing spending or raising revenues which will be combined into a single, omnibus reconciliation bill for consideration by the House later this year. That legislation, making permanent changes in law, will enable us to put in place this year the budget savings that will be achieved over the next 5 years.

In all, the conference agreement assumes spending cuts of $1.21 for each dollar of tax increases. This calculation counts the increase in taxes on Social Security benefits for beneficiaries above certain thresholds as a tax increase rather than as a cut in benefits.

Despite the substantial deficit reduction called for by this agreement, it also assumes full funding of Head Start, of WIC, of child immunization, and of the Mickey Leland Hunger Program. All of these programs, I believe many Members would agree, are absolutely essential to ensuring the education, health, and well-being of our Nation's children, the very future of our Nation, whose needs have been neglected for too long.

Mr. Speaker, passage of the conference report on the fiscal year 1994 concurrent resolution on the budget will set us on a course toward substantially lowering the size of the deficits the Federal Government has been running in recent years and, along with

that, slowing the rapid growth of the Nation's debt that has resulted from these deficits.

But the difficult work, I would remind the Members of the House, on the budget remains before us. The budget resolution, as Members are aware, is only the blueprint for Federal spending and revenues. Decisions on actual program cuts and on any specific tax increases will be made as other committees report the specific spending and revenue measures called for by the resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], my friend, for yielding the time, and, Mr. Speaker, it is too bad there are not more Members on the floor, because those of my colleagues, who are back in their offices, should know their political career could be riding on the next vote that takes place on the floor of this House, because they may be voting to raise the national debt ceiling by $586 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule because the rule is wrong, because the budget resolution conference report that it makes in order increases taxes too much, it cuts spending too little, and it does nothing to bring about meaningful deficit reduction, meaningful deficit reduction.

This rule, Mr. Speaker, includes a waiver of the 3-day layover requirement that allows Members to have a chance to learn what it is that they are being asked to vote on, not exactly a wild and crazy idea when we look at this $1½ trillion budget. Not one Member of this Congress has any idea what is in this except for about five people that finished writing it about midnight last night. In this case the budget resolution conference report was not even filed until after the House convened at 2 o'clock this afternoon, and there are only two copies of this for 176 Republican Members on this side of the aisle, and people are coming over here, fighting over copy and that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. Speaker, that means Members of Congress had no opportunity to go over this conference agreement, and, Mr. Speaker, this is not the right way to do business. This is not some small piece of legislation we are talking about. This budget resolution purports to set the priorities for this Nation for the next 5 years.

And, Mr. Speaker, waiving the 3-day layover requirement is never a good idea, never, but in this case it is really a terrible idea.

Let me tell my colleagues what else it does. This rule waives the scope of the conference rule which prohibits putting material into the conference report which was not in either the House or the Senate version, and that is why, when my colleagues look at all these handwritten notes on each page, many things have been added after the conferees adjourned last night and disbanded.

What is in this budget that my colleagues are going to be voting on? For example, this conference report includes a provision written into the margin which provides a separate reconciliation deadline for setting a debt limit. One more time we are bending the rules, Mr. Speaker, and, Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to be fully aware of what it is that they are being asked to vote on by adopting this rule.

Not only will my colleagues be adopting the conference report on the budget, but, by that same vote, they will be voting to raise the debt limit from $4.145 trillion up to $4.731 trillion. That is an increase, get this, an increase, of $586 billion.

How much money is that? When the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] came to this Congress with me 15 years ago, Mr. Speaker, that is how much the whole Federal budget was 15 years ago: $586 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, "Now, Members, you might think you're not really voting to increase the debt limit by voting for this budget resolution, but, under House rule XLIX, that is exactly what you're doing, and don't let any of your leadership try to tell you that you're not."

House rule XLIX is the so-called Gephardt rule that provides that, once we have adopted this conference report, the Clerk will take the debt limit level from the budget resolution and put it in the joint resolution which shall be deemed to have been passed by the House when we adopt this resolution. That means that my colleagues are voting to increase the debt limit by $586 billion with their vote on this budget.

Mr. Speaker, that is not legislating. It is a red-ink-producing machine on automatic pilot.

Where is the accountability? Where is the "representative" in the House of Representatives? Why should we be hiding behind these rules instead of stepping out front and voting on these major issues the way people sent us here to do, and that is what they expect of us.

Mr. Speaker, I attempted, up in the Committee on Rules, to amend this rule so that we could remove that automatic pilot and put the Members of the House back in control of the major decisions being made on behalf of the American taxpayers. My amendment to the rule would simply say, quote, that the provisions of the Gephardt rule shall not apply to this conference report. Instead the House will have to bravely stand up and vote to raise the debt limit.

□ 1640

I would urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that I might be able to offer that amendment to the rule now and give the House this chance to do its sworn duty of superintending the debt of this country. By so doing, my colleagues, you will in turn give us an opportunity on this floor to vote on a legislative line-item veto, and right now you are being prohibited from doing that, and vote on a balanced budget constitutional amendment, two matters which absolutely must be considered in connection with any further efforts to raise the national debt ceiling.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to vote down the previous question so that they may vote for a temporary public-debt-limit bill and for a line-item veto and balanced budget amendment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the budget itself, this budget resolution is a disaster about to happen. Does this Congress realize what it is about to do? We as a body are going to levy $336 billion in new taxes on the backs of the American people. That is the largest tax increase in the 200-year history of this Nation.

We as a body are going to set the stage for spending $231 billion in new Government spending over the next 5 years, without any meaningful deficit reduction. As a matter of fact, the deficit will even rise in the 5th year of this budget.

Mr. Speaker, this is not right, this is not fair, and it certainly is not the right way to deal with the American economy.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if Members vote this budget today, they will be voting to raise the debt limit, as I have said before, by $586 billion, because voting for this budget today will take away their only opportunity to vote for a temporary debt limit that only raises the debt limit $225 billion. That is what we would be faced with if we did not have this bill before us. Members will also be ducking out on their chance to vote for a true line-item veto.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of this rule I will try to defeat the previous question so we can knock out the Gephardt rule that automatically approves raising the debt ceiling by that $586 billion for an entire year. So Members should remember when they come over here, do not vote yes on the previous question. If they do, they are going to be voting for this debt ceiling increase. Vote no on that previous question.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would tell my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], that we apparently, at least at the moment, and perhaps forever, have no further requests for time. So if the gentleman wants to proceed, he should please do so.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] was fair on the last rule and did not try to take advantage of that, so at this point I yield 2 minutes to the dis-

tinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Glen Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON], for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the process around which we are even considering this budget.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that when we look at, once again, waiving the 3-day layover, when we look at the facts, as we have, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] shows, that this is an inordinately complex measure that has come before us.

One is reminded of one of the Framers of our Constitution, James Madison, who in coauthoring with Messrs. Hamilton and Jay the Federalist Papers, in the 62d Federalist, James Madison had to have been thinking about what is before us today when he wrote the following:

> It will be of no avail to the people that the laws are made by men of their own choice if the laws be so voluminous that they cannot be read or so incoherent that they cannot be understood.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have a very simple choice here. I urge opposition to the previous question so that we can work to try desperately to improve this process and allow Members to have the chance to look at this budget. It is clearly a sham for us to think that we can reach far beyond what that Random House Dictionary, back there describes as a budget, to impose on the American people something that is anything but that.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. KIM], a new and outstanding freshman Member of this House.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, here we go again.

We are asked to raise our national debt limit by $225 billion. Over the next 6 months, we are asked to accumulate debt at a rate of $1.2 billion per day.

Is this the President who was going to cut the deficit in half in 4 years?

Now we meet today to increase the debt by $225 billion to $4.37 trillion—yes, trillion. I cannot support this request. I find it outrageous.

Why more debt? I will tell you why—$16 billion for the so-called emergency supplemental appropriations measure that was passed last week that we are told will put America back to work—but we are also told in that bill that every American taxpayer should pay $28 million to bail out the D.C. budget shortfall. We are forced to pay for publication of two fish atlases and studies of the sicklefin chub. These are Presidential imperatives. These are emergencies? This is supposed to stimulate our economy? How?

The increase in the debt limit is irresponsible. It is not only irresponsible—it violates every wish and every hope of the Nation's taxpayers.

Our President promised Americans that he would immediately begin debt reduction and sound fiscal policies. He has not and we can only wonder if he ever will. As yet, we have not seen his tax legislation, and we have no way of determining the tax burden Mrs. Clinton's health plan will include. This is not a time to rise the debt limit. It is time to reduce spending. It is time to end the monumental waste in Government.

The people in my district do not want to pay millions for fish atlases. I do not think any of us have even seen a sicklefin chub and the cities in my district are very hard pressed for revenue but none of them expect a bailout from the Federal Government. And I am proud of them.

The American people voted for change, I do not see any change. I see waste, I see debt limit increases, I see no inclination to cut this outrageous spending. I do see broken promises and vacant rhetoric and I do not like it one bit.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the deputy whip.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a document that we have before us which is the conference report on the budget that was prepared in the dead of night by Democrats only, and the more information we find out about, the worse it looks.

I am told, for example, that the conferees on this budget document met one time on Tuesday. They met for a photo op. Then when it got to the real business of negotiations, the Republican conferees were completely shut out of the room and were not permitted to negotiate. All the negotiations were carried on behind closed doors, and the Republicans were not permitted in.

Now, that is how this budget document was arrived at. And guess what? Even after they arrived at that document in the dead of night, the Republican conferees, the people who were members of the committee, were not even given a copy of it until it was filed in the House at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

That is fairness, folks? That is the way it operates in the House of Representatives.

Why do they not want Republicans and others to see this document? Why are there only two copies of this document provided to the Republican side of the aisle? Why are there no documents around the floor? Because the more you look at this document, the worse it gets.

For example, this document does not even include the cost of the President's $16 billion stimulus package. And because it excludes that cost, it means that it is a total phony in terms of spending.

Then when you get down and begin to add up the numbers, and we have had some people back doing number crunching now, when you add up the numbers, you find out that this conference report provides for less deficit reduction than the House-passed budget resolution over the 5-year period.

□ 1650

And in fact, when we really look at it, we find out that under the conference agreement, spending will climb by almost $40 billion more than the House bill over a 5-year period.

The House went into the conference behind closed doors with Democrats only there, and the House got taken to the cleaners. And so we end up with a document on the floor that they cannot justify. And then we look at another little thing that happened. The House voted unanimously not to raise the taxes on Social Security recipients. And what happened behind closed doors? For $40 billion, did the House at least get our position taken on not taxing Social Security recipients? No. We gave that up, too.

The House just got royally taken to the cleaners by the U.S. Senate that wanted to spend more money. And now we are going to vote on this without knowing anything about it.

Let me tell my colleagues a couple of other things about this particular deal, this particular bill, the way it is structured does one thing and one thing only. For all of the thick pages here, for all of these pages, this bill does only one thing for real. It raises the public debt.

The main obligation under the budget resolution is to provide 602(a) allocations to the Committee on Appropriations. I realize middle-class America does not know what that means. What that means is that it sets a limit that the Committee on Appropriations can spend. This bill does not do it.

The rule that we have out here right now says that they do not have to file those until some time later. So this bill has no 602(a) allocations in it, which means it has no caps. So that the only thing this bill does, this bill does only one thing for real, it raises the debt by $586 billion. That is the only real thing that is in this bill.

Every Member who votes for this bill is voting to do only one real thing, and that is to raise the debt by $586 billion. Each Member who casts a vote for this particular document can only say that "What I did was I voted to raise the debt by $586 billion. I set no limits. I got nothing from the Senate. In fact, all I got was more spending. I did not get to keep the Social Security people off taxes. No. All I got was to raise the bill on the public debt by $586 billion. As a Member of the House, that is all I can do."

I would suggest to my colleagues, they might want to vote against that. The first place they can vote against it is to vote for the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] on the previous question.

What he will do is strip out the debt question to make certain that when the bill comes to the floor, it will not have the debt in it. That means it will have nothing in it. If we passed the previous question, this will be a worthless document because the only thing it does is raises the debt by $586 billion. But it will be the only key note. It will be the only place where Members will have an opportunity to eliminate the debt section. And if they do not vote for the Solomon motion, what they are going to end up with is a budget presentation on the floor that allows them to do one thing and one thing only: Raise the debt by $586 billion.

I would suggest they might not want to do that. They may want to support the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]. Then we can have a real debate about what is really in this document, which is pretty bad, a document that is a spending document and a taxing document.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I hope that middle America is paying attention to this debate, because one of the most salient points that was just made was that President Clinton has proposed what is called an economic stimulus package that is costing $16.5 billion, and it is not even included in the budget that they are talking about.

All the deficit spending that is in that budget, which is into the billions and billions and billions of dollars, even though there is a $400 billion-plus tax increase in there, does not include this $16 billion so-called economic stimulus package that is filled with pork.

It has got swimming pools in there for various communities around the country. It has got gymnasiums in there for various communities around the country. It has got parking garages in there. It has got libraries in there.

These are things that local communities ought to pay for but taxpayers from around the country are taking care of their friends in Alabama and their friends in Florida and their friends in California with these pork-barrel projects. And the thing that is most irksome about this, if there is such a word, is that the President has not even put it in this budget.

It is $16 billion more that is going to be added to the debt in addition to what this does.

I just heard from my colleagues this is going to increase the national debt by $586 billion over the next year. I wonder how many other things we are going to have added to this debt over the next year. Certainly, this $16.5 billion so-called economic stimulus package, which I call pork package, is going to be added in addition to it.

We have to start coining new words, new definitions around here. Today I started one: Clintonomics.

Remember Reaganomics? Everybody criticized? Remember Clintonomics, because it is going to cost 1.4 million jobs in the next 4 to 5 years. That is how many jobs we are going to lose, at least according to most economists. Clintonomics. And it is going to lead to a Clintastrophy, an economic Clintastrophy. Find that in your lexicon. If it is not there now, it should be.

The first thing we ought to do is start addressing the problem of Government spending. Just 10 years ago we had our first $1 trillion national debt. Now we are almost to $4.5 trillion in debt. It took us 200 years to get to $1 trillion and less than 10 years to more than quadruple it. And what are we doing? Instead of cutting spending, we are raising your taxes more than double the largest tax increase in U.S. history. And that is supposed to solve our problems? Remember that when you get your paycheck next year. Remember that when you pay your utility bill and you are paying $400, $500 more for gas or electricity in your home next year, because that Btu tax, the big-time unemployment tax we call it, is going to be hitting each and every one of you.

The problem is, this really concerns me, is that the media has not really gone into the program and explained it to the American people. It is no wonder to me that the people of this country want President Clinton to succeed. I want him to succeed. But at the same time, while he is succeeding, I do not want to see him take the economy right down the tubes to a degree that is worse than what we have seen over the last 3 to 4 years.

We raised taxes in 1990 to the tune of $184 billion. And what did it cost? It cost us jobs, and it cost us an economic recession.

Now they are raising taxes more than double that. Sure, we want President Clinton to succeed, but we want the economy to succeed even more. And the way to make sure the economy succeeds and grows so that we create more jobs and do not lose them overseas is to cut Government spending first. That is the key. Government spending is out of control.

We brought in $500 billion in tax revenues 10 years ago. Now it is $1.2 trillion, almost triple what we brought in 10 years ago. Yet we are still running $300 to $400 billion in red each year. So raising taxes is not the answer.

Since we raised taxes $184 billion in 1990, for every $1 in new taxes, we have spent $2.70. So the problem is not that we are not getting enough revenue. The problem is spending is out of control. And they will not make the hard decisions on cutting spending.

We had a proposal called the 2-percent solution that would freeze all Government spending and no more than a growth rate of 2-percent per year over the previous year. They would not let us even bring it out of the Committee on Rules to the floor. That would have balanced the budget in 5 years without a tax increase. That is the problem.

They want to raise taxes and they want to spend us into oblivion. And they are going to do it unless America rises up and says, "No more, no more."

The problem is they face a dilemma that Benjamin Franklin said the second Continental Congress faced, and that is, they have to either hang together or hang separately. And they are swallowing very hard this huge tax increase of President Clinton.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Many of us have just been trying to very rapidly go through this budget document. I hope every Member has the chance to observe the largest proposed tax increase in history, the $2 trillion increase in the debt limit and the unpresidented overspending before they cast their votes, I think many of the Members, and I think the American people do not realize the increased debt that this resolution advocated. If we look on page 8, we increase the debt limit of the U.S. Government from the current $4 trillion to $6.182 trillion, at the end of this 5-year cycle.

□ 1700

If the American people realized that we are continuing to increase the debt this amount that we are simply reducing the increase in spending and not reducing actual spending they would not approve. We are not dealing with the real problem. A government that is too big and out of control is taking the money out of the American taxpayer's pocket to satisfy special interest spending. I think Americans should say to their Congressman and Congresswoman, "Wait a minute, something is wrong, stop overspending."

If the Members will look at this budget resolution they will notice something else that seems to be a little tricky in this document. Instead of making Congress vote on increasing the debt ceiling, we simply say we are going to assume a bill is passed to raise the debt ceiling. So once we pass this document we have already precluded a separate vote on increasing the debt ceiling for 1994.

We not only increase the debt ceiling for fiscal year 1994 but also on page 70 we increase the debt ceiling for a full

calendar year 1994, to get us through that election cycle. Individual Congressmen do not have to cast an embarrassing vote to again raise the debt ceiling when we are running for election in 1994.

I am concerned, No. 1, at the speed with which we are asked to accept this document. I am concerned, of course, as every Member of Congress and the American people should be, that we are increasing taxes by $240 billion and we are not doing anything to control overspending and the huge debt that we are passing on to future generations.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from California, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, we will visit in a little more detail about the budget resolution later, but I hear so many just total distortions of what we are doing that I had to rise for a couple of minutes.

The facts are that we have a conference report today that will produce $496 billion of real deficit reduction for this country, a combination of spending cuts and revenue increases; revenue increases, 72 percent coming from the top 5 percent of the income scale in our country, people with incomes over $100,000.

I listen to some of my friends who speak with such vehemence. They had their President for the last 4 years. Rarely could they find themselves to have the capacity to agree with him. That is part of the problem why we have had the gridlock we have had over recent years.

We have today a real program, a President who has advanced it. We have the potential to move that program forward. In my judgment that is the obligation we have to the American people. This is a program that will serve the American people well.

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

Mr. SABO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, were any Republicans included in the negotiations on the final product of the budget?

Mr. SABO. I would say to the gentleman, no, they were not heavily involved in final negotiations.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, heavily involved? Were any of them involved at all?

Mr. SABO. They were involved in the conference committee meeting, but, I have to be frank, not in the actual negotiations.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, in fact, those negotiations took place behind closed doors, with absolutely no Republicans in the room, is that not correct, I would ask the gentleman?

Mr. SABO. I think our Republican friends, who I give the highest marks to in the work and effort they have put into this process, obviously have some very fundamental policy disagreements with us. The potential for us finding any agreement that they would find acceptable was exceedingly remote.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, isn't that the purpose of a conference committee, that the conferees get together? After all, it was a Republican motion that suggested that we ought to eliminate the Social Security tax. It was adopted unanimously on the floor, and then the Republicans were shut out of the conference, and guess what, we come back here and the tax on Social Security is still left in the bill, despite the fact that the House unanimously said we ought not to have it.

Mr. SABO. The gentleman from Pennsylvania at times confuses me. A little while ago he said there was nothing in this resolution.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, I am simply saying to the gentleman that the only operative thing in the resolution is that we are raising the public debt. They have no 602(a) allocations in it. Those do not come until a couple of days from now.

Mr. SABO. Tomorrow.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield again, they are not in the resolution as we are passing it. I am suggesting to the gentleman that Republicans might have wanted to be in the room to fight for the one thing that the House did approve unanimously of the Republicans' and that was to eliminate the Social Security tax. They were shut out of the room and not allowed to bring that into the debate.

Mr. SABO. I would just suggest to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the Republicans clearly disagree with this package. We understand that. They have a different view of where the country should go. We accept that. They have a different view of how the tax structure in this country should be structured. We accept that. They have a very fundamental different view of what the role of the Government is. We accept that.

They have made these points. I think their members of the Committee on the Budget have made that point. I disagree with those fundamental assumptions, but in our judgment this does things that are real, and it is a program developed by a new President with new vision for this country. We believe that it moves us forward in very positive ways.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, we only took part in initial negotiations.

Mr. SABO. I would tell the gentleman, the opening statements were part of the ongoing process that resulted in an agreement.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABO. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut.

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

I want to commend the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, for the work that he has done. I do not know that we need to do a civics 101 lesson here. It seems to me that while the art of legislative democracy to function is for there to be some negotiation, the frustration of the American people over the last 12 years has been that at some point we were not able to put together a legislative package that would be signed by a President. There were differences on our side and there were differences from the Republican President.

While I think the gentleman ought to be commended for trying to take into account the wide variety of opinion, not just in the Republicans and the Democrats but even within the Democratic caucus on these issues, the final analysis is he needed to come to closure. He needed to come to an agreement that he could bring to the floor and pass and that the President of the United States would sign.

I think that if we understand how a democracy works, at some point we have to count the votes in the conference committee and on the floor. There has to be a proposal made by one side that can carry the day, and the gentleman has done that in a very admirable fashion.

This weekend, as I was going around my district, on WCBS Radio out of New York they said they were about to do a little ditty, a little song about Congress. I almost covered by ears, because they have not been all that good lately. Suddenly I heard on WCBS Radio, "Congressmen in motion, passing legislation, getting it to the President to be signed," and I want to commend this gentleman for the work that he has done, the hours he has put in. I think he has been more than generous in listening to the opposition, in trying to accommodate the breadth of opinion that exists in the Democratic caucus and the Republican caucus. At some point, and we are at that point now, we need to move forward with a package, yes or no.

We are going to have that opportunity. People can vote for it or they can vote against it. The thing we cannot allow to occur is an endless debate, an endless set of negotiations that continues gridlock and continues to preclude Government from doing what it needs to do. That is to take action to try to get this economy going again.

I want to commend the gentleman for his work and patience.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I want to make only this observation. I have noticed over the years it is very easy for Members of

Congress to scream their personal passions for a certain position, which then gets 50 votes and does not accomplish much except to make the person who has given very vehement speeches feel good.

Our challenge is to work with the President, put a program and a proposal forward that has the potential of getting 218 votes, moving to the other body, and eventually passing and becoming law.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The last gentleman I see, who just came out of the Cloakroom, my good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], started out by saying that these people do not need a lesson in civics 101, and then he premised his whole argument over the fact that the President has to sign this document and we have to get it to him.

The President will sign the budget agreement. We all know that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING].

□ 1710

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have had the opportunity to go through this type of debate here on the budget resolution. I find it very interesting. I also find it cause for concern because I believe that we are not really doing the American people's work here today. We are doing our own work. We are doing our own political work, our own political shenanigans.

If we were talking to the American people, we would know that the work we are doing her today is not what they want done. I would suggest that the President and the leadership of this Congress, the Speaker, should try and get a little more in touch with what the American people are interested in seeing this body do.

Now, the President does have his town meetings, but the questions I think are pretty canned. Everybody knows what they are going to be ahead of time. I doubt if the Speaker does town meetings. I would suggest it would be a good idea for him to do so, because what we are doing here today is not what the American people want, not the taxpaying American people. The leadership needs to get in tune. I will give Members an example of what the President has said and what he had done. During the campaign he said we are going to cut $3 for every $1 of new taxes. Then when we had the hearings in the Senate for the confirmation of Secretary Bentsen it was down to $2 of cuts for every $1 of new taxes. I believe when the President came here to this body that had been reduced to 1 in 1. Ladies and gentlemen, today we are at 4 in 1. We are now at $4 of taxes for every $1 of cut.

What we have here is big taxes, very little cuts and, gentlemen, we have a big increase in the debt.

I sometimes believe that the American people must feel like a parent or a grandparent who watches their spendthrift children mortgaging their future for more frivolous expenditures and knows that they are faced with utter disaster and sits by helplessly. No wonder the American people are fed up with the actions of this Congress.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time on our side, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I heard my good friend, MARTIN SABO, Who I have great respect for, and who has done as good a job as I think he could on this budget, say he heard some vehemence. And I just want to say that I do not want to talk vehemence right now. I just want to be frank, and I want to be sincere, I really do, because I am worried.

When this budget bill left this House, we all were concerned that all of the proposed cuts in the budget, which only totaled about $200 billion at that time, were all falling in the last 3 years of this 5-year budget. In the first year, 1994, there was only $6 billion in cuts in spending. In the second year there was only $10 billion in cuts in spending. And now that the bill has come back to us, and we have been trying to read through it, it looks like there are absolutely no cuts in spending during 1994 and 1995.

Now what is significant about that, ladies and gentlemen, is we have been operating under a 5-year budget going back to 1990 when George Bush broke his promise of no new taxes, and he agreed to those new taxes, and he agreed to spending caps which were written into the law. That law with the spending caps expires at the end of 1995. So here we have a budget coming back here with no spending cuts at all in the remaining 2 years of the budget cycle when we actually have spending controls.

That means in 1993, 1994, and 1995 when President Clinton is proposing heavy cuts, it means there is no spending cap controls whatsoever.

Do Members think that Congress is going to live up to what is in this budget when they never have under Republican or Democrat administrations in the past? The answer is no.

That is why I am gong to propose in a few minutes to defeat the previous question. All we are going to do, ladies and gentleman, especially my colleagues on this side of this aisle, all we are going to do is bring back a rule to this floor which is going to remove the debt ceiling bill out of this bill, we are going to strike it out. That means Members will not be voting for a $586 billion increase in the debt ceiling. And we will have a legitimate vote on that tomorrow, not today, at which time you and I will have an opportunity to offer a line-item veto.

Now there are about 85 Democrats on this side of the aisle who want that opportunity to vote for a line-item veto, and there are a lot more on our side. We want the opportunity to attach that line-item veto to that debt ceiling bill. If you come over to this Chamber and vote "no" on the previous question, you will be voting "no" to increase the debt by $586 billion, and you will be voting "yes" to give yourselves the opportunity to attach that line-item veto the debt ceiling, which means to the American people there is going to be some kind of spending controls, perhaps in the next 5 years.

That is all we are asking. Members better think about it because their political career could be riding on it. Two years from now we are going to be accountable for what we do on this floor today.

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

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, let me just make three very brief comments, if I may.

The first is that raising the debt limit is, in this gentleman's opinion at least, the responsible thing to do. Many of us on this side of the aisle voted to do just that on several occasions over the past 12 years at the request of Mr. Reagan and Mr. Bush. They were correct in asking us to do it. We were correct, those of us who joined in supporting their requests, in making that possible.

I think Members understand that that is something that comes with the territory, and that some of us who responsibly believe is the correct thing to do.

Second, I would say to my good friend from New York, and he is my good friend who raised some concern earlier on about the portion of the rule which waives scope in this particular rule, we do, I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], as I am sure he knows, but let me point out to other Members, we do so in order to instruct the Ways and Means Committee to report out a debt limit bill to the floor by Friday, a debt limit bill for fiscal year 1993 so that Members in fact can have a separate vote on it.

As the gentleman also probably now knows, although did not at the original time, our Rules Committee does in fact meet in 40 or 45 minutes to report, I assume and hope, a rule so that that particular bill in fact can be voted on.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will my good friend yield at that point?

Mr. BEILENSON. Of course, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to be contentious or vehement at all, but the problem is that we are

going to be deprived from the opportunity of trying to attach a line-item veto to that debt ceiling bill. We all know it is coming out under a closed rule which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] has requested. We are going to try to prevent that, but we know we will not succeed, and therein lies the argument. If you vote no on the previous question now, it will force us to have that opportunity to have that line-item veto attached, because you are going to need Republican votes to raise that debt ceiling. You cannot do it by yourself, unless you do it through this method here.

Mr. BEILENSON. I understand the gentleman's point. It is a perfectly legitimate point. I simply wanted Members to know, and wanted the public to know that our waiver of scope here was a reasonable thing to do and was required by the fact that we are directing the Ways and Means Committee on our side and the Finance Committee on the other side in the other house to report out by day after tomorrow, and in fact the Ways and Means Committee already, as the gentleman knows, has done it here today, a debt limit bill on which there will be a separate vote, presumably on tomorrow.

The third thing that I did want to mention is the responsible I hope, at least partially, and I know the gentleman will not accept it, and will not agree with my position, but the gentleman makes a perfectly valid point about the line-item veto, and I think it is fair to say that is a separate matter, it ought to be a separate matter, it deserves to be brought up separately, and so far as this gentleman is aware, and I think the Members of both sexes and on both sides of the aisle are aware, there is now every indication that some such bill will be before us in the relatively near future, probably when we come back from our work period over the Easter recess. But in any case, it will be in the relatively near future. So I think the gentleman and his friends on that side will have an opportunity within a very few weeks to have a vote of one sort or another on one sort or another of a line-item veto bill.

□ 1720

In any case, for the reasons that our good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, suggested and for the reasons that were stated, I thought so well, by me in my opening remarks almost an hour ago, I ask support for our rule.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). 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. SOLOMON. 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 clause 5(b)(1) of rule XV, the Chair may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for a recorded vote on the resolution without intervening business.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 251, nays 173, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—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
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
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
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
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
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
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—173

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
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
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
McDade
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—6

Barton
Clyburn
Ford (TN)
Henry
LaFalce
Quillen

□ 1739

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. 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 250, nays 172, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—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
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
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
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
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
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
Washington
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
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
McDade
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

Barton
Brooks
Clyburn
Ford (TN)
Henry
Jefferson
LaFalce
Quillen

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.

□ 1752

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 145, I call up the conference report on 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.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). Pursuant to House Resolution 145, the conference report is considered as read.

(For conference report and statement, see prior proceedings of the House today, March 31, 1993.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

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

Mr. Speaker, before I make comments about our budget resolution, I would be remiss if I did not first thank the staff of the Committee on the Budget for their incredibly hard work in putting this budget resolution in place. They are an incredibly good staff, and I deeply appreciate the efforts they have made.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I have to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], my good friend who, while we disagree on substance, I think he has done a remarkable job as the ranking member of the minority in presenting a Republican alternative and Republican vision of where they think this country should go.

Mr. Speaker, last November the American people elected a new President because they wanted some fundamental change in this country. They wanted real problems dealt with, and they wanted a Congress that would respond to that President and that Presidential leadership with action.

We come to that point today where we have the option of moving the President's new vision for this country forward. We produced this budget document which achieves that goal.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an end; it is really the beginning of a process, because later will come reconciliation bills, the appropriation bills, a variety of authorizing bills that implement the policies of this new President.

I think we have a good conference report for our colleagues. It does some very basic things:

It provides $496 billion of deficit reductions over the next 5 years. It meets the spending caps for discretionary spending that were contained in the 1990 Budget Act and limits discretionary spending for each of the next 5 years to levels that are below that which we expect to spend in 1993. It deals with some of the more fundamental problems that we face in moving the President's program forward in saying that we have to deal with the youngest kids in our society in terms of the WIC Program and Head Start Program to make sure they get a good start in life. It deals with the training of our work force in this country in that we invest in our infrastructure and that we deal with the problem of our new emerging high technology in this country and this world so that we have a competitive economy for the 21st century. It also deals with some of the basic needs of hard-working Americans who work full time and still are in poverty by increasing the earned income tax credit.

Let me just briefly summarize some of the things from the House bill to the conference report. The House bill reflected the revenue suggestions by the President which placed the emphasis on having the most affluent Americans

pay the most of the new revenue increases. The Senate, we found, went beyond us and had $22 billion of new taxes beyond the House bill. They are not in the conference report. The Senate had $13½ billion less of discretionary spending cuts than the House. We split that difference. The Senate had $2.8 billion less in cuts in the ag area, and we receded to the Senate. The House, in a very important policy change, had made some recommendations for changing COLA's, some for people under age 62 and others for people over age 62. The conference report contains those recommendations as it relates to COLA adjustments for people who are under age 62 which has $2.7 billion savings over the next 5 years. The Senate had less in the earned income tax credit than the House, the conference reflects the House position, and there were some other technical changes in terms of the conference report.

However, Mr. Speaker, in summary what it produces is a document with $496 billion real deficit reduction over the next 5 years. It fundamentally moves the new President's program forward to make us competitive and ready for the 21st century.

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

□ 1800

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

Well, I guess I come to the floor today, I do not know, just I guess stunned, shocked. I guess I should not be though. I have been in the House long enough that I should not be that way.

Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to say that in many respects, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] was successful in the negotiations. In other words, he got the Senate to move partially our way.

Well, let me tell you what we have in this budget deal. We have higher taxes coming out of the conference than we had coming out of the House. It is hard to believe, is it not, that the House passed this bill that had 2½ times as many taxes as there were spending cuts, and we come back, and we have got more taxes.

Now let us talk about spending. We know we have $182 billion in new spending programs offered by the majority as investment programs. You decide whether more Government spending is investment or not. I think more Government spending is just that, more Government spending, more debt. But we come back from conference with more spending than we had when we left the House.

Now, if you wonder about why this chart is in such bad shape, it is because of the time we had to put this thing together. I would have liked it to have been a little more professional, but this reflects the amount of time we have had on this. But let me tell you what the bottom line is: The deficit under this plan goes up, as opposed to the plan that left the House. It goes up by $1,090,000,000,000.

So we hear talk about the fact that we have a great deficit reduction plan, and you know what the bottom line is? You know what the rubber is when it meets the road? You know what happens when you get under the hood and start to look at what is going on? You get over $1,090,000,000,000 more in deficit, and added on top of it a big fat tax increase and more Government spending. And we won in conference, in a manner of speaking. We pulled it our way, and we still went up in every single one of these categories.

So when Members go home, they have got to talk about taxing the American people in order to have more spending in order to have a $1,090,000,000,000 deficit increase.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what? I am going to tell Members now, that that ain't going to sell. You know, I do not know what kind of mail Members are getting, but I can state the kind of mail I am getting says, "Cut spending first. If you are going to have any taxes, use them to reduce the deficit, and get Government spending down."

What we have got here is a $1,090,000,000,000 increase in the Federal deficit, accompanied with those big fat taxes.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about the conference. I have been to a lot of conferences. I have been on the conference committee now about seven or eight times with the Committee on Armed Services. We get in there, we have a meeting, we get together and negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about the budget conference. You are going to hear a lot about this budget conference.

We show up to a photo session. We sit around a table and everybody makes their speeches about what they think ought to be done. Then the chairman of the conference adjourns the conference. Then the Democrats go behind closed doors, write the bill, and then we find out what it is. So there is no negotiating, there is no discussion, there is no back and forth.

Maybe in a sense this is good, because the Republicans have made every single effort in the House of Representatives, we have made every effort possible to try to improve the package, to try to reduce Government spending, to try to lower the taxes on the American people, and every single one of those proposals was rejected on party line vote. Every single one of those proposals that was taken up there to the Committee on Rules to try to reduce the taxes in specific ways was rejected by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, it is not our package. We tried. We tried to reduce spending, we tried to reduce taxes, we tried to reduce the debt, and we were roadblocked every single step of the way. We, the Republicans over here, do you know what we were subjected to? Gridlock.

There is a picture in Sports Illustrated of a guy with a tennis shoe stamped on the side of his face, and that is what happened to us.

Mr. Speaker, we may be defeated in this package, but we are not beaten. Let me tell you, you are going to have to come in here over the next several months, and we are going to have pictures of your economic program. We are going to take a look at the revenues, and we are going to take a look at the cuts, and we are going to take a look at the deficit, and we are going to take a look at the performance of this economy.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, the difference could not be more stark, the analysis will not be more clear. The sad thing though is when this economy does not work like it should, when you cannot make the cuts in defense because they are not responsible, when your taxes go up, when your deficits go up, unfortunately, we are going to have to tell you that we told you so.

But do you know what the real tragedy is? There will be no solace whatsoever in having to tell you that, because it will be the country that will be hurt. And maybe this debate is good. Democrats feel, the majority party feels, that the central Government, the King Kong Government that is big, that is tall, that is powerful, that is a bully, is the way to solve America's problems.

We do not happen to believe that. We think that an absence of Government, that limited Government, is the answer.

Mr. Speaker, we are polarized. We are going to find out over the next couple of years whether King Kong Government works, whether a powerful central Government trying to run America is the answer to America's problems. I do not think we will find that it is.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the fiscal year 1994 budget resolution. This resolution requires over $496 billion in deficit reduction over the next 5 years—over half of which will be from cuts in spending. The cuts in spending set in this budget are real, they are deep, and they are enforceable.

The 5-year spending caps will keep discretionary outlays lower in each of the next 5 fiscal years than they were in fiscal year 1993. Not compared to baseline spending, not adjusted for inflation—but in absolute terms, we will spend out less dollars in fiscal year 1998 than we do in fiscal year 1993.

At the same time, our budget resolution provides room in the discretionary budget for President Clinton's important domestic initiatives. Particularly in function 500, the education, training and social services function, which is the heart of the Clinton program.

Mr. Speaker, no one can deny that the more than $3 trillion in additional debt which 12 years of Reagonomics has placed on our children is a terrible legacy of the 1980's. We have been buying more Government than we have been willing to pay for—and passing the bill onto the next generation.

Addressing the Federal budget deficit is not only a fiscal and economic imperative—it is a moral imperative.

This budget resolution is a major step toward reducing the debt passed on to our children—while at the same time investing in their education, their jobs, and their future.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this budget.

□ 1810

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and compliment him on the great work that he has done. Again, I want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the chairman of the committee, for his leadership.

I would like to emphasize, however, one thing the gentleman from Ohio has said. Republicans may have showed up at the initial conference, and that was about it. I did not even get an invitation, and I am a conferee. I would have thought the chairman of the committee would have thought, "My gosh, how in the heck are we going to go forward without MCMILLAN?"

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman did not receive an invitation, my apologies. We did miss his eloquence.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I think maybe the gentleman takes us a little bit for granted. That is my point. I do not mean him personally, the process does.

Basically, this is a Democratic budget. The public needs to understand that. And if my colleagues think having a Democrat in the White House is what made the difference, wrong again. Same thing was true last year.

We went through the same process. We went down there, and we had an initial meeting. And then the Democrats in the Senate and the House got together, and they came up with their budget proposal. And that has been going on for the 8 years that I have been up here in which we have had Republican Presidents.

So I want the public to understand what we are doing here. I want to talk a little bit again, specifically, about it.

The public needs to understand that what we are doing in this proposed budget is on a net basis, and this is CBO scoring, increasing net taxes by $267 billion over 5 years and attaining net spending reduction of $160 billion.

Now, that is $425 billion worth of deficit reduction spread over 5 years. But when we talk about deficit reduction, we are talking about against what is called the baseline budget.

That is an increased level of spending. So what happens, after all these taxes are raised, and we can see it right up there on that chart, the deficit, the debt of the United States over that 5-year period will be increased by over $1 trillion. That is over $1,000 billion. It will increase, despite the fact that we are raising those new taxes.

In the first year, that is $27 billion of net new taxes and $9 billion in net spending increases. That is even before counting the $16 billion in this so-called emergency supplemental request, which is not needed anyway, as a stimulus.

The Republican proposal, on the other hand, proposed in excess of $430 billion worth of spending cuts and no tax increases, absolutely no tax increases. And the public needs to understand that.

Mr. Speaker, we need to focus on spending first, especially in what is really round one of a two rounder. Because when health care reform comes up within the next 2 months, we are probably going to have another $80 billion a year worth of tax increases on top of the $80 billion a year of tax increases that are contained in this proposal.

I want the public to understand what we are doing here. We are not reducing the deficit, except against the baseline. We are increasing debt by $1,000 billion.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, who did an excellent job.

My Republican colleagues are complaining about their exclusion from a process which they had de facto boycotted; namely, it has been clear for all the time that I have been here that the Republicans did not plan to vote for a budget. Having planned not to vote for it, they should not be surprised when Members did not make a great effort to win their votes.

The budget that comes forward does put limits on spending. It says that the discretionary spending, domestic and military and foreign, will be the same at the end of the 5-year period as it was at the start. There are increases. The increases are in Social Security. The increases are also in the medical part of the budget.

Now, we do have a two step process, and the President will be bringing forward soon a plan to deal with the medical problem. The President has been very explicit. We have a two step process here.

First, let us get discretionary spending under control. Then we will deal with the medical care part, and the President will be bringing forward a program that will deal with that.

I also want to talk some about spending, because what strikes me about my Republican colleagues is that spending is a bad word. And it is an undifferentiated bad word.

We have not heard them say "Good spending is one thing and bad is another." All spending is bad.

If we want to increase funds for immunization, if we want to increase funds for Head Start, if we want to increase funds for trying to educate children whom we have not well educated, that is spending.

Now, I do not want to be unfair to my Republican colleagues. I do not mind it, but not in this context. It is not necessary.

The fact is that they are not against all spending. When the military wants to spend money, that is fine. The military, in fact, they have told us is getting too little out of this. So they think that we are spending too much on immunization, too much on Head Start, too much on trying to house the homeless and not enough on the military.

When we hear Members talk about spending in general as a bad thing, we have what we had for 12 years.

I believe in this society that a vibrant, vigorous private sector is essential, if we are to have prosperity. But my Republican friends think, as they thought during the 1980's, that a vigorous private sector is both a necessary and a sufficient condition for the quality of life we want. And they are wrong on this.

The private sector must do well. That is a necessary condition. But it is not sufficient. There are, in fact, important parts of our life, public health, public safety, even economic cooperation, as we see in other countries, where there is a valid and positive role for the public sector.

And this assumption that all virtue adheres to the private sector and the public sector has nothing positive to contribute is the root cause of the intellectual confusion that is rife on the Republican side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The Chair wishes to advise Members controlling the debate time that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 20½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 19½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton/Democrat budget is a fraud on the American people. Consideration of the budget resolution conference report is part of this continuing fraud agreed to by the ruling Democratic elite in private in the dark of the night, hurried to the floor just a short time ago. Republican Members and most Democrat Members have barely seen the report, let alone had time to study it. Hence, the handwritten kind of charts that we have got here. How can this body claim it is voting responsibly on the budget resolution when its contents are unknown? But it is easy to see why it is being rushed to the floor. If familiarity breeds contempt, familiarity with this budget may cause a revolution.

Like thieves in the night, this budget steals away this country's economic future while the public sleeps. It robs the country of our current economic recovery by imposing $327 billion of taxes on the American people, the largest tax increase in American history.

Dozens of new taxes. Let me just list a few of them for my colleagues: an income tax, a wage tax, a corporate income tax, an energy tax, a possessions tax, a service industry tax, a tax for tax identification number validation, a tax deduction restriction on business expenses, a pension tax, a security dealers tax, a tax by disallowing moving deductions, a gas tax, an estate tax, a club dues tax, a tax on FSLIC assistance payments, a tax on international corporations, an IRS tax, a commodity tax, a harbor maintenance tax, an inland waterway tax, an SEC tax and, of course, a tax on Social Security benefits.

These taxes hit not just the rich. Clinton's campaign promises notwithstanding, they hit everybody, beginning with those who make $20,000 per year. These are taxes that fly in the face of history and logic.

Taxes do not lead to economic growth. They slow growth. They penalize success. They reduce entrepreneurial activities and reduce growth.

In fact, the Clinton budget here, even by its own admission, is going to add, as is pointed out here, $1.1 trillion to the debt over the next 5 years.

□ 1820

Mr. Speaker, the result is today another tax and spend train that is leaving the station loaded up with special interest spending, dishonest budgeting, and massive tax increases. The only hope is this train will derail before it leads use to economic ruin.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

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

Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of this body listening to this debate, I am more than a little surprised. First of all, I am somewhat astounded, Mr. Speaker, that Members of the minority, those who sat quietly by while budgets handed down by Republican administrations of the last 12 years drove the national debt of this country from $1 to $4 trillion, a 300-percent increase, today show such chagrin at the budget proposed by President Clinton, a budget which makes a greater effort at deficit reduction than ever proposed by a President in the history of this country.

The other thing that surprises me is the difference in arguments made earlier in the Committee on the Budget and arguments made here on the floor. In the Committee on the Budget we heard a great deal of argument that it was not fair treating the accounting for the earned income tax credit, treating those costs as a tax cut. After the conference committee treated half of those as a spending increase, just as they had earlier urged, howls of protest emanated from the minority regarding the increases in spending that merely result from a changed accounting treatment, one they had earlier urged.

The other thing that I am surprised about is how they argue this is non-responsive to the calls of the public for reduced public spending. This budget resolution proposes over the next 5 years lower discretionary spending levels than were expended or than are to be expended in 1993. That is a very substantial reduction, and one that has to be acknowledged in the treatment of this.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I just want to say that the budget proposal before us is an extremely sound one. It attacks the deficit foursquare, and much of the rhetoric heard on the floor should not be taken into serious account.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, rarely has the phrase "pig in a poke" been more apt than with this resolution. The administration has managed to keep the pork spending in, the fat tax increases in, and even the true features of this pig-of-a-plan hidden in the poke. The only thing they seem to have left out of the bag is the deficit reduction. The Paul Bunyon of a deficit reduction plan that Bill Clinton announced on this floor just 2 months ago has returned to us as Tiny Tim today.

Who really knows what is in this budget resolution? We have no idea what programs go with numbers that were put together just last night. Why? Because the administration has never provided us with any specifics. We still have not seen their budget, which has been delayed yet again and will not appear before this document has been forced through. The only certainty is that there are far higher taxes and far less deficit reduction than Americans know or want.

When all is said and done on this budget plan, one simple truth remains: the Congress and the White House will not cut spending unless it is for the Nation's defense. They won't cut personnel unless they salute and wear a uniform. They won't cut programs unless they are painted olive green or battleship gray.

No force on Earth could decimate our Armed Forces as this plan will do. No foreign adversary could reduce our competitive advantage as will this plan.

Republicans have alternatives: We offered $430 billion of deficit reduction without $1 of tax increases.

My colleagues who are about to vote for this resolution may someday regret this vote, but not half as much as the American people will.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise first of all to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget and his colleagues for having brought us a worthwhile and a workable document, a package which is responsible, which addresses the question of deficit, which provides the necessary revenues, which keeps intact essential programs.

I would like to remind my colleagues on this side of the aisle, this is the only game in town. This is a package which will work. This is the package which is going to pass.

I would remind them that we have been warning our Republican colleagues for years that the Republicans have consistently under 12 years of their administrations sent up here budgets that were outrageously out of balance. The Democrats in the leadership of Congress have cut each and every one of those budgets over the years, and we must say that we are delighted that our Republican colleagues are now joining us. This is a worthwhile change and we commend them for it. It is good.

Having said that, I want to say that I intend to support this conference report and urge my colleagues to do it, to do the same thing, because I think it is in the public interest.

I would like, however, to address one modest concern that I think the House should have. In this conference report there is a curious provision which requires the committees of the House by Friday, May 14, to report their reconciliation recommendations to this body. The Senate committees will have until Friday, June 18, to do the same thing, 1 month and 4 days later. I find this a curious thing. I suspect that it

may perhaps reflect an inability or a reluctance on the part of the other body to do the work which they are supposed to do in a seemly and timely fashion.

I would urge my colleagues to note that this will not be the first time in which the other body has been incapable of meeting its constitutional and its statutory responsibilities. Perhaps my dear friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, can explain to us why the other body needs this time of tender and extraordinary consideration, and why the House committees are facing a different time limit.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I must say that on the part of the House, we have great confidence that the gentleman and other committee Chairs who get the reconciliation instructions will be able to move very efficiently and effectively.

The choice on the part of the Senate in their thought was that they, frankly, needed more time.

Mr. DINGELL. We will meet our deadlines, I would say to the gentleman. We will make the cuts which are imposed. They are harsh. We hope our senatorial colleagues will meet the deadline. We think that would be wonderful. It would be a refreshing change, and I thank my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. If the gentleman will yield further, I hear so much rhetoric from my friends on the Republican side that there are no cuts in this budget. We know we have frozen the discretionary spending at below 1993 levels, but the gentleman chairs a committee and has to make some decisions. Have we given the gentleman some tasks in terms of reducing spending, I would ask?

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is eminently correct, Mr. Speaker. There are massive cuts in Medicare and Medicaid here. There are massive increases in expenditures, even in small agencies like the SEC, and I am talking about revenue increases, and cuts in expenditures by those agencies.

We will meet those deadlines, in cooperation with my good friend.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is being sold as a plan for deficit reduction and stimulation of the economy. That is a tragedy, a tragedy, because the likely outcome will be exactly the opposite, a far larger deficit and reduced economic growth.

For example, this budget plan contains the largest tax increase in American history. As a matter of fact, it is nearly twice as large as the second largest tax increase, which was imposed in 1990. Yet this plan not only does not restrain Government spending, it actually adds another $1 trillion plus to our national debt.

Is this what the public voted for in the last election? Certainly not. The voters were told that President Clinton would cut taxes for the middle class. Instead, the average family of four will pay at least $500 more in added taxes next year under the Clinton plan. Even senior citizens on fixed incomes will pay more. For many, 85 percent of their Social Security benefits will now be taxed.

Is this fairness? What will this massive tax increase do to the economy?

□ 1830

According to Lawrence Kudlow, chief economist for a top Wall Street investment firm, we will actually lose 3.2 million jobs by 1996, and reduce economic output by $450 billion.

Here we go again. If we adopt this conference report, we are following the exact same path we took in 1990. Two and a half years ago in 1990 we raised taxes in our ill-fated attempt to reduce the deficit. It did not work then, and it will not work now. Let's resoundingly reject this budget plan before it sends our economy into a massive recession.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in favor of the House/Senate conference agreement. I think it is one that is well worthy of support.

We could go over the list and pick out any number of areas with which we agree strongly or disagree to some extent, but let me first make it clear that I would like to talk about section 050, national defense, where the budget authority is 263.4 and the outlays are 277. It is my understanding these are the Senate figures which came back.

I also wish to say that for the coming year of 1994 these will be adequate, and we can work within this budget on the Armed Services Committee.

However, I wish to send a warning, Mr. Speaker, that in the days and years ahead as we look at our national defense, we as a Congress and we as a Nation must make a decision as to whether we want to have the best national defense possible or not. I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will be able to look in the future and not let this budget free-fall on national defense.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think most of us are all after the same goals. What is agonizing is the fact that this Congress is trying to deal with reducing the deficit. I think we all want to do that.

However, this budget resolution increases our debt by $1 trillion. It increases the ceiling on spending, it increases the ceiling of what we are going to be allowed to spend by $2 trillion.

For those Americans who have observed what is happening in the U.S. Congress and have observed the fact that this Congress has increased the indebtedness of the American people by $3 trillion over the last decade, they should be every upset that this budget again increases the debt ceiling by another $2 trillion over the next 5 years. The spending debt limit is increased within the language of this resolution because Congress is embarrassed to vote on increasing the debt ceiling to these new heights by a separate vote. We simply say when we pass this we pass a new debt limit for 1994 and project a new obnoxious debt of $6.182 trillion within 5 years.

And we not only increase the debt ceiling, but we get through the next election by increasing the debt for a whole calendar year so that we are not going to be forced to vote on new debt ceilings during the 1994 election.

I think if the American people knew that we were increasing taxes and not reducing spending for the next fiscal year, that we are increasing the debt, they would say "no, cut spending first."

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of the conference report House Concurrent Resolution 64, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994.

By adopting this resolution, the Members of this House will take a critical step along the path of long-term deficit reduction. This resolution contains measures that will reduce the Federal deficit by $496 billion by 1997. Discretionary spending will be frozen for 5 years at 1993 outlay levels.

The sacrifices called for in this resolution do not fall disproportionately on any one group.

The spending cuts are real and the fairness in our Tax Code, eroded during the past decade, is restored by asking those most able to pay to do so.

The resolution endorses new initiatives so that we can begin to invest in America again. Advancements in health care, support for our children, revitalization of our Nation's infrastructure and manufacturing base, and new investments in high technology will stimulate long-term economic growth.

We know that budget deficit reduction in the years beyond fiscal year 1998 will be stymied unless we can control the escalating cost of health care. Research and prevention are proven cost containment tools. And this reso-

lution includes new investments for women's health research and childhood immunization that I have worked 3 years to achieve.

The resolution calls for additional defense spending cuts so that our military budget will begin to reflect post-cold war realities, such as the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and the economic collapse of the former Soviet Union. While it is true that regions of this country will be challenged to make painful transitions from a military economy to a commercial one again, this resolution supports bold defense conversion strategies, ignored for years by previous administrations.

I am disappointed that the other body would not agree to reduce defense spending by the levels approved in the House resolution. But, our fight to eliminate wasteful weapon systems plagued with inefficiency and cost overruns, will continue in full force during the appropriations process. There are defense spending cuts that we can achieve over the next 5 years that will not hurt our economy here at home.

I would like to remind my colleagues that at the same time we were paying $170 billion for the defense of our allies, many of our defense contracts were awarded to these foreign countries to produce spare parts for our weapon systems, such as the Patriot missile we used in Desert Storm.

Finally, this resolution supports new investments to stimulate long-term economic growth through new investments in infrastructure, commercial research, and high technology. I am particularly pleased with the bold new investment in high-speed rail. This is a transportation innovation I have advocated for the past 4 years.

Not only is high-speed rail environmentally sound and energy efficient, it will provide a major boost to our economy.

House Concurrent Resolution 64 presents a strong challenge to this Congress. The spending cuts compel us to make certain that every Federal dollar must be invested wisely.

This resolution provides the discipline we need to get Federal spending under control and our country on a sound economic course again. I urge its adoption.

□ 1840

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], from Cleveland, OH.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I am rising to oppose this budget resolution, because instead of providing the promising new direction it claims to do, this plan represents a continuation of the failed fiscal policies of the past.

What other conclusion can be drawn from this document that hardly anyone here in the House of Representatives has had a chance to read, let alone review and analyze?

Apparently, the House leadership has decided that the best course of action for them to take is to ram this charade of a budget plan through the House, before anyone can actually read the various proposals within it. In fact, the speed and haste with which the House Democratic leadership is acting makes me wonder what it is that they have to hide.

Is there something in this budget plan that they don't want the American people to see or know about?

I think I know why the majority leadership wants this bill passed as quickly as possible. If the American people actually realized that the Democrats in Congress are asking them to pay over $300 billion in new taxes, so that another trillion dollars—can be piled onto the public debt after 4 more years of deficit-spending, they might be angry.

And it is being promoted by President Clinton and the Democrats in Congress with a distortion and subversion of the English language in an attempt to camouflage exactly what it is they are doing.

In the few, short months since its inauguration, the Clinton administration has knowingly and calculatedly redefined words like contribution, savings, investment, sacrifice, patriotism, emergency, deficit reduction, stimulus, and family income for its own political profit.

This is not just public relations jargon and glibness—it is far more serious. It's a wholesale debasement of the English language.

The greatest thinkers of western civilization, from the Old Testament prophets to the most current post-modern philosophers, have all testified to the importance of the word, because in politics especially, words make clear our intentions and give voters the ability to choose and evaluate the people who seek to lead them.

That is why George Bush's statement "Read my lips—no new taxes" during the 1988 Presidential campaign was such a liability for him during the 1992 campaign. When George Bush made his statement, millions of voters felt that he was entering into a solemn covenant with them—that he absolutely, positively would not raise their taxes during his term in office.

Well, when he broke his vow by signing into law the huge tax increases included in the 1990 budget agreement, the voters felt betrayed, and they acted accordingly.

And I, for one, believe that George Bush got exactly what he bargained for, and deserved, from the American people last November.

Now, here we are not 6 months later, being asked to approve the biggest taxing and spending program in the history of the Republic, and it is being promoted by a slick promotional campaign in which taxes are called contributions, pork-barrel spending is called investment, economic recovery is called an emergency, and a $1,000 billion increase in the national debt is called deficit reduction.

It is no wonder to me that most people's ability to analyze and evaluate their leaders' policies has become impaired. When the established meanings of words are twisted and subverted, how can anyone expect the people to be able to make educated and thoughtful decisions?

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all of my fellow firstterm Members will join with me in opposition to this mockery of a budget. We were not sent to Washington, DC, on a campaign of change and reform so that we could be part of the failed status quo. We were sent to town to make bold, dramatic, and fundamental changes in Federal policy. This budget fails that test. It does not deserve our support, and it should be rejected.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, and I congratulate him for the work that he has done.

I rise in support of the product of the committee and the conference and would ask the gentleman to enter into a colloquy with me.

I want to commend you on your efforts in the conference to reduce the burden on Federal workers and retirees. Am I correct that changes made in the conference will provide a full cost-of-living adjustment to retirees above age 62?

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOYER. And finally, am I also correct that the conference report maintains the agreement that the Administration, Authorizing, Appropriating and Budget Committees will work to find acceptable alternative methods for achieving the budget savings so that locality pay shall be implemented in fiscal year 1994?

Mr. SABO. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. HOYER. And to clarify, when I say fiscal year, beginning January 1, 1994? Is that correct?

Mr. SABO. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Give me a break, blame the other side? Blame that other body? Blame yourselves.

And, freshman Democrats, do not think you are making a difference

here, because you are going along. It is the same old story that the debt is going to go up $1 trillion because of what you are doing.

I respect the Members of the other side. You are good people. But I do not respect what is happening here. I do not respect what you are doing.

The debt ceiling you are raising in this bill; $2 trillion. You are not reducing the deficits. They are going up. They are going to add $1 trillion.

Now, when Republicans met your challenge, and your challenge was to come in with specific cuts, we did. When the President spoke from this dais, he talked about 4 to 1 taxes to spending cuts. To your credit, you went to the President and said that is too high, and you got him down to 2 to 1. It is still too high; $2 of taxes for $1 of spending cuts, and then you cave in to the Senate and you blame the Senate, and you are back up to 3 to 1. Do not blame the Senate. Blame yourselves.

Vote against this package. Vote to cut spending. Vote to bring some sanity to this place and get this trillion-dollar deficit, that you are going to add in the next 5 years, down.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution but I do so with some reluctance.

I have been quite public about my desire to help President Clinton achieve his deficit reduction goals. He has been elected by the American people to accomplish change in this country and a part of that change involves reducing significantly our national debt. There is no bigger responsibility before us. When it comes to deficit reduction, I am on the team, and quite willing to play downfield blocker as the President quarterbacks us to reduced deficits.

It is the President's responsibility—and I believe desire—to lead. And I believe that he will. In that regard, my position has been clear: I am prepared to support, and help pass, the President's plan.

This budget resolution conference agreement requires an impressive $496 billion of deficit reduction over the next 5 years. It also lays a heavy responsibility on the shoulders of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means. In large measure, that is appropriate, given our jurisdictional responsibilities and the substance of the President's legislative agenda for deficit reduction. I am concerned, however, that this conference agreement, in several instances, goes beyond the President's proposals, making assumptions that it will be difficult for the Committee on Ways and Means to achieve.

Let me be specific. On the revenue side, we will be expected to raise $272 billion over 5 years. That is $4 billion more than the Joint Committee on Taxation [JCT] now estimates that the President's plan will achieve. I do not want anyone to be confused about my position on this: I have no intention of raising more revenues for deficit reduction than the President proposes. Period.

On the spending side, the conference agreement assumes all of the administration's Medicare cuts—a total of $48.3 billion—and nearly $26 billion in new outlays for an expanded earned income tax credit.

There is considerable discussion about placing other new spending initiatives in the reconciliation bill, including proposals for childhood immunization and family preservation services. I support the goals of both of these programs, so long as we pay for them. Toward that end, I expect that the President will propose ways to offset the costs of these initiatives. If he does not, I do not plan to suggest revenue sources of my own.

Here is the bottom line, I say to my colleagues. The job ahead of us is enormous, even with an effective ally like Bill Clinton. This package asks us to do roughly $6 billion more than the President's plan when it comes to items within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means—$4 billion in revenues, $1.5 billion for family preservation, and $600 million from assuming the trade adjustment assistance entitlement is converted to discretionary spending. I cannot assure you that I will be able to make up the difference.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a comment on the speech that the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means just made. It appears as though, before this document is even leaving the House, before we even pass the conference committee report, we are already losing the deficit reduction.

I think what I heard, is that we are going to lose several billion dollars from where the conference committee has agreed to produce revenues, so before we even get out the door, we have lost money. Of course, we lost a ton of money coming across the treadway. We got out there in the rotunda, and we got fouled up somewhere around there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, let me first compliment the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for the fine, exemplary job he has done in handling the budget resolution initially when it came to the floor and how he has deported himself with this conference report.

I rise in opposition to the conference report today. The report sets forth the budget blueprint for the next 5 years, based in large part on the budget outline proposed by President Clinton.

The budget blueprint still contains the basic elements that caused me, and most of the Members on our side, to oppose the House budget resolution when it was voted on March 18.

It calls for the largest tax increase in U.S. history. Now, maybe that point has been made any number of times earlier today, but it bears repeating until it finally soaks in with the American people.

It calls for large spending increases in Federal spending over the next 5 years, and when the taxes, that were mislabeled as spending cuts, and all the fee increases are taken out of the list of spending cuts, that list becomes very short. The largest item on that list is the $112 billion cut in defense programs.

What will the final product actually look like when the legislation implementing this blueprint is enacted? In my view, it may be unrecognizable. We know that the Democrats in Congress have already started to tinker with the President's plan.

□ 1850

In this blueprint the conferees agreed to a higher revenue level than was in the House-passed resolution. They have scaled back some of the cuts in agriculture programs after coming under criticism, and they have increased discretionary spending. And after adding together the revenue number and the higher spending number, the result is a higher deficit.

Like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], who talked to me very briefly earlier on the floor of the House, today said "You know, this conference report has higher taxes, more spending, and a bigger deficit." I believe the situation has just gotten completely out of hand.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. I thank the minority leader for yielding.

You know, outside of the fact that it has higher taxes, higher spending, and a bigger deficit, it is a pretty good package outside of those three points.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, just so we have the record straight, the resolution assumes the same revenue as the House budget resolution. It did not increase the revenue assumptions.

Mr. MICHEL. From the way I see it, when the record is finally complete, you can bet your bottom dollar, it means higher taxes, higher spending, and a bigger deficit. There is no way you are going to get around that.

Democratic Senators convinced the President that the mining and grazing fee increases proposed should be dropped from the budget, and the President warned us that special interests would try to change the budget plan. What he did not tell us was that he would cave in to special interests once he received pressure from his own Democratic Members.

Finally, I would like to make sure that Members are clear, when they vote for the budget resolution conference report, that they are also voting to increase the public debt limit from $4.1 trillion to $4.7 trillion. The House, under rule XLIX, the Gephardt rule, has a special procedure whereby the public debt figure reflected in the budget resolution is separately engrossed in a joint resolution. It is deemed to have passed the House by the same vote as that on the budget resolution conference report. This separate joint resolution is then sent directly over to the other body.

In addition, the House tomorrow is going to be asked to pass a short-term debt limit extension under a minireconciliation process. It will extend the debt limit through the end of this fiscal year until September 30. We hear that the administration wants the short-term debt limit extension in order to pressure our Democratic friends in the fall to pass the larger reconciliation bill, which will contain another provision to raise the debt limit when it is reached at that time.

For these many reasons, I must vote against the conference report today and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, and let me say to my colleagues that this is where the rubber meets the road. We have a serious problem in America. We have all known that.

On the other side, I have heard lots of complaints that they were not allowed four alternatives, only two; we are calling things something that we should not call them.

Someone got up and said, "gridlock"; the media and the Democrats have invented the word gridlock. The bottom line is this: The last time we were at such a crucial crossroads in America was 1981. There was a new President swept in on a mandate for change. He had a budget that he presented. I opposed it. But there were 55 of my Democratic colleagues—I have their names here—who voted for that budget because they knew that we have to move. They would have written something differently than what the Republicans proposed, but we would have had deadlock. I do not hear any of that from the other side.

I think the gentleman from Ohio does deserve credit, as I mentioned before, for presenting such a detailed budget. But it did not have the votes to pass.

What the other side should have done was come over and say, "Okay, for the good of the country we are willing to play ball. We would like a few changes here and there, and then we are going to join you in finally reducing the monster of the deficit that has brought this country down to its knees."

They did not; and they carp and complain.

The resolution that we have here, my colleagues, is not perfect, but it is going to set America right again. It is going to get a handle on the deficit, our No. 1 economic problem, and start putting Americans back to work as it frees up that money for the things we need.

There is no other alternative.

You are either saying "no" or moving America forward.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS].

Mr. INGLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I hear a lot of discussion in this Chamber, and I am very concerned about it, as a freshman Member, to hear the discussion about a Republican budget and a Democratic budget. The fact is this is America's budget, and I am very concerned about it. It is also America's family budget.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine a family budgeting the way that this vote is about to go. Can you imagine a family that is $4 trillion in debt deciding that what it shall do in the first year in a $1.5 trillion budget is cut just $6 billion in spending and raise taxes by $28 billion? This plan has most of the cuts in 1997 and 1998. In fact, of the $63 billion in unspecified cuts, $30 billion of them come in 1998. That I submit is an illusory cut.

There is no way that those cuts are going to happen in 1993; $30 billion way off in 1998. The fact is this is America's family budget, and we only budget 1 year at a time.

So, to claim credit for the 30 billion dollars' worth of unspecified cuts out as far as 1998 is a fraud on the American people.

The American people want a family budget for this year, not for 1998. We need to cut spending here and cut it now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

Mr. SLATTERY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, I would like to commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] for his hard work in fashioning a budget resolution, that he could find 218 votes for, in this very diverse body. We should never overlook how difficult it is to put together a package, a budget for this great country of ours, that 218 Members of this body will vote for. That is the ultimate test around here: Whether you can find the votes to get something done.

The gentleman from Minnesota and the members of this committee have done a good job in fashioning the package that they bring to us today.

Needless to say, we have a very serious budget problem. Over the last decade we have added nearly $3 trillion to our Nation's debt, $3 trillion in one decade. And I believe every American recognizes that that trend has to change. I would like to see it change more quickly than this particular resolution calls for. But I do not have 217 other people here on the floor of the House to vote the way I would like to vote.

The proposal before us today is a very important first step for the new administration in turning this Nation's fiscal policy around.

As far as I am concerned, it contains some very tough proposals. It is going to be very hard for the Congress to live with the discretionary caps on spending that this budget resolution prescribes. That is tough medicine.

The Congress has never in recent history lived with a 5-percent spending cap.

That is going to be a great challenge for this administration and this body, to live within that kind of limitation.

In addition to that, this plan also tackles some of the tough entitlement programs. Yes; we did change Social Security. We are talking about freezes on pay, freezes on COLA's; this is tough medicine.

□ 1900

And yes, we are talking about nearly $500 billion in deficit reduction over 5 years, and that is not going to be easy to achieve, either, but it is a real first step in the right direction of turning this Nation's fiscal policy around.

In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, we have to find 218 votes, and I submit to my colleagues that today this is the best plan in spite of some of its flaws that we can come anywhere near finding 218 votes for.

I urge my colleagues to vote for it and then join me in voting for spending levels that will be below the spending levels prescribed in this budget resolution as we deal with many of the appropriation bills later on in the process.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I have been hearing over and over again about the Republican Presidents bringing us this big deficit.

Do you know what? I cannot remember a time when a Republican President sent a budget proposal up here that the day that it arrived—no, before it got to Capitol Hill, when it was coming up in the car from the White House—the big spenders on the majority side declared it dead on arrival.

You folks declared the President's budget dead on arrival.

Do you know why? Because you wanted to spend more, that is why, and that is what drove the deficits sky high.

Now, let me tell you about your President. He comes up here one morning to make a talk to the Republicans, because he wants us to get involved.

I said, "Mr. President, why do you have $84 billion in taxes and $2 billion in spending cuts? You were the one who said you wanted change. Why don't you give us $84 billion in spending cuts and $2 billion in taxes?"

Do you know what the President said? "I would like to give you change, but I have to give you what the traffic can bear." That is just what the gentleman from Kansas said.

Well, this is the best that can pass. This is the only package that can get 218 votes; that is right. It is a lousy package, but you can get 218 votes for it. That is not the way you ought to pass legislation and put your blueprint for change and your blueprint for America forward. You ought to put something forward that you are proud of.

So I said to the President, "You are for change; we are for change. Let's pull the agenda our way so we can get more spending cuts."

And do you know what the President told me? "Give us your specifics."

Well, we go to committee. We laid down an 82-page document with more specifics than your President had in his package. And do you know what you did? Over 10½ hours on a party line vote, you rejected every single effort to reduce taxes and to cut spending, every single one.

We wanted to participate in this game. You would not let us participate in this budget process, because you wanted to have more taxes. You did not want to have more spending cuts.

Now, let me tell you, the American people are going to find out about this plan. And do you know who is going to find out about it? The senior citizens when they pay more taxes. They do not know they are being taxed under this program.

When Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI slaps a tax on them, you are going to hear from them.

People who drive cars—the only people affected under this plan, people who are millionaires and people who breathe, and the people who drive cars are going to be paying more gas taxes.

If you are from Ohio, you have the business community come around and talk about the loss of industrial jobs that are going to occur in our State because of the big Btu energy taxes that are going to occur. These folks are going to find out about it.

The middle-income taxpayers who were promised a tax cut and got a big fat tax increase, they are going to find out about this plan.

And let me tell you about defense. You cannot make the defense numbers. There have been some people on your side who talked about defense here today. Let me tell you, you try to cut $30 billion 4 years from now on and $39 billion 5 years from now, you cannot do it. You cannot make those cuts. You cannot throw all those people out of work with a mindless effort to try to cut defense for a political reason. Your side will not put up with that. You are going to have to come up with other spending cuts, which I do not think you can do, or you are going to have to raise people's taxes more.

Do you know what, folks, we have a choice. As Republicans who were shut out of this process all the way along, Republicans who made a good-faith effort to put our program forward to work with the majority, to try to cut spending first, we as Republicans made an effort. We were shut out.

Do you know what we ought to do because we were shut out? We do not like this package. It raises the national debt another 1 trillion 90 billion dollars. We have to come here and vote a hard "no" on this package. We have to vote a hard "no" to send this package back to the conference committee so that we can cut spending first and give the American people what they asked for in the November elections.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself, the final minute.

Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] it is true Republican Presidential budgets used to be dead on arrival, and the people running the fastest away from them were the gentleman's colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle.

In the election in November, the American people said they wanted change. They elected a new President with a new vision for the future of this country, and they want a Congress that will move that program forward. Today is the time for us to deliver. Vote "yes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. KASICH. 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 184, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—240

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Orton
Andrews (ME)	Gordon	Owens
Andrews (TX)	Green	Parker
Applegate	Gutierrez	Pastor
Bacchus (FL)	Hall (OH)	Payne (NJ)
Baesler	Hamburg	Payne (VA)
Barcia	Hamilton	Pelosi
Barlow	Harman	Penny
Barrett (WI)	Hastings	Peterson (FL)
Becerra	Hayes	Peterson (MN)
Beilenson	Hefner	Pickle
Berman	Hilliard	Pomeroy
Bevill	Hinchey	Poshard
Bilbray	Hoagland	Price (NC)
Bishop	Hochbrueckner	Rahall
Blackwell	Holden	Rangel
Bonior	Hoyer	Reed
Borski	Hughes	Reynolds
Boucher	Hutto	Richardson
Brewster	Inslee	Roemer
Brooks	Jefferson	Rose
Browder	Johnson (GA)	Rostenkowski
Brown (CA)	Johnson (SD)	Rowland
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Johnston	Rush
Bryant	Kanjorski	Sabo
Byrne	Kaptur	Sanders
Cantwell	Kennedy	Sangmeister
Cardin	Kennelly	Sarpalius
Carr	Kildee	Sawyer
Chapman	Kleczka	Schenk
Clay	Klein	Schroeder
Clayton	Klink	Schumer
Clement	Kopetski	Scott
Clyburn	Kreidler	Serrano
Coleman	Lambert	Sharp
Collins (IL)	Lancaster	Shepherd
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Skaggs
Condit	LaRocco	Skelton
Conyers	Laughlin	Slattery
Cooper	Lehman	Slaughter
Coppersmith	Levin	Smith (IA)
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Spratt
Coyne	Lloyd	Stark
Cramer	Lowey	Stenholm
Danner	Maloney	Stokes
Darden	Mann	Strickland
de la Garza	Manton	Studds
Deal	Markey	Stupak
DeFazio	Martinez	Swett
DeLauro	Matsui	Swift
Dellums	Mazzoli	Synar
Derrick	McCloskey	Tanner
Deutsch	McCurdy	Tauzin
Dicks	McDermott	Tejeda
Dingell	McHale	Thornton
Dixon	McKinney	Thurman
Dooley	McNulty	Torres
Durbin	Meehan	Torricelli
Edwards (CA)	Meek	Towns
Edwards (TX)	Menendez	Tucker
Engel	Mfume	Unsoeld
English (AZ)	Miller (CA)	Valentine
English (OK)	Mineta	Velazquez
Eshoo	Minge	Vento
Evans	Mink	Visclosky
Fazio	Moakley	Volkmer
Fields (LA)	Mollohan	Washington
Filner	Montgomery	Waters
Fingerhut	Moran	Watt
Flake	Murphy	Waxman
Foglietta	Murtha	Wheat
Ford (MI)	Nadler	Whitten
Frank (MA)	Natcher	Williams
Frost	Neal (MA)	Wilson
Furse	Neal (NC)	Wise
Gejdenson	Oberstar	Woolsey
Gephardt	Obey	Wyden
Gibbons	Olver	Wynn
Glickman	Ortiz	Yates

NAYS—184

Allard	Bateman	Burton
Andrews (NJ)	Bentley	Buyer
Archer	Bereuter	Callahan
Armey	Bilirakis	Calvert
Bachus (AL)	Bliley	Camp
Baker (CA)	Blute	Canady
Baker (LA)	Boehlert	Castle
Ballenger	Boehner	Clinger
Barrett (NE)	Bonilla	Coble
Bartlett	Bunning	Collins (GA)

Combest	Inglis	Porter
Cox	Inhofe	Pryce (OH)
Crane	Istook	Quinn
Crapo	Jacobs	Ramstad
Cunningham	Johnson (CT)	Ravenel
DeLay	Johnson, Sam	Regula
Diaz-Balart	Kasich	Ridge
Dickey	Kim	Roberts
Doolittle	King	Rogers
Dornan	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Dreier	Klug	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan	Knollenberg	Roth
Dunn	Kolbe	Roukema
Emerson	Kyl	Royce
Everett	Lazio	Santorum
Ewing	Leach	Saxton
Fawell	Levy	Schaefer
Fields (TX)	Lewis (CA)	Schiff
Fish	Lewis (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Fowler	Lightfoot	Shaw
Franks (CT)	Linder	Shays
Franks (NJ)	Lipinski	Shuster
Gallegly	Livingston	Sisisky
Gallo	Long	Skeen
Gekas	Machtley	Smith (MI)
Geren	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Gilchrest	Margolies-Mezvinsky	Smith (OR)
Gillmor	McCandless	Smith (TX)
Gilman	McCollum	Snowe
Gingrich	McCrery	Solomon
Goodlatte	McDade	Spence
Goodling	McHugh	Stearns
Goss	McInnis	Stump
Grams	McKeon	Sundquist
Grandy	McMillan	Talent
Greenwood	Meyers	Taylor (MS)
Gunderson	Mica	Taylor (NC)
Hall (TX)	Michel	Thomas (CA)
Hancock	Miller (FL)	Thomas (WY)
Hansen	Molinari	Torkildsen
Hastert	Moorhead	Traficant
Hefley	Morella	Upton
Herger	Myers	Vucanovich
Hobson	Nussle	Walker
Hoekstra	Oxley	Walsh
Hoke	Packard	Weldon
Horn	Pallone	Wolf
Houghton	Paxon	Young (AK)
Huffington	Petri	Young (FL)
Hunter	Pickett	Zeliff
Hutchinson	Pombo	Zimmer
Hyde		

NOT VOTING—6

Abercrombie	Ford (TN)	LaFalce
Barton	Henry	Quillen

□ 1927

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(The following material is included herewith pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 145, waiving points of order against the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 64:)

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 302(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1994

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
050 National defense	180	180	0
150 International affairs	169	169	0
300 Natural resources and environment	2,140	1,895	0
350 Agriculture	9,742	574	0
370 Commerce and housing credit	1,220	1,521	0
400 Transportation	589	592	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	12,168	11,486	0
550 Health	96,446	96,436	0
570 Medicare	49,369	49,369	0
600 Income security	74,177	73,926	0
650 Social Security	32	32	0
700 Veterans benefits and services	17,391	18,715	0
750 Administration of justice	336	330	0
800 General Government	7,397	7,396	0

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 302(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1994—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
900 Net interest	63	63	0
Subtotal	271,419	262,683	0
Discretionary Appropriations Action (Assumed Legislation)			
050 National defense	263,883	277,511	0
150 International affairs	21,714	21,627	0
250 General science, space, and technology	18,055	17,559	0
270 Energy	5,665	5,604	0
300 Natural resources and environment	20,320	20,883	0
350 Agriculture	4,117	4,204	0
370 Commerce and housing credit	3,347	3,244	0
400 Transportation	14,110	36,308	0
450 Community and regional development	8,260	8,375	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	41,073	38,296	0
550 Health	21,799	21,091	0
570 Medicare	2,944	2,941	0
600 Income security	32,567	34,656	0
650 Social Security	0	2,840	0
700 Veterans benefits and services	16,807	16,890	0
750 Administration of justice	14,489	14,701	0
800 General government	11,814	12,027	0
Subtotal	500,964	538,757	0
Discretionary Action by Other Committees (Assumed Entitlement Legislation)			
300 National resources and environment	38	38	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	247	138	0
550 Health	−191	−191	0
600 Income security	567	567	0
700 Veterans benefits and services	70	69	0
Subtotal	731	621	0
Committee total	773,113	802,061	0
AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
150 International affairs	−523	−523	0
270 Energy	0	−715	0
300 Natural resources and environment	490	509	0
350 Agriculture	11,013	9,848	9,734
400 Transportation	50	50	0
450 Community and regional development	567	552	0
600 Income security	0	0	1,091
800 General government	333	332	333
900 Net interest	0	0	63
Subtotal	11,931	10,054	11,221
Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)			
300 Natural resources and environment	−7	−7	0
350 Agriculture	−60	−60	−60
800 General government	2	1	0
Subtotal	−65	−66	−60
Committee total	11,866	9,988	11,161
ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
050 National defense	12,891	12,923	3
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	4	4	0
600 Income security	27,018	26,916	26,916
700 Veterans benefits and services	191	180	180
Subtotal	40,104	40,023	27,099
Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)			
600 Income security	−128	−128	0
Subtotal	−184	−184	0
Committee total	39,976	39,895	27,099
BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted law)			
150 International affairs	−717	−1,913	0
370 Commerce and housing credit	11,999	3,830	0

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 302(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1994—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
450 Community and regional development	0	−68	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	1	1	0
600 Income security	0	64	0
800 General government	5	5	0
900 Net interest	2,799	2,799	0
Subtotal	14,087	4,718	0
Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)			
370 Commerce and housing credit	0	−338	0
Subtotal	0	−338	0
Committee total	14,087	4,380	0
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
750 Administration of justice	40	40	40
Subtotal	40	40	40
Committee total	40	40	40
EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	1,536	1,640	4,964
600 Income security	115	117	9,075
Subtotal	1,651	1,757	14,039
Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)			
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	0	0	118
Subtotal	0	0	118
Committee total	1,651	1,757	14,157
ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
270 Energy	0	63	0
300 Natural resources and environment	0	−3	0
400 Transportation	22	13	0
550 Health	453	460	92,173
600 Income security	14,663	14,405	11,175
800 General government	8	8	8
Subtotal	15,145	14,945	103,356
Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)			
550 Health	0	0	−180
950 Undistributed offsetting receipts	0	−1,700	0
Subtotal	0	−1,700	−180
Committee total	15,145	13,245	103,176
FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
150 International affairs	13,263	13,720	0
600 Income security	453	444	434
800 General government	6	6	0
Subtotal	13,722	14,170	434
Committee total	13,722	14,170	434
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
800 General government	15	13	0
Subtotal	15	13	0
Committee total	15	13	0
HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	20	16	0
800 General government	29	0	92
Subtotal	49	16	92

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 302(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1994—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
Committee total	49	16	92
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
370 Commerce and housing credit	317	317	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	812	564	0
600 Income security	46	14	14
750 Administration of justice	1,247	1,267	180
800 General government	477	477	100
Subtotal	2,899	2,639	294
Committee total	2,899	2,639	293
MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
300 Natural resources and environment	495	467	0
370 Commerce and housing credit	65	64	0
400 Transportation	8	30	537
600 Income security	12	6	0
800 General government	7	7	0
Subtotals	588	574	537
Committee total	588	574	537
NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
270 Energy	15	−139	0
300 Natural resources and environment	128	83	19
450 Community and regional development	579	568	409
550 Health	6	4	0
800 General government	750	750	757
Subtotal	1,477	1,266	1,185
Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)			
300 Natural resources and environment	−71	−71	0
800 General government	−46	−41	0
Subtotal	−117	−112	0
Committee totals	1,360	1,154	1,185
POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
550 Health	0	−218	4,050
600 Income security	37,329	36,167	36,167
800 General government	13,191	13,190	0
Subtotal	50,520	49,139	40,217
Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)			
550 Health	0	0	−11

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 302(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1994—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
600 Income security	−66	−66	−66
Subtotal	−66	−66	−77
Committee total	50,454	49,073	40,140
PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
270 Energy	978	835	0
300 Natural resources and environment	219	193	0
400 Transportation	24,226	0	0
450 Community and regional development	5	156	0
800 General government	16	16	0
Subtotal	25,444	1,199	0
Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)			
300 Natural resources and environment	−13	−13	0
400 Transportation	2,105	0	0
Subtotal	2,092	−13	0
Committee total	27,536	1,186	0
SCIENCE, SPACE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
250 General science, space, and technology	22	22	0
270 Energy	8	8	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	1	1	0
Subtotal	31	31	0
Committee total	31	31	0
SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
370 Commerce and housing credit	187	52	0
450 Community and regional development	0	−344	0
Subtotal	187	−292	0
Committee total	187	−292	0
VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
700 Veterans benefits and services	1,581	1,772	18,577
Subtotal	1,581	1,772	18,577
Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)			
700 Veterans benefits and services	−11	−11	70
Subtotal	−11	−11	70

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 302(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1994—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
Committee totals	1,570	1,761	18,647
WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	0	0	6,927
550 Health	521	521	521
570 Medicare	168,798	166,720	166,711
600 Income security	35,898	35,250	74,891
650 Social Security	6,037	6,037	0
750 Administration of justice	486	471	270
800 General government	421	421	420
900 Net interest	309,669	309,669	309,669
Subtotal	521,830	519,089	559,409
Discretionary Action (Assumed Legislation)			
370 Commerce and housing credit	0	136	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	0	0	129
570 Medicare	−3,148	−2,462	−2,462
600 Income security	339	339	341
750 Administration of justice	−23	−23	0
900 Net interest	−44	−44	−44
Subtotal	−2,876	−2,054	−2,036
Committee total	518,954	517,035	557,373
UNASSIGNED TO COMMITTEES			
Current Level (Enacted Law)			
050 National defense	−13,577	−13,577	0
150 International affairs	−14,212	−14,212	0
270 Energy	−1,893	−1,893	0
300 Natural resources and environment	−3,152	−3,152	0
350 Agriculture	−9,621	−121	0
370 Commerce and housing credit	−256	−256	0
400 Transportation	−508	−508	0
450 Community and regional development	−454	−454	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	−57	−57	0
550 Health	−12	−12	0
570 Medicare	−66,757	−66,757	0
600 Income security	−11,868	−11,868	0
700 Veterans benefits and services	−1,283	−1,275	0
750 Administration of justice	−1,525	−1,525	0
800 General government	−21,463	−21,463	0
900 Net interest	−72,637	−72,637	−54,867
950 Undistributed offsetting receipts	−30,653	−30,653	0
Subtotal	−249,929	−240,421	−54,867
Committee total	−249,929	−240,421	−54,867
Total—Current level	722,796	683,420	721,632
Total—Discretionary action	500,517	534,885	−2,293
Grand total	1,223,314	1,218,305	719,339

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 302(a)/602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1994 to 1998
APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE						
Current level:						
Budget authority	271,419	294,190	293,805	326,120	356,768	1,542,302
Outlays	262,683	284,564	284,435	316,655	347,814	1,496,151
Discretionary action:						
Budget authority	500,964	506,287	519,142	528,079	530,639	2,585,111
Outlays	538,757	541,272	547,263	547,346	547,870	2,722,508
Discretionary action by other committees:						
Budget authority	731	893	24,651	24,069	24,315	74,659
Outlays	621	978	24,308	24,232	24,272	74,411
Committee total:						
Budget authority	773,113	801,371	837,597	878,268	911,722	4,202,071
Outlays	802,061	826,813	856,006	888,232	919,956	4,293,068
AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	11,931	10,306	9,703	9,878	9,931	51,749
Outlays	10,054	7,754	6,503	6,569	6,529	37,409
Discretionary action:						
Budget authority	−65	−74	−468	−992	−1,126	−2,725
Outlays	−66	−75	−468	−992	−1,126	−2,727

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 302(a)/602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—Continued

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1994 to 1998
Committee total:						
Budget authority	11,866	10,232	9,235	8,886	8,805	49,024
Outlays	9,988	7,679	6,035	5,577	5,403	34,682
New entitlement authority	−60	−66	702	208	104	888
ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	40,104	41,272	42,523	43,856	45,165	212,920
Outlays	40,023	41,189	42,439	43,771	45,081	212,503
Discretionary action:						
Budget authority	−128	−292	−458	−644	−843	−2,365
Outlays	−128	−291	−456	−642	−840	−2,357
Committee total:						
Budget authority	39,976	40,980	42,065	43,212	44,322	210,555
Outlays	39,895	40,898	41,983	43,129	44,241	210,146
New entitlement authority	−128	−291	−456	−642	−840	−2,357
BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	14,087	14,014	11,771	7,664	7,687	55,233
Outlays	4,718	9,395	597	−13,287	−10,779	−9,356
Discretionary action:						
Budget authority	0	0	0	0	0	0
Outlays	−338	−346	−550	−769	−789	−2,792
Committee total:						
Budget authority	14,087	14,014	11,771	7,664	7,687	55,223
Outlays	4,380	9,049	47	−14,056	−11,568	−12,148
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	40	42	44	47	49	222
Outlays	40	42	44	47	49	222
EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	1,651	840	281	165	143	3,080
Outlays	1,757	904	−4,015	−235	124	−1,465
New entitlement authority	118	313	−487	−1,776	−2,216	−4,048
ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	15,145	15,523	16,000	16,467	16,620	79,755
Outlays	14,945	15,353	15,785	16,087	16,400	78,570
Discretionary action:						
Budget authority	0	0	−378	−389	−402	−1,169
Outlays	−1,700	−1,800	−2,078	−1,389	−1,402	−8,369
Committee total:						
Budget authority	15,145	15,523	15,622	16,078	16,218	78,586
Outlays	13,245	13,553	13,707	14,698	14,998	70,201
New entitlement authority	−180	−1,373	−1,740	−2,103	−2,402	−7,798
FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	13,721	12,945	12,133	11,688	11,049	61,536
Outlays	14,170	13,557	12,923	12,553	12,021	65,224
Discretionary action:						
Budget authority	0	−1	−1	−1	−2	−5
Outlays	0	−1	−1	−1	−2	−5
Committee total:						
Budget authority	13,721	12,944	12,132	11,687	11,047	61,531
Outlays	14,170	13,556	12,922	12,552	12,019	65,219
New entitlement authority	0	−1	−1	−1	−2	−5
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	15	103	109	110	110	447
Outlays	13	100	107	107	108	435
HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	49	47	45	46	47	234
Outlays	16	41	110	20	17	204
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	2,899	2,113	2,196	2,258	2,315	11,781
Outlays	2,639	2,253	2,165	2,206	2,260	11,523
Discretionary action:						
Budget authority	0	0	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	−104	−137	−112	−119	−472
Committee total:						
Budget authority	2,899	2,113	2,196	2,258	2,315	11,781
Outlays	2,639	2,149	2,028	2,094	2,141	11,051
MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	588	624	635	622	633	3,102
Outlays	574	531	567	574	515	2,761
Discretionary action:						
Budget authority	0	0	−67	−68	−70	−205

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 302(a)/602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—Continued

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1994 to 1998
Outlays	0	0	−67	−68	−70	−205
Committee total:						
Budget authority	588	624	568	554	563	2,897
Outlays	574	531	500	506	445	2,556
New entitlement authority	0	−1	−1	−1	−1	−4
NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	1,477	1,737	1,767	1,863	1,493	8,337
Outlays	1,266	1,490	1,672	1,746	1,609	7,783
Discretionary action:						
Budget authority	−117	−133	−140	−155	−164	−709
Outlays	−112	−130	−138	−152	−161	−693
Committee total:						
Budget authority	1,360	1,604	1,627	1,708	1,329	7,628
Outlays	1,154	1,360	1,534	1,594	1,448	7,090
POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	50,520	52,209	58,222	61,198	64,300	286,449
Outlays	49,139	50,473	56,424	59,271	61,904	277,211
Discretionary action:						
Budget authority	−65	−358	−2,533	−3,571	−3,671	−10,199
Outlays	−66	−474	−2,649	−3,687	−3,671	−10,547
Committee total:						
Budget authority	50,454	51,851	55,689	57,627	60,629	276,250
Outlays	49,073	49,999	53,775	55,584	58,233	266,664
New entitlement authority	−77	−143	−2,321	−3,361	−3,695	−9,597
PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	25,444	25,962	25,504	27,062	1,231	105,203
Outlays	1,199	1,390	1,332	1,129	1,009	6,059
Discretionary action:						
Budget authority	2,092	2,143	2,196	2,251	28,776	37,458
Outlays	−13	−18	−18	−18	−18	−85
Committee total:						
Budget authority	27,536	28,105	27,700	29,314	30,007	142,662
Outlays	1,186	1,372	1,314	1,111	991	5,974
SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	31	31	32	32	32	158
Outlays	31	31	32	32	32	158
SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	187	74	11	11	11	294
Outlays	−292	−256	−247	−224	−193	−1,212
VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	1,581	1,577	1,651	1,541	1,467	7,817
Outlays	1,772	1,896	1,654	1,632	1,599	8,363
Discretionary action:						
Budget authority	−11	−130	−143	−154	−918	−1,356
Outlays	−11	−130	−143	−154	−914	−1,352
Committee total:						
Budget authority	1,570	1,447	1,508	1,387	549	6,461
Outlays	1,761	1,566	1,521	1,478	685	7,011
New entitlement authority	70	456	820	1,189	912	3,447
WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	521,830	569,695	608,670	650,154	693,840	3,044,189
Outlays	519,089	564,035	605,977	647,817	691,464	3,028,382
Discretionary action:						
Budget authority	−2,876	−1,398	−4,198	−8,678	−12,519	−29,669
Outlays	−2,054	−684	−3,291	−7,404	−10,989	−24,422
Committee total:						
Budget authority	518,954	568,297	604,472	641,476	681,321	3,014,520
Outlays	517,035	563,351	602,686	640,413	680,476	3,003,961
New entitlement authority	−2,036	−791	−1,421	−3,463	−4,885	−12,596
UNASSIGNED TO COMMITTEE						
Current level (enacted law):						
Budget authority	−249,929	−260,780	−275,269	−290,551	−302,503	−1,379,032
Outlays	−240,421	−252,192	−266,880	−281,454	−293,798	−1,334,745
Total current level:						
Budget authority	722,790	782,526	809,834	870,232	910,388	4,095,770
Outlays	683,414	742,350	761,633	815,015	883,768	3,886,180
Total discretionary action:						
Budget authority	500,523	506,937	537,602	539,747	564,016	2,648,825
Outlays	534,891	538,197	561,576	556,190	552,041	2,742,895
Grand total:						
Budget authority	1,223,314	1,289,463	1,347,437	1,409,979	1,474,404	6,744,597
Outlays	1,218,305	1,280,546	1,323,209	1,371,205	1,435,809	6,629,074
Total new entitlement authority	−2,293	−1,897	−4,904	−9,950	−13,025	−32,069

REQUEST FOR GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material on the conference report to accompany House Concurrent Resolution 64.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). Objection is heard.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcalls that occurred during my leave of absence on account of illness in the family, I would have voted "yes" on rollcalls 123 through 127.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1430, PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT EXTENSION

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-50) on the resolution (H. Res. 147) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1430) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1930

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO PROCEED OUT OF ORDER

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 1 minute.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would just like to inform the House that the Committee on Rules, in its infinite wisdom, just passed another closed rule. That means that the minority as well as many of the majority will not have an opportunity to present amendments and to debate issues that are relevant to the people and their constituencies. I think the message needs to be sent to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, my first inquiry is whether or not the legislative business of the House has been completed for the day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair knows of no other legislative business to be called up today.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, my second is, as to the status of the ongoing negotiations between the majority and the minority party, as to whether or not special orders will continue in its present form or be restricted with the idea of saving some money for the citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman that that is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair advises the gentleman that that portion of his remarks is not a parliamentary inquiry.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly about this. I feel it is a needless expense to the House and an embarrassment to the House.

However, it is my understanding that there are negotiations between the majority and the minority party as to the future of special orders.

With the wishes of many of my colleagues who have voted with me to limit special orders, I will not call for a rollcall vote tonight or tomorrow night but would like to inform the Members of the House that my colleagues and I, should nothing happen by the end of the Easter district work period, that we will, once again, begin calling for votes on adjournment.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DIRECTOR OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Director of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, NON-LEGISLATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES,

Washington, DC, March 30, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS C. FOLEY,

Speaker, House of Representatives, H-204, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to rule L of the Rules of the House that my office has been served with a subpoena issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel to the House, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is not inconsistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

LEONARD P. WISHART III,

Director.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 667

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 667.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO VACATE SPECIAL ORDER AND INSTITUTE NEW SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the 60-minute special order of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] and, in lieu thereof, I ask unanimous consent that he may address the House for 5 minutes today.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

INCREASED FUNDING FOR THE WHITE HOUSE

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

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I read this morning with interest that President Clinton has asked Congress to provide the White House more funding next year. Not just a slight increase, but $3.5 million more than last year.

Well, call me sentimental, but it seems only yesterday that President Clinton told us he would reduce administrative costs by 3 percent, yet he is asking for a 10 percent increase now. The $3.5 million increase would be even higher had the White House not eliminated the Office of Environmental Quality, which was, to say the least, an interesting choice. One might have thought that the Vice President would have objected, but Mr. GORE may have been distracted while asking for his 4-percent increase.

President Clinton says he needs a 10-percent increase for White House operations, but for what? To help American taxpayers make a larger sacrifice? Or invest in the patriotism of the American taxpayer?

The Americans out there who are going to sacrifice, whether they like it or not, can take heart in knowing that Mr. Clinton and his White House staffers will be hard at work taxing taxpayers and spending their money.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD the Washington Times article, as follows:

WHITE HOUSE SEEKS SOME FUND BOOSTS, VOWS SAVINGS LATER

(By J. Jennings Moss)

The Clinton administration yesterday asked a House subcommittee to increase spending in some White House offices but promised lawmakers that its overall staffing budget levels would drop.

The biggest single increase would come with the Office of Policy Development,

which administration officials want to boost by 36 percent in fiscal 1994. Another increase of nearly 10 percent would go for White House operations.

Patsy Thomasson, director of the office of administration in the Executive Office of the President, said the increased spending is needed because the White House is reorganizing responsibilities and there is a larger load of constituent letters.

But she said that when all of the budgets under the Executive Office of the President are analyzed, the Clinton White House would save $10 million and the White House staff would drop by 25 percent.

"Our approach to budgeting the White House is, I believe, a more direct and more honest approach," she told a House Appropriations subcommittee. She said it ends the "shell game" of using staff members on loan from other departments without applying their salaries to White House budget sheets.

"The savings are there, the staff cuts are there. The cuts are real," Ms. Thomasson said.

But some Republicans on the subcommittee on treasury, postal service and general government wanted to know specifically where the cuts are coming from. The panel's ranking GOP member—Rep. Jim Ross Lightfoot of Iowa—said other White House offices also are asking for more money this year.

"Somewhere along the line, we're going to have to eliminate something in the White House. . . . I'm not sure this isn't somewhat of a shell game as well," Mr. Lightfoot said.

Ms. Thomasson noted that among the cuts are the elimination of the Office of Environmental Quality, an office that had 40 jobs and a $2.7 million appropriation in 1993.

The White House's own budget is being scrutinized because of President Clinton's vow shortly after taking office that he would reduce the White House staff by 25 percent, cut administrative costs by 3 percent and freeze salaries. He directed federal departments to cut 100,000 jobs through attrition and slice 12 percent from their budgets over the next four years.

The total number of staffers at the Executive Office of the President now is 1,173, with 146 other employees detailed from other agencies, Ms. Thomasson said. By Oct. 1, the number will drop to 1,044. The numbers do not include the Office of Management and Budget or the Office of the Trade Representative, which Mr. Clinton excluded.

In the budgets presented yesterday, the White House asked for:

$5.1 million for the Office of Policy Development, a 36 percent increase over 1993. The office has been reorganized and includes the National Economic Council, the Domestic Policy Council and the Office on Environmental Policy. Because of the change in the office's focus, the increased funding would go to pay for more highly-training staffers and for more travel.

$38.9 million for White House operations, a nearly 10 percent increase. The increase is for additional postage and stationery because of a flood of correspondence to the president—as many as 10 million pieces this year. It also would pay for improvements to the phone system and for other communications tools.

$3.3 million for Vice President Al Gore to provide assistance to the president, a nearly 4 percent increase from 1993.

$324,000 for Mr. Gore's official residence, the same level as this year.

$24.8 million for the Office of Administration, a 1 percent increase.

IT'S TIME TO RAISE THE DIKES

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

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, as I speak, thousands of anxious-ridden Americans in my district of the Wyoming Valley are watching the Susquehanna River rise. Wyoming Valley 21 years ago, during Flood Agnes, suffered over 2 billion dollars' worth of damage and caused the relocation of thousands of families. Twenty-one years ago the President of the United States promised those families that he and the U.S. Government would raise the levees along the Susquehanna River at Wilkes-Barre. That promise is still not kept. Mr. Speaker, 21 years is long enough, and the anxiety of the American citizens for that period of time must now be answered.

This afternoon I am asking the Committee on Appropriations to make the final commitment of $1 million to finish the design for the Wyoming Valley levee system. It is time that we get on with the project that is 21 years too late.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (PA) Times Leader, Mar. 31, 1993]

IT'S TIME TO RAISE THE DIKES

6 feet . . . 7 feet . . . 8 feet . . .

"The Susquehanna River is rising, but Wyoming Valley residents shouldn't worry about its flooding—even in low-lying communities."

9 feet . . . 10 feet . . . 11 feet . . .

"The river, which measured at slightly above 6 feet Friday afternoon, is expected to rise to 10 feet by Saturday and 14 to 15 feet by Sunday.

"That's still well below the 22-foot flood level, which is the natural bank of the river."

12 feet . . . 13 feet . . . 14 feet . . .

"The rising Susquehanna River, swelled with melting snow, may flood some low-lying areas unprotected by dikes this week.

"It's going to be borderline if we see any flooding in the low-level areas."

15 feet . . . 16 feet . . . 17 feet . . .

"Since the start of the weekend, the Susquehanna River has swelled to 15 feet and is expected to peak at 17 to 19 feet by Tuesday.

"It doesn't get serious until about 20 feet. Then we'll see the low-lying areas take on some water."

THE RIVER

18 feet . . . 19 feet . . . 20 feet . . .

"Hanover Township, Kingston and Wilkes-Barre activated their pump stations Saturday, but the river's elevation is not expected to create any mainland problems."

21 feet . . . 22 feet . . . 23 feet . . .

"It would have to reach 25 feet before some communities like West Pittston would have to be concerned . . . This isn't anything serious."

24 feet . . . 25 feet . . . 26 feet . . .

"The Blizzard of '93's spring thaw was expected to push the Susquehanna River above 24 feet this morning, causing minor flooding in low-lying areas.

". . . predicted the quick-swelling Susquehanna River would crest early this morning at between 24 and 26 feet."

27 feet . . . 28 feet . . . 29 feet . . .

Um—folks?

Isn't it time we raised the dikes around here, the way we've been talking about doing for 21 years?

[From the Wilkes-Barre (PA) Citizen Voice, Mar. 31, 1993]

EMA ISSUES FLOOD ADVISORY

Luzerne County Emergency Management Agency officials last night issued a flood advisory for the river communities of the Wyoming Valley, urging those municipalities and residents to take "protective" action in the face of rising waters of the Susquehanna River which are expected to crest as high as 32 feet sometime this afternoon.

At approximately 10:30 p.m., EMA executive director Jim Siracuse issued the advisory which affects portions of Shickshinny, Plymouth, Plymouth Township, the Mark Plaza in Edwardsville, West Nanticoke, Duryea, West Pittston and the Hollenback Park section of Wilkes-Barre. Siracuse said the advisory was prompted by a revision from the River Forecast Center in State College, which, earlier in the evening, had been predicting the Susquehanna to crest in Wilkes-Barre at approximately 27 feet. Later, those figures were upgraded to a crest of 23 to 29 feet.

Siracuse discounted rumors that the rising waters were the result of flood gates being opened in upstate New York. He said he had been in contact with the Army Corps of Engineers on Tuesday afternoon who informed him, "There is no release taking place nor do they plan on a release."

The EMA head stressed the advisory was a "precautionary" measure. "We are not telling people to start loading their vehicles," he stressed but was quick to add, "We'd rather err on this side of safety." Siracuse again emphasized the advisory was not meant to scare people but rather to give municipalities and residents sufficient time to implement protective measures for those low lying areas which are affected when the river reaches the 28 to 29 feet stage.

The rising waters caused several roadways to be closed including Route 11 heading north, from Hunlock Creek to West Nanticoke. Siracuse noted that the flood control system in the Wyoming Valley provides protections to levels of 37 to 39 feet. At approximately 11 p.m. last night, he said the river was rising at a rate of .15 to .25 feet and hour.

By 1 p.m., Canal Street in Shickshinny had been closed to traffic as backwater coated with a scum of debris began covering the macadam. The scene was repeated throughout the heart of the Wyoming Valley Tuesday afternoon, residents gathering in yards, on levees, on bridges, watching the rising Susquehanna River with nervous eyes and hearts filled with the horrid memories of Hurricane Agnes in 1972 and her less vicious cousin Eloise in 1975. By 1 p.m., Canal Street in Shickshinny, Route 239 in Mocanaqua, SR 3036 in Wapwallopen/Nescopeck and Swetland Lane, Wyoming, had all been closed. At 4 p.m., the Susquehanna River in Wilkes-Barre measured 26.05 feet and was predicted to crest between 27 and 29 feet after midnight, below flood stage in the levee protected areas of the valley but above the natural bank of the river in all areas of the Valley not protected by dikes. As of 4 p.m., river watchers were still waiting for the Susquehanna River north at Towanda to crest.

Eight miles north of Shickshinny, in West Nanticoke, the same vigil was played out Tuesday afternoon along the riverbank, resi-

dents watching, waiting, wondering whether to begin moving valuables from basements to first and second floors, questioning the predictions of the professional river watchers and gambling on the wisdom of their neighbors and that sixth sense that becomes a part of life for those who live on the flood plain.

Joyce Munson, of 350 E. Canal St. in West Nanticoke stood watching the river that runs past her back yard since 3 a.m. Tuesday morning. Munson, a former Plymouth resident, has lived in the neat little home on Canal Street, West Nanticoke, for just two years, not long enough to experience first hand the devastation wrought in the neighborhood by Agnes 20 years before, or the basement flooding caused by Eloise in 1975. "I'm a little nervous," she admitted.

As their morning dawned, Munson watched as three of four tiers of landscaping in her back yard were gradually swallowed by the rising river. In the distance, as the sounds of a hammer rattled, her neighbor boarding up his basement, Munson relied on the experience of her more flood savvy neighbors for advice on whether to begin packing her basement. "If it hits that one bush, my neighbors tell me that we'll be getting water in our basement," she said, pointed to a shrub about 20 feet from her back porch.

"Last night, I could hear the rapid river. It was eerie. We started putting markers out to measure how fast the water was rising. We stuck one stick in and within 15 to 20 minutes, it had disappeared beneath the water," she said.

Munson's immediate neighbor Judy Novak, of 260 E. Canal St., and her family are veterans of the flood prone area, having lived through Anges in 1972 in a HUD trailer not far from the riverfront home, their house with eight feet of water on the first floor. In Eloise in 1975, their home had water to the top of their cellar steps.

Novak reassured Munson. "For us to have water on the first floor, it would have to spill over the dikes in Wilkes-Barre," she said. "After you have lived here for a while, you know from experience. We're taking it in stride. You kind of get used to it. Certainly, you pay attention to what is happening. But you don't dwell on it too much. If you did, you could drive yourself crazy."

If the water rose higher, residents there would begin emptying their basements, disconnecting motors from the heating units and moving them to upper levels, and hoping. With many older residents on the street, offering assistance if it was needed to helping their older neighbors move whatever had to be taken from basements to upper stories. "You learn when you live down here not to finish your basement," Novak quipped.

All homes there are considered to be part of the low lying and generally unpopulated areas of the Valley inundated when the river exceeds 22 feet and overflows its natural banks.

"I'm not worried, not really," Munson said. "As long as I feel safe. If the river picks up speed and starts sounding spooky, then I'm out of here. But you know, it really is beautiful down here. Many of the people who live here take their boats out after dinner during the summer and motor up and down the river. It really is a wonderful place to live."

Jim Siracuse, executive director of Luzerne County Emergency Management Agency, said Tuesday afternoon that the river had not crested as expected at Towanda by 4 p.m., although the rate that the river level was rising appeared to be slowing. The average rate of increase has been about ¼ foot per hour, he said. Generally, the river at Wilkes-Barre will crest 12 hours after the river at Towanda, Siracuse said.

The spring thaw following the blizzard of 1993 has made river conditions particularly difficult to predict for several reasons, Siracuse said. "It has been such a long time since we've seen these levels. There was 30 inches of snowpack followed by a week of having rain in upstate New York which super saturated the snow. Compounding these conditions were temperature variables which make this thaw very difficult to predict."

The last time the Susquehanna River crested in Wilkes-Barre at 28/29 feet was in March of 1986.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (PA) Times Leader, Mar. 31, 1993]

FLOOD WATCH

(By P. Douglas Filaroski)

WILKES-BARRE.—The continued rise of the Susquehanna River, and the uncertainty about how high it will get, had residents watching and worrying Tuesday while recalling the nightmares from the Agnes flood of 1972.

At 11 p.m. Tuesday, Luzerne County Emergency Management Agency officials were predicting the river would crest between 28 and 29 feet early this afternoon, while acknowledging that forecasting has been difficult.

Officials also issued an advisory—which is not as serious as a state of emergency—that riverfront communities should be prepared for levels of up to 32 feet. Areas affected by the advisory include Shickshinny, Plymouth Township, West Nanticoke, Duryea, West Pittston, Hollenback Park section of Wilkes-Barre and the Mark Plaza in Edwardsville.

"We did not feel comfortable with the cushion of 28 to 29 feet that the River Forecast Center has given us," county Emergency Management Agency executive director Jim Siracuse said late Tuesday. "We hope we do not reach the 30 to 32 foot level, but we feel better about erring on the part of safety."

Many area residents, especially those in Shickshinny, Mocanaqua and West Pittston, nervously eyed the 26.8-foot-high river Tuesday as it spilled over its 22-foot natural banks and creeped toward their homes.

"When you see the water come up like this, people get scared. They start thinking about '72," said Herby Derby, 42, who owns and resides at Herby Derby Florist off Canal Street in Shickshinny.

By Tuesday afternoon, the swollen river had engulfed a Canal Street park in Shickshinny, seeped onto River Street in Mocanaqua, and flooded backyard sheds on Canal Street in West Pittston.

It had closed Route 239 in Mocanaqua; state Route 3036 in Wapwallopen/Nescopek; Swetland Lane in Wyoming; and Canal Street in Shickshinny.

Most residents' homes and basements are safe as long as the river remains under 30 feet high, emergency officials say. But erratic predictions of the river crest had thousands of residents outside their homes keeping vigil.

"We wait, we sit and we watch. We wait, we sit and we watch," said Frank Slominiski, 49, of River Street in Mocanaqa, who was perched on his front porch about three feet above the encroaching river.

"The biggest thing has been the uncertain prediction. * * * The worst is the waiting at night," he said.

Slominsiki said he had not slept in 36 hours—worried about the rising river.

Siracuse explained why river crest predictions have gone from 19 feet Sunday to 23 feet Monday to 29 feet Tuesday. He said the uncertainty has been largely due to recent rainfall absorbed in previously light snow from the blizzard in upstate New York.

In West Pittston, the river bank resembled a public park Tuesday as curious onlookers came to see the Susquehanna waters firsthand. Children ran up to the water's edge as parents cautiously eyed the rising waters.

Darwin and Hilda Llewellyn, of Lacoe Street in West Pittston, lived through the 1972 flood and said the rising river makes them nervous. However, Hilda said the couple's home appeared safe.

"I don't think it's going to come to our house." Hilda said.

Others, like Ed Powers, who lives on Susquehanna Avenue, said he's not worried about the rising waters. "I saw it before," he said. "I'm going out tonight."

Wyoming Area students from Harding or Falls were dismissed early because of the potential flooding of Route 92 in Exeter Township. Greater Nanticoke also released students who live in low-lying areas.

Some residents came to the riverfront Tuesday to recall the 1972 flood. Louis Spezialetti said the trip made him feel good about his decision to move from Shickshinny to Berwick in 1973.

"The government gave me a chance to get out, and I took it. I'm glad I did," said Spezialetti.

It made others wish they had, too.

"We moved out for 18 years after the 1972 flood. But we moved back a couple of years ago," said Russell Noss of Canal Street in Shickshinny.

"Now, we're just waiting and seeing what's coming," he said.

Tuesday's 26.8-foot river level is the highest the Susquehanna has risen since when the river swelled to 28 feet in March 1986 when a spring thaw combined with heavy rains, said Siracuse.

In 1972's flood from Tropical Storm Agnes, the river topped at a record 40.6 feet. Since then, it has risen to levels of 35 feet in 1975 and 31 feet in 1979.

While the general mood of residents was one of concern, some people assumed a lighter attitude about the swelling river.

Patty Sidari, of West Pittston, said it was "just fascinating" watching the river. If the Susquehanna rises too fast and floods her home, she said she may be headed for an early vacation.

"I'm supposed to visit my parents in California in June for my sister's graduation," she said. "I may be going earlier and unexpected."

□ 1940

DOES AMERICA NEED AN INCREASE IN THE DEBT LIMIT?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, here we go again. Today, the House of Representatives increased the debt limit by $225 billion to $4.37 trillion, yes, trillion dollars. This is outrageous.

Weren't these Members of Congress on the same campaign trail that I was last November? Didn't they promise to

come to Washington armed with a mandate from the people to change business-as-usual politics in this town?

What could be so important that this Congress would vote to raise the national debt rather than lower it as promised? Let me see if I can explain it to you.

This increase in debt is the result of the so-called emergency stimulus measure that Congress passed last week to the tune of $16 billion.

A measure that we are told will put America back to work. But let me tell you what's really in that measure: $28 million to bail out the District of Columbia. And won't somebody please explain how the publication of two fish atlases and conducting a study of the sicklefin chub stimulates the economy?

The President calls them emergencies. This is the same President who was going to put an end to the waste in Government and cut the deficit in half in 4 years.

But here he is asking us to accumulate a new debt at the rate of $1.2 billion a day over the next 6 months.

The increase in the debt limit is irresponsible. It is not only irresponsible, it violates every wish and every hope of the Nations; taxpayers.

Our President promised Americans that he would immediately begin debt reduction and sound fiscal policies. He hasn't, and we can only wonder if he ever will.

As yet, we haven't seen his tax legislation, and we have no way of determining the tax burden Mrs. Clinton health plan will include.

This is not a time to raise the debt limit. It's time to reduce spending. It's time to put an end to this monumental waste in Government.

The people of my district don't want to pay millions for fish atlases. I don't think many of us even know what a sicklefin chub looks like.

And the cities of my district are just as hard-pressed as the District of Columbia, but I don't see Congress running to their aid to bail my cities out.

The American people voted for change last November, but I don't see any changes. I see waste. I see increases in the national debt. I see increases in spending. And I see broken promises and vacant rhetoric.

Where's the balanced budget amendment? Where's the tax break for the middle class? Where's the line-item veto?

These are the bills that Congress should have voted on today. These are the overdue reforms the people of America are waiting to see from this Congress, not raising the debt limit.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO ENSURE FAIR TREATMENT FOR SOCIAL SECURITY RECIPIENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce a piece of legislation for fair treatment of Social Security recipients on the interest earned on their tax-exempt income.

I introduce this piece of legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that tax-exempt interest shall not be taken into account in determining the portion of Social Security benefits subject to income taxation.

It is clear that in 1986 when this piece of legislation was passed, that it was not intended to penalize those persons who contribute so much to the infrastructure of this Nation by participation in buying municipal and other bonds. Presently those who are receiving Social Security benefits and earn tax-exempt income and interest are unduly penalized by a stipulation in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which causes their interest earnings to be treated differently.

I do not think, Madam Speaker, that this is appropriate for persons who have given so much of their lives, so much of their time, that they come to a point in their life when they are treated differently than other citizens who participate in the purchase of bonds that help us to support our infrastructure, and to support the work of our cities and our State in this Nation.

In order to calculate the level of taxation of Social Security benefits, the interest earned on tax-exempt income, such as municipal bonds, is included in the formula used to determine if Social Security will be taxed. Thus, Social Security recipients are not taxed as other tax payers in regard to interest from normally tax-exempt securities. This is tantamount to imposing additional taxes on a very select group; Social Security recipients.

This matter has been brought to my attention in several townhall meetings that I have held over the last week, and in each and every one of them there are senior citizens who are concerned about this problem because they feel that they are not treated justly and fairly, as other American citizens are.

Social Security is a mandatory program that was put in place to secure the long-term sustainability of our elderly. This legislation seeks to rescue that promise so that we can fulfill our obligation to those who have provided us with the foundation on which we stand. I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in cosponsoring this legislation to treat Social Security recipients fairly.

NO REAL REFORM FROM DEMOCRAT FRESHMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I yield to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON].

Mr. PAXON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, it was not too long ago, a matter of a couple of months, election time was held in this country and there were a lot of folks that campaigned to serve in the Congress of the United States. Across the aisle we had many of our colleagues who were candidates, Democrats, soon to be freshman class, who talked a lot about reform, talked a lot about changing this institution.

As chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee I had a chance to look over many of the commercials that they used in their campaigns, and the literature that was sent out and the speeches they gave, passionately talking about changing this institution. They were going to come to Congress with a new broom to sweep clean, to bring about real reform in the House of Representatives.

Since they took office, those 63 of our colleagues across the aisle, those new freshman Democratic Members, their rhetoric has not changed, but lo and behold, their actions have changed.

Just this evening on television, on NBC, they did a little story about the freshman Democratic class coming to Washington and talking about reform of the institution. They noted the fact that this NBC report by Lisa Myers, that when it came time for the rubber to meet the road, for actions to speak louder than words, the freshman Democrats backed down. What really happened was they had a little meeting with the Speaker and then they backed down.

The report, I think, would make interesting viewing by anyone who happens to live in the districts of those new freshman Democrats, because it said much better than I can tonight that the ballyhooed series of reforms they were going to present for changing the House of Representatives really amounted to nothing more than window dressing, and that some of the senior Democrats had made certain that that freshman class backed down on those reforms.

Then just a few minutes ago in this Chamber those same freshman Democrats marched to the floor. They had a chance to cast another vote for real change and real reform. It was called raising the Nation's debt ceiling. During the campaign many of them very passionately talked about putting the lid on Government spending, controlling waste in Government, and making real change so that the American people did not have to pay more and more taxes for more and more wasteful Federal spending.

Lo and behold, just like the freshman class faced when it came down to the question of eliminating perks and changing the procedures of this House of Representatives, the freshman Democrats, 60 of the 61 that came to this House floor, voted to raise that debt ceiling. They did not vote for reform or change, they voted for business as usual. They fell in line, they got in line and they cast their votes. Sixty of the sixty freshman Democrats that voted, voted to raise the debt ceiling.

□ 1950

I hope that the constituents back home, when they have a chance, will note that fact that it was like giving someone in chapter 11 a credit card and raising the line of credit. The result, voting to raise the debt ceiling, means that spending is going to be raised right up to that limit, and I predict that in the next couple of years we will be right back here again casting votes to raise the debt ceiling, while they will march back to their district over the Easter recess and say oh, no, I am cutting spending, I am for real change, I am for real reform.

But when it came down to a chance today in this House of Representatives to vote for real reform, the freshman Democrats fell right in line with the old guard. The message was clear: Stay in line, keep in line. And that is the way business is done in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GOSS. I thank my colleague from New York for those illuminating remarks. And I hope that he is aware of the fact that the freshmen will have another chance tomorrow to prove their mettle, because in fact we are going to have a closed rule on the debt extension question. And we had very good testimony in the Rules Committee from Members of the Democratic freshman class and the Republican freshman class on enhanced rescission. Regrettably their amendments were not made in order.

But they have a chance to vote "no" on the previous question tomorrow on that rule, and that will be the next test to see whether we really are dealing with reform or whether we are dealing with rhetoric.

DEEP CUTS IN THE DEFENSE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, one of the big concerns of many in the House of Representatives is the draconian cuts in defense that President Clinton has proposed in his budget. He has proposed cutting, depending on who you talk to, up to $127 billion out of the defense budget over the next 5 years. And with the uncertainty that we face in the world in places like the former Yugoslavia, in Somalia, in Russia where Boris Yeltsin's head sits very uneasy on this shoulder, although he has been able to stave off his opponents for a short time, the situation to say the least is very uneasy, and I and many of my colleagues feel very strongly that the cuts that have been proposed by the Clinton administration are draconian, will cut into the muscle and bone of the defense of this Nation and put our defense capability in a very precarious situation.

Tonight I would like to yield to three very competent Members of the House of Representatives who have worked very hard on this subject to discuss in depth the problem with these massive defense cuts as proposed by the Clinton administration.

I am happy to yield to my colleague in the well, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY].

Mr. MACHTLEY. Madam Speaker, one of the things I think we face as a Nation is that we are not sure where we are going in this world of uncertainty. During the last 2 days we have had testimony in the Armed Services Committee from the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, now Secretary of Defense Les Aspin, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Colin Powell, and today the CNO and the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

In all of these discussions I think it is important to understand that there has been no strategic planning on what size base force we will need by 1996 and 1997. What is driving this defense budget is OMB and those who think that the way to cut our deficit ought to be strictly reducing the defense spending.

Now I think that it is important to recognize that while Republicans are discussing this tonight, we are also supporting a reduction in the defense budget. In 1990, when they had the present budget agreement, there was a recognition that the world was changing, that we had to reduce our defense spending in order to take care of our domestic needs, and that is why we established an adjusted baseline. It was called the Bush adjusted baseline. It was a bipartisan agreement. It was, I thought, a very good reduction.

We had been reducing our defense since 1985 continually in real dollars each year, and we were on what they will call a down slope that I think would have given us a particularly good, balanced reduction process.

When candidate Clinton was running for office on April 1, he said that what he thought we ought to do is reduce our defense budget $50 billion to $60 billion below the amount which was in the Bush baseline. Less than 1 year later we had a proposal from the administration which would reduce our national defense, our budget from 1993 to 1997, 5 years, a total of $122 billion to $127 billion.

When Chairman Aspin was before us, he said, "I don't think it is really a $127 billion cut over those years." But I think if we look at the testimony that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee provided in his speech on March 5, he clearly documented that there is at least $122 billion, and probably higher as inflation will set in.

Now what has caused this enormous cut, again, is no strategic plan, but merely people who are looking to reduce the deficit.

We will get through probably with no problem, very little problem the 1994 budget. It is only a reduction of about $12 billion, and I think that is reasonable. And we will probably get through the 1995 budget, because that is a reduction of about $17 billion. But where we are going to have some significant problem is when we get to 1996 and 1997. The reduction in 1996 will be $24.8 billion, and in 1997 it will be $38 billion.

That means 62 percent of the defense cuts in this budget proposal which was agreed on will occur in 2 years. There is not enough time to ramp down, there is not enough time to plan how are we going to take out of our military. We now have 2.1 million military people serving in uniform, and there will not be enough time to smoothly transition these people out.

Here tonight are two other members of the Armed Services Committee that I hope my colleague will yield to. One is a distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee who has just joined us. He understands the problems in the military because he has served in the military. As a new Member from Indiana, he is a major in the U.S. Army. This distinguished Member of the House was called upon active duty. He served in Desert Storm. He understands what the soldiers, and I understand as a member of the Navy what the sailors go through.

Also we have with us tonight our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, CURT WELDON. I hope the gentleman from Indiana will yield at this time so that my distinguished colleague can discuss some of the issues that are in this budget.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to my colleague from Indiana, Mr. BUYER.

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the remarks by my distinguished colleague in the well, the gentleman from Rhode Island, who is in fact an Annapolis graduate himself. Having served this country in the Navy, he thoroughly understands the implications of the drawdowns and the effects upon personnel.

To my colleague, he brought up an interesting fact of what it is that is driving the drawdown in this budget when candidate Clinton, as the gentleman pointed out, 11 months ago recommended a $60 billion cut. Now all of a sudden he has recommended a $128

billion cut over 5 years, while we have received testimony from the Joint Chiefs regarding the fact that the contingencies are only escalating, that the requirements around the world are only escalating. So there is no rationale for such deep cuts.

I have a notice that during Secretary Les Aspin's testimony before the committee he outlined what he called the President Clinton national security plan.

□ 2000

And in that, he outlined four post-cold-war dangers. Three of them, I believe, are dangers. One of them is called political. He outlined the nuclear dangers around the world and Third World nuclear terrorism, and the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The others he cited as dangers to emerging democratic forms of government, and infant democracies around the world, with which I agree, and third is the regional dangers, times where we could respond to things that occurred like at Desert Storm, the regional instabilities throughout the world; that is, in fact, important.

But the fourth is what he called economic dangers here at home, and that, I believe, is an unnecessary element to include in your threat assessments when you decide what should be the force structure of the U.S. military.

I can only cite to the chairman, RON DELLUMS, who said yesterday that threat assessments should be based on objective threats and not political threats. To the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I agree with that statement, because when you include the economic effects of America as a threat assessment, that is a political motivation, and actually what they are doing is they are using that as an illusory justification to make deep cuts in the military.

Mr. MACHTLEY. The gentleman is absolutely right.

If I may discuss that, what I just put up here on the chart, I think it is particularly illustrative of the point that I was making earlier.

On the prebudget summit baseline, this was the last cold war budget, the total of 1993 through 1997 was $1.810 trillion. After the cold war ended, after the Berlin Wall came down, there was another budget summit agreement where we reduced that baseline by $325 billion to 1.485.

The Bush proposal, which was submitted during the last Congress, reduced that again to 1.425, a reduction of about $60 billion.

Now, the Clinton candidacy suggested that from this number right here, 1.425, we should reduce another $60 billion. That was stated on April 1.

When he was elected, what he did was submit a budget which is 1.301 which is a $509 billion cut. If you subtract the difference between the Bush baseline and the Clinton baseline, lo and behold, it is not $60 billion. It is $122 billion.

Just so people do not think these numbers were cooked and that somehow this is a partisan presentation of numbers, these are the specific numbers that Senator NUNN presented in the other body on his testimony on March 5. These are not numbers which we made up.

Now, I think it is important to recognize this big jump, and as I indicated, this will occur primarily in 1996 and 1997, but as we are ramping down, it would be too late to move on.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], who has served so well on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. WELDON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for this special order tonight to discuss a very important issue, that of our defense budget and our defense budget posture.

As I said before in our committee yesterday, when we had Secretary Aspin and Chairman Colin Powell in, I have some grave concerns about where we are going, and to follow up what my colleague from Rhode Island has stated about this being a bipartisan concern, not only has Senator SAM NUNN echoed his concerns in terms of the budget numbers and the process we are going through, but our own chairman of our Defense Appropriations Committee has, as recently as this past week, been quoted in the Washington papers as saying, "I am beginning to see a hollow force developing again." He is beginning to express his concerns, and has said that in the out years it is going to be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to provide the budget cuts that the President is proposing, and yet still keep up the missions that are being asked of our Marines and other armed services around the world.

My first major concern deals with that. This dollar amount was pulled out of the air. In a direct question to Secretary Aspin yesterday, I said, "Mr. Secretary, where did you get this number from? Was it based upon a threat assessment?" He said, "No." "Was it based upon some staff work there in the Pentagon?" He said, "No." I said, "Where did you get it from?" He said that it was based upon a number given to him by the Office of Management and Budget, and they got that by pulling it out of the air. So we are, in fact, determining what the defense posture of this country will be not based upon reality and what, in fact, is out there in the real world and the hot spots that we know are there, but we are basing it upon a budget number pulled out of the air that has now been told to us we have to fit the military into this configuration.

That is an extremely troubling situation to me.

My second concern deals with personnel cutbacks. We are increasing the missions. We are sending our troops to Florida for Hurricane Andrew, to the L.A. riots, we have them over in Somalia, we are talking about sending them to Bosnia. Yet we are cutting back the support that in fact will allow these troops to be put around the world as advocated by Members of this body, many of whom do not support the military in terms of their funding requirements. I spoke yesterday in committee and mentioned that while I was in Somalia 2 months ago, we talked to some troops who told us that they had been deployed for three of the last four Christmas holiday seasons. They had been in Desert Storm, they were on troop exercises in Okinawa, and they now found themselves in Somalia. They did not even have the time to resupply their ships to provide the basic support materials necessary to complete the Somalian operation.

We are stretching our troops to the limit. In fact, General Mundy this morning in our hearing said the same thing. We cannot keep asking our marines to do more with less money. That is, in fact, where we are.

My third concern is morale. You cannot ask the military to do all of these new assignments, to be an all-volunteer force, to transfer from base to base as we realign bases, and then tell them, on top of that, that we are going to freeze their pay, and that, in fact, we are going to reduce the amount of opportunities that they have to achieve higher levels of rank in the military. This certainly is not putting people first.

My fourth concern is a very real one, and that is economic impact. The President has stressed repeatedly his need to create a stimulus package to create new jobs. He has told us that this stimulus package that we, in fact, have passed in this body, without my support, would create 500,000 jobs.

The American people are smarter than that. They understand that over 5 years we, in fact, will be causing one out of every two American defense-related workers to lose their jobs. Now, this is not my assessment. In fact, I would like to quote for the record two studies that I provided to my colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services.

First of all, the Office of Technology Assessment came out with a report that said, in fact, that if we continue the cuts that we are currently planning for the next 5 years that we could see the amount of layoffs in defense-related jobs lost total to 2.5 million men and women. As a matter of fact, in addition to that, the Congressional Budget Office has said in a document that they just recently released that up to 1.8 million men and women could lose their jobs. This figure of 1.8 to 2.5 million is out of a total work force of 5.5

million American men and women who work in defense-related jobs.

Now, here we are talking about eliminating perhaps an average of 2 million jobs, while the President is talking about stimulating 500,000 new jobs.

I would say to my colleagues that we had better look carefully at this, because these American men and women who are being outplaced not just in the Pentagon but from McDonnell Douglas, from Boeing, from Grumman have no place to go. There are no jobs of equal pay with equal status that they can move into.

So this notion of retraining is a farce right now, because our economy cannot sustain these kinds of massive cuts.

That gets into my fifth concern, and that concern relates to what I think is, on the part of the administration, an oversimplification of defense conversion. Defense conversion is not going to happen by some stroke of lightning from this body or from the White House in terms of creating new jobs. It is not going to happen by putting money into retraining if there are no jobs to retrain these people for. It is not going to happen by trying to force companies like Grumman and McDonnell Douglas into new industries. We tried that back in the 1970's, and many of those workers for those companies remember what happened. They were not successful in that process.

Conversion can work, but it has got to be a slow and deliberate process, and it certainly is not going to be dictated by anything we do legislatively here in this body.

But with all of these concerns that I have, my No. 1 concern out of the six concerns I have listed, and the overriding concern that I think my colleagues here have is what is being talked about quietly in the Halls of the Congress, what is being talked about by my colleagues on the Democratic side as well as my colleagues on the Republican side, but it is a low level of discussion, and that concern is the concern that what is being said about this President is that he just does not care about the men and women serving in our military.

I am not going to use my quotes. I am going to use some quotes from a retired Army colonel, Don Snyder, who now is a defense analyst for the Center for Strategic International Studies. In a recent article in the Baltimore Sun that ran nationwide, he said:

> More than 60 days into his administration, he has not appointed the third person at the Pentagon. The military has some rude things to learn, namely, that this guy does not care about them.

What a tragic thing to have to deal with, that the American men and women serving in our military, in fact, are seeing a growing concern in America that this President does not care about them, and it is nothing that he can solve by giving words or by stopping at a ship. To show concern and show caring, he has got to involve himself in the problems and the concerns that these young people have.

So with all of the other things that are happening in terms of our defense budget, the thing that troubles me the most is that fact, and I think it is something that the President is going to have to deal with.

There have been numerous articles in the Washington press and the national press about this President really having a problem in relating to the military. He is the Commander in Chief, and he deserves the respect of our Armed Forces, but I would also say that our Armed Forces deserve the respect of the President and his entire administration.

□ 2010

That, I think, is my biggest concern, and I know it is a concern which is shared by the gentleman in the well. I thank the gentleman for yielding for this very important special order.

Mr. MACHTLEY. I thank the gentleman very much for pointing that out.

If I could pick up on a few points the gentleman raised. Today, when the Commandant, General Mundy, spoke to us, he pointed out that last year there were approximately 24 conflicts occurring in the world. Today there are still approximately 24 conflicts where marines are currently pre-positioned or deployed. In fact, last year, during those 24 conflicts, he said, we had approximately 22,000 young marines who were deployed outside the continental United States. Today we have 30,000 marines in the same force, which now has been reduced over the last year by 9,000 troops. These are the best, probably, enlisted men and officers that our Nation has ever had. And I know that my distinguished colleague from Indiana, who recently served with them, shares that thought.

Mr. WELDON. The gentleman may want to follow up on what else General Mundy said in regard to his ability to carry out those missions if in fact the 5-year defense cuts were made. Was the gentleman there when the Commandant referred to that?

Mr. MACHTLEY. I was. It seemed clear to me that he could not continue if the tempo of operations is going to continue; if the money is reduced, he cannot continue to field three divisions in the Marine Corps. It will have to be something significantly less.

Now, that raises the point: If we are going to have these regional conflicts—and as you look at what is taking place in Bosnia, Iran, and Iraq, which is arming up at an alarming rate, and if you look at the issue of North Korea and the fragileness of Russia, if you look around the world at India and Pakistan—you begin to realize this is not going to be a peaceful world on a regional basis. And if we are going to ask our marines to be able to get there either on a fast transport or somehow be predeployed, we are going to have to take our troops, constantly, away from their families.

Admiral Kelso today mentioned that today we had 200 ships deployed for 6 months. We had 106,000 of our young Americans on these ships who sailed to parts unknown, not asking for any heroic farewells or special recognition, just because it was their duty. The world is a very dangerous place.

Mr. BUYER. I thank the gentleman.

The purpose of the military is to meet the national security needs of the Nation. When we have all these commitments and requirements throughout the world what concerns many of us here in this body is that these cuts lack any reason. You cannot justify these cuts.

Now, we recognize that defense cuts need to be made. I think people recognize that. The cold war is in fact over; we have won it. But nobody wants to step forward and say that the U.S. military should be the world's policeman. Nobody is willing to say that. I do not believe that we in fact should.

We should have—we should turn to our European allies and ask them to have greater responsibilities.

But there is very dire concern and General Mundy, Commandant of the Marine Corps, highlighted that today, in fact.

Mr. WELDON. On that one point, I think it is very important that we stress to our colleagues and the American public that we as Republicans and those Members who support a strong defense in fact have supported deep cuts in defense spending. President Bush, before he left office, proposed a 33-percent reduction over 5 years, which we were in the midst of. In addition, the budget we passed on the floor of the House cut an additional $60 billion, which is what candidate Clinton proposed beyond what President Bush proposed. So we have proposed dramatic cuts in defense spending.

So we are not talking about a totally hawkish position in terms of restoring all these defense dollars. We are in fact talking about making defense cuts, but based upon doing them logically, and based upon threats, not just pulling numbers out of the air for political advantage or political purposes.

Mr. BUYER. Based on political assessments.

Mr. WELDON. Political assessments, exactly.

Mr. BUYER. That is what these cuts are based on, political assessments.

You know, I will tell you, being a freshman coming into this body and listening to the new language on Capitol Hill about spending and taxes, investment and contributions, I now learn that if you want to make deep

cuts in the military for domestic spending, you call it conversion. That is another new language they like to throw around.

But I am extremely concerned that deep cuts—this $120 billion is already on top of the $60 billion of Bush's cuts that were based upon threats, real national security threats. Those threats which that assessment was based upon are the same threats that we face today and we have increased requirements.

Mr. WELDON. Further on that point, in the 6 or 7 years that I have been here now—and I think my colleague in the well who has been around would share this view—each of the years we have in fact talked about where our defense budget should be for that year, we have had a net threat assessment given to us, a very detailed explanation provided by the CIA and other intelligence organizations in the military, defense intelligence, about what the potential threats are in the world. Based upon these threats, we come up with a budget.

We have not had any such threat assessment this year, and neither has the President. If these numbers were not based on that, they were pulled out of the air.

Mr. BUYER. That is because the President has not shared his national and diplomatic and political strategy for America on the defense posture.

Mr. MACHTLEY. If I was not so cheap, I would have had large charts made. But I want to point out by this small chart—because I think we should conserve taxpayer dollars—that this is the graph which shows what you gentlemen were discussing. The reduction which was planned by the previous budgets, you can see it was a 41-percent real-term real reduction. But when we got here after the collapse of the Soviet Union and after the fall of the Berlin Wall, instead of this line, which would have represented the $60 billion cut that candidate Clinton suggested was appropriate, this is the course that we are on.

Now, when I talk to my constituents back home and I say, "How much of the total expenditure of the United States do you think is defense," many of them say, "Well, it must be 30, 40, 50 percent," I have had them say "60 percent." But of the $1.5 trillion which we spend as a Nation, less than 17 percent is defense. We are going to spend more in interest payments.

What does that relate to in terms of our total gross domestic product? It is going to be something less than 3 percent of the $5 trillion, or $6 trillion economy which we will have in 1997. We will spend less than 3 percent.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I may interrupt and say if you go back to 1960, when John F. Kennedy was President, we were spending almost 50 percent, 48.6 or 48.7 percent of all Government spending was in the area of defense. Now it is down to 17 percent, as the gentleman said. That is a dramatic drop, and the American people I do not think are aware of that.

Mr. MACHTLEY. It will go down from 17 to 13 percent by 1997, a drop of 4 percentage points, for total spending.

So we are talking about substantial, very, very real cuts. This is not a gradual transition.

I see we have another distinguished colleague from California, who is serving with great honor in Congress and on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman.

With that introduction, I want to come back again and again. I congratulate my colleagues for filling in a much-needed void because the Clinton administration is whipping this budget through both bodies and the American people do not realize that 85 percent of the cuts do come out of national security.

The other point that is being made by everyone here is that the threat has not changed, it has not gotten any less since the Bush administration sat down with the people who won the war in Desert Storm, and tried to figure out how they could eke another $50 billion out of the 5-year budget. And then Mr. Clinton comes along and cuts $127 billion below the Bush cuts.

I want to tell my colleagues that not only has the threat not reduced since that time when the Bush administration sat down, it has actually increased.

If you read the Washington Post today, you will see that Communist China is moving into the South China Sea with a vengence.

They are claiming every island in the South China Sea, in the Spratly Islands, where Woody Island in particular is, they are now establishing a warship base and a warplane landing strip. They have moved into Burma, where they built a naval base for the Burmese, and they are now accessing that base. They are building a military intelligence base just to the south of there. They are claiming everything.

According to the Washington Post, they have picked up 72 SU-27 long-range strike fighters from the Soviet Union, they are picking up MiG-31 long-range interceptors, they are picking up 404 main battle tanks and some A-50 airborne warning and control aircraft. They are continuing with their nuclear buildup.

Korea has now withdrawn from the nonproliferation treaty. They are building a nuclear system.

□ 2020

They have not shown any of the benign intent that the now-dissolved Soviet Union shows, and if you move to the old Soviet Union instead of one government that has nuclear weapons to worry about, we now have nuclear weapons residing with four governments. While those four States presently show a benign intent with respect to the United States, they obviously right now are not intent on striking us with nuclear systems, the reformist leaders of those governments have beneath them a hard line Communist group who are only one heartbeat away from recontrol of those former Soviet systems. So that stability, while Mr. Yeltsin is reeling, he still seems to be holding on by the skin of his teeth, which has been his history over the last several years, and we are hoping he is able to hold on, the hardliner Communists who built those strategic systems and aimed them at cities in the United States are just a step away from control of the Soviet Union.

If you add all those things up—along with the bombing of the World Trade Center just a few weeks ago and realize that the people who bombed the World Trade Center would at some time perhaps like to use nuclear systems, a nuclear device instead of that conventional device—then you can see that the world is not only a very dangerous place, but in some ways it is more dangerous than when the only confrontation of import was a confrontation between us and the Soviet Union.

All my colleagues in the House Armed Services Committee and the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] who I see over here who is on the Appropriations Committee and is very concerned about defense, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] who has done a great job of trying to slash pork on this floor, understand the importance of national security.

We all understand that the most important social service that President Clinton owes the people of the United States is to protect them. He is not protecting them. He is disarming America, and that is something we should all be very worried about.

Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland, who has been a very strong voice in this House for reason, and for fiscal responsibility.

Mr. BURTON on Indiana. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I hope for the strong defense of this country. I want to say that every remark that each of you has made here tonight is very, very important and I hope the American public understands what is being said and what is happening to this country.

I want to just call to your attention and maybe somebody did and I did not hear it, but the slashing of the defense budget began right here in this House. It began in this Congress. The pressure began 2, 3, 4, or 5 years ago, if you recall. Everybody was saying get rid of

defense, get rid of defense. You ought to cut the defense budget. As soon as the Berlin Wall came down, everybody said, oh, the cold war is over. We do not have to do anything anymore.

As has already been said here tonight, it is a very dangerous place out there.

Many of my constituents have said to me, if we have no use for the military overseas, let us bring them home and let us let them help with the war here in our country. Let us let them help in the drug war. Let us let them help in policing the streets and make our streets safer, but let us not just dismiss our military personnel arbitrarily and put them out on the street at a time when there are no jobs as well.

They emphasize that the conversion is slow. You have to have places for these people to go or we are going to be in even worse shape than we are today. I think all of this needs to be looked at very carefully.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield on that point, we went through about 7 hours of testimony, not only dealing with the use of force by the military, but new uses of the military, which can be alarming at times because not all our forces are trained for different new uses of the military.

Examples of that deal with Hurricane Andrew, deal with the Somalia operations; but let us talk about how it affects the soldier, the troops right there on the desert floor of Somalia.

Our military are trained as combatants. They are not trained as police officers, so now we are using them in so-called peacemaking functions that are transferred to peacekeeping functions, but we are going to give them robust rules of engagement.

Now, we have policemen all across America who are trained as police officers. When they meet a greater threat, they call in the SWAT teams as combatants. Our military is like the SWAT. They are combatants. They are not trained as police officers, so when we take our military and we put them under U.N. auspices and guise and we are going to use them as peacekeepers in the world, as policemen, but nobody wants to call them policemen, they are not trained for that function.

In Somalia where 2 weeks ago a gunnery sergeant in the Marine Corps came under court martial proceedings, an article 32 hearing questioning whether or not he pulled the trigger too early in Somalia. He is not trained as a police officer. He is trained as a combatant, and then to judge him otherwise is flat out wrong.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I understand that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] has experience in the Persian Gulf. Could the gentleman describe what he did in the Persian Gulf?

Mr. BUYER. Well, I served as a military lawyer, a JAG officer at the Western Enemy Prisoner-of-War Camp. I conducted war crimes interrogations. I lived in a tent in the desert for about 4 months. Life was very basic.

When you live in an environment in the desert and you share a tent, when we talk about how basic life gets, you have to kick the restroom, the outdoor john to get the flies off before you ever sit down to go to the restroom, life gets very, very basic.

So when you talk about sending troops out into the field of environment where life is so very basic, away from their families and with further sacrifices, and then when they come home, after having served in a theater of war in Somalia or Yugoslavia or Panama and they are being underpaid 12 percent under civilian pay, and then you want to throw gays in the military on top of them, and when they come back to America you do not know whether or not they are going to have a job. They do not know whether or not they are going to be able to reenlist in the military.

Some of these who are Silver Star recipients and Bronze Star recipients, the military turns to them and says, "Thank you very much for the service to your country," and they pat them on the back and they send them out into the world and say, "Go get a job." That is very alarming.

Then we questioned the Joint Chiefs here lately, "Gee, are these cuts going to affect the morale?"

And they come in and they salute and they say that morale in the U.S. military is the best we have ever seen.

Well, I agree with the general. He wants to say that, but when you get out there and talk with these troops, they are very, very concerned, not only how these cuts are going to affect them, but they are also concerned about who is their commander in chief.

Mr. MACHTLEY. I think it is important to point out, as the gentleman has so vividly characterized our military as not only good solid soldiers and sailors, but people willing to sacrifice and go to these places, that these are not the types of people that we ought to turn our backs on.

I think it is absolutely wrong that this administration has singled out the military and Federal employees for pay freezes. At a time when we are encouraging our very best people to get into the military because we want educated people, because we want good leaders, because although we are drawing down the numbers—and we are going to draw them down again from 2.1 million people in uniform down to less than 1.4—it is going to be, I think, a remarkable drawdown and now we are also telling these people who are sitting over in Somalia, who gave up their Christmas vacations with their families, who have not seen their young children play Little League and go to their recitals, we are telling them we are going to freeze your pay.

Why? Because they do not have the political ability, as many other segments of our population do, to come to Washington and say this is wrong. We are serving in a capacity where we ought not to have to bear the full brunt of the freeze in Government, and it is a freeze this year and then it is reduced by 1 percent below the cost of living for the next 4 years. It is wrong. It is the wrong message to send to our military.

As a time, when as the gentleman indicates, when regardless how you may feel about the issues of gays in the military, how you may feel about the issues of women in the military, how you may feel about base closures, these crosscurrents are going to be affecting the morale of all our people. We must be absolutely prepared to do something to help the good people stay, or we will be left with a military that is very hollow.

General Mundy this morning in his testimony said that of every dollar which we appropriate to the Marine Corps, 77 cents goes into the pocket of the soldier, the leatherneck, the marine who is there on the line day and night, 77 cents out of every dollar. Seventeen cents goes into his training, teaching him to be the very best, teaching him to be a cohesive unit, and only 6 cents in the Marine Corps is going to go into overhead.

I do not think frankly that we want to reduce our training. The reason I am speaking out and having these special orders, both last night and tonight, is because I want the American people to understand 2 and 3 years from now that there is a reason why our military became very hollow. It is because of decisions that were made today in 1993.

□ 2030

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman give his background in the military briefly?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I would like to just interject one thing here.

I have been in Congress for some time now, and I came shortly after Jimmy Carter left the White House, and I do not recall anybody having mentioned this tonight, but we are going through much of the same things in the way of tax increases, and more spending and military cuts that we saw during the Carter administration, and at the end of the Carter administration, if you talk to anyone who was in the military, they will tell you they did not have bullets for their guns for training, they did not have shells for their cannon, they were not capable of doing the things that they should have been doing, and our military was in a very, very difficult situation. The Communists had taken over 11 countries in the world because of our weakness or perceived weakness, and, as a result, when Ronald Reagan came in, we had to spend massive amounts of money to regain our military capability so we

could compete in the world, and, had it not been for Ronald Reagan coming in after the same kinds of things we are going through today, you would not have seen the Berlin Wall fall, you would not have seen the disintegration of the Soviet Union because we would have let them have the field all to themselves, and we are running that same risk again today, and I commend all three of you, and everybody on the Armed Services Committee, the four of you, for bringing this to the attention of the American people because we are about to make the same mistakes that we made in the late 1970's again, and it need not happen, and so I applaud you for your efforts, and I hope you will keep it up.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has hit upon an important point here. What is occurring is a fundamental shift in what the role of the Federal Government is, and people have to understand that.

When the people went to the polls on election day in November, Mr. Speaker, they said they wanted a couple of things to happen. They wanted the Government to be more responsive to them, they wanted us to make Government work for them, and they also wanted to see us control the size of the growth of the Federal Government.

In fact what is happening now, and this was pointed out to me, not by one of my Republican colleagues, but by one of my Democratic colleagues who pointed out to me that at the end of this 5-year budget agreement, if we were to follow through with the entire Clinton budget proposal over 5 years, that right now defense spending is our third largest item of spending in the Federal budget. If, in fact, the Clinton plan stays intact, which I do not think it will be because my colleagues on the other side, I think, will oppose the kind of deep defense cuts we are talking about, but, if we were to follow it through, general welfare and all of those programs in that category would, in fact, become the third largest item of Federal spending.

Now that is not a Republican saying that. That was a Democrat colleague of mine saying that is, in fact, what will occur at the end of the fifth year. That is not what the American people voted for in November. The American people voted for us to get Government under control. That is not what the Clinton proposal is all about.

The Clinton proposal is about dismantling our military to a level lower than at any time since before World War II and taking all of that money that would have gone for national security and putting it into new social problems, and I am not against social problems. I am a teacher by profession. I spent my life in the public schools of Pennsylvania, ran a Chapter 1 Program for 3 years. I have devoted my lifetime to helping people, but you cannot live in a world where you deny the threats exist:

Khomeini's, Mu'ammar Qadhafi's, Castro's Hitler's, Mussolini's; it is going to happen again.

My colleagues will remember in the committee yesterday; I think it was the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], a Democrat, who was a strong supporter of our military who said, "Remember the lessons of history." The argument that IKE recalled to us in the committee was: Remember what was said back in 1938. America was at a time of peace. We would never again have to worry about conflict.

We do not live in that kind of world, Mr. Speaker, and that was the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] pointing out to us that we cannot completely dismantle what has, in fact, given us the strongest and the freest country on the face of the Earth, and that is what we are doing. It is a major, fundamental shift, and the American people have to understand that.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania said "history"—I am really getting very tired of the word "new" that is being used here on Capitol Hill, and I see what Secretary Aspin used, called it the new plan for defense for President Clinton. As my colleagues know, if the President does not read history, then everything is new, and that is exactly the gentleman's point.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I want to ask the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY], because he is a great member with superb intellect on the Committee on Armed Services, could you give us a little bit of your background with respect to the military?

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of being appointed by my Congressman, then John P. Sailor, to go to the U.S. Naval Academy. I studied there for 4 years, graduated, served 5½ years on active duty, and that was, most of that period was, during the Vietnam war era. Then I got out of the military and active duty, stayed in the Reserves and continued to stay in the Reserves because I think that each of us has an obligation to try and contribute back and also that the Reserves are as vital a part of our military, and, although we are talking primarily of Active Forces, I think the Reserves are a very, very important link between the civilian world and the military. To keep that nexus is extremely important so that we know what is going on.

And so I have kept both a professional and an interest in the military, both in the Navy and as a member of the Committee on Armed Services since I came here in 1988. I have had an opportunity to go on many factfinding missions and talk to officers. A lot of my classmates, a lot of my colleagues, a lot of young marines, a lot of young sergeants, and I have been so impressed.

The military is so much different, frankly, than when I was on active duty. They are better. They are smarter. When I was on active duty, it was very difficult to find good intellectually intelligent, motivated kids who wanted to go into the military. Today, unless you have a high school degree, you are not going to get into the military unless you are really motivated. You are not going to get into the officer programs.

We have the best military, and I say that not because I have served in the military, but I am sure my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], would probably concur, and anyone who has studied the historical nature of our military would have to agree, that we have the very finest military, the very finest volunteers, and this is an important aspect of the military today. It is an All Volunteer Force. We have no draft mandating the people into the military, and, if we treat our soldiers and sailors with disrespect in terms of cutting this budget, in terms of not training them properly, in terms of not giving them a career path, we are going to create not just a hollow military, but a military made up of people who are not particularly interested in being a good officer.

Now I wanted to point out, because I think it is also important because we are talking about the strategic planning: When then-Chairman Les Aspin of the Committee on Armed Services during the last Congress sat down, he came up with what I thought were four very thoughtful alternatives for force structure, and they were based on threats around the world, they were based on economic factors, and they were based on, I think, some good commonsense approach, and I think that in fairness to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services it is most worthwhile pointing out that, if any of us was asked to take over that job, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to prepare a budget for 5 years in a relatively short time.

Now, as he readily admitted, this budget this year is really just sort of a treading-water budget. He recognizes the problems that we are going to face in the outyears of this 5-year period, but what he did during this period of time is create a 4(C) option, and in that 4(C) he defined and delineated what would be the structure of a military and what could we afford.

Now let me share with you some of those numbers because I think this points out, as my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], was saying, how we have reduced our military. At the end of 1991, we had 16 active divisions in the

military. Option C was to have nine. That would be the goal that we would have. We had 10 Reserve divisions in the military. Option C would have us with six. We had three divisions in the Marine Corps. Option C would have us with two. We had 22 Air Force active air wings. Option C would give us 10. We had 12 Reserve wings. Option C would give us eight. We had a goal of 600 ships. We were at about 528 at the end of 1991. Option C would reduce the number of ships to 340. We had 15 carriers. These are the ships which get our troops and air wings to far-off places where our Air Force is unable to go. We had 15 carriers at the end of 1991. Option C would reduce that to 12. We had 87 attack submarines which were patrolling at the end of 1991. Option C would reduce that to 40. We had 65 assault ships. Option C would reduce that to 50.

The cuts which we are discussing tonight are 2½ times the defense budget cuts which Chairman Aspin anticipated on Option C. He based his cuts for Option C on a budget of $275 billion at the end of 1997. This chart shows that we will be, based on the Clinton proposal at the end of 1997, at $248 billion.

□ 2040

The total cuts are 2½ times. So what does that lead one to assume? Because there is an interrelationship between dollars and the number of ships and the number of divisions, it means that we must go below Option C. It means that instead of having nine divisions in the Army, we will probably have eight, which is just one-half of the number of divisions that we had at the end of 1991.

Mr. BUYER. Did not General Sullivan testify today he used eight divisions in the Desert Storm operation?

Mr. MACHTLEY. That is correct. We are talking about in the last year we have taken out of our military 500,000 troops, which is the equivalent of what we will have.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That is very, very important. I hope that is stressed again and again. They are going to cut back our military preparedness as far as the Army is concerned to the equivalent of all the troops that were used in Desert Storm?

Mr. BUYER. From the Army, eight divisions.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If we have the need to go into two or three different areas, like right now we have troops in Somalia, they are talking about Yugoslavia, they are talking about something in Eastern Europe that may come up, we will not have the manpower to deal with it.

Mr. BUYER. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. HUNTER. Since we are on this point, I think it is important to remember that when we won the war in Desert Storm, Colin Powell, our Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, pointed out the reason we took so many body bags, thousands of body bags, was because we anticipated the worst in Desert Storm. But the reason we were able to bring back the great majority of those body bags empty, that there were not dead Americans to put in them, is because we won that war with what he called overwhelming force.

So the first question is, how many engagements do you want to be involved in, do you plan on being involved in, if you have to. The second question is, how do you want to win? Do you want to win with a minimum of American casualties, or do you want to have an almost level playing field because you have cut your forces down so much that you win, but you win a very bloody and protracted conflict that sends back tens of thousands of young men in body bags?

So we are looking today at a scenario, if these Clinton budget cuts go through, in which we cannot handle at the same time a Desert Storm operation and perhaps the defense of the Korean Peninsula without enormous casualties and enormous deaths.

Mr. MACHTLEY. If I may just continue on, I think one of the most important weapon systems we have is our aircraft carriers. That has distinguished our Navy, because it permits us to project power where we do not have a base, where we cannot have our Air Force.

If these cuts are put in place, if one draws a logical conclusion they are 2½ times what was anticipated by Chairman Aspin, that would mean that instead of having the 15 carriers which we had, which were located all over the world, we might end up with less than 12 aircraft carriers. Although they are saying today we will not go below 12, the dollars are not going to permit 12. Under Option B which Chairman Aspin had, that would have had eight aircraft carriers.

What are we going to ask our people to do? Be gone all the time? Not just 6 months, but 9 months, or 12 months? There is a limit on which we can ask the people in this Nation to serve in the military, and it is of great concern and why I think we need to speak out so the American people understand what course we are embarking on and where we will be at the end of 1997.

Mr. WELDON. To follow up on my colleague from California [Mr. HUNTER], his point is Colin Powell said repeatedly we just do not want to be prepared to fight a battle on an even playing field. We want to be prepared to go in with adequate strength to win decisively.

Beyond that, the real purpose of our military is to deter aggression and send a signal to all of these would-be tyrants that America is not going to sit back and take any kind of aggression any place in the world.

Remember back in the 1970's what occurred when we had the hostages in Iran and when we had the situation in Beirut? Where we had America being tested all over the world because these tyrants felt that we in fact were somewhat vulnerable?

That is what we get by weakening our military to such a level where these people can assemble other nations together and bring together military forces to try to test the will of the American people and to test the will of freedom-loving people around the world.

What is absolutely so mindboggling to me is that our strong military helped deter aggression, bring down communism, and change the face of the nations of this world. Now we are going back to a point in time that we were in in the mid-1970's when our military was unable to meet the demands that we asked of them in terms of situations that occurred in other parts of the world, like the situation in Iran.

Mr. BUYER. If the gentleman would yield, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] brought up a very good point when he talked about capabilities, and his surprise what these deep cuts in fact mean if we did our draw downs, either 8 or 10 divisions.

If we used 10 divisions in the Army in the operation of Desert Storm, we would not be able to respond to threats throughout the world. The gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] when he brought up the fact that forces could be overrun and more lives could be sacrificed in other parts of the world, that is in fact a reality.

When you have occurrences that open up on many different fronts, for example, I know the gentleman from Indiana is a strong supporter of the operations in Somalia, so we are in Somalia. We have a President that is on the verge, at this time we are unsure of our commitment as part of the U.N. peacekeeping force, of Yugoslavia.

Let us say all of a sudden something occurs that is on the same scale of a Desert Storm. Then if we take that military that has been cut down and reduced in size and put them into a regional conflict, and then all of a sudden the North Koreans pour across into South Korea, all of those Americans there on the border are in jeopardy because we do not have the backup for them.

I was really alarmed today on the Committee on Armed Services when I heard questions about, gee whiz, maybe we should be cutting back on our aircraft carriers.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY], when he talked about projection of force, you need that battle carrier group there to be able to respond and back up if you have in fact overrun positions.

The gentleman from Annapolis and the Naval Academy I am sure would like to comment on that.

Mr. MACHTLEY. If I may, I think the most important mission, and this

cannot be lost as we begin to talk about what is the mission of the military, the most important mission of the military is peacekeeping.

When the military is engaged in a conflict, we want them, of course, to be successful. But we hope that by having an adequate force structure in a way which can be positioned to avoid conflict, that we can say that we are successful because we are not having conflicts.

Al Bernstein, who is a distinguished professor and student of strategy, as I mentioned last night, has begun to think about this idea of what happens when we reduce our conventional forces below a certain level. What will the Third World nations and those who are interested in military aggression think of this and what might they do? He has come up with a theory called peer competition. They will view us as a competitor by their own peer standards, and they might be encouraged to take aggressive actions against neighbor nations. They might be encouraged to test us.

They will not do it unless they have a reasonably good chance of success. For instance, let me give you a couple of examples of hot spots. Suppose we are somehow involved in a peacekeeping mission between Iraq and Iran and we have a number of troops over there as we do now, and the Koreans, as the gentleman has indicated, determines that this is the time. We are not going to have the ability to be both there, and if there is a problem in Russia, be in the Russian theater and also in Korea. They would think of us as potentially weak and think that they could compete with us because of our lack of ability along conventional terms to develop a response.

A.M. Rosenthal, as I also mentioned last night, has provided another scare, I thought. If the President of the United States is ever put in that dilemma where our troops are being overrun and when the media is presenting vivid pictorials, up to the minute presentations on C-SPAN of the United States soldiers being overrun and killed, the logical conclusion might be by some people that they should encourage the use of nuclear weapons by us to stop the aggression of a larger conventional force.

I suspect that no one in this country has ever thought that the United States might be the first nation to use nuclear weapons. Do not let our military get down so low on conventional forces that this becomes a rally cry by those who do not understand what that would mean.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. One of the things I would like to briefly mention is we should profit from history. After World War I and the Treaty of Versailles was signed, all of the allies decided the best way to eliminate the possibility of war was to disarm. All of the allies started unilaterally disarming. Great Britain disarmed. They sunk a lot of their ships. We disarmed. The world started disarming because they said the best way to stay out of war was to disarm.

At the same time a man named Adolf Hitler started violating the Treaty of Versailles by building up his military beyond the 100,000 limit, by using them as a cadre to train millions of Germans to be members of the Third Reich.

□ 2050

And Britain went so far as to sell airplane engines to the Luftwaffe because they did not believe there was a possibility of another war. And because of not only the perceived weakness but the actual weakness of Great Britain, the United States and all the allies, Hitler felt like he could take those steps necessary to invade other countries in Europe, Poland and so forth, which led to the outbreak of World War II. And it cost millions of lives.

So there is historical precedent for what you are talking about tonight. It happened after World War I, and it caused World War II. The minute the great powers of the Earth, the free powers of the Earth are perceived to be weak, you have these totalitarians, these tyrants that want to take power and they try. And Hitler is a perfect example.

We must not allow that to happen again. We have Saddam Hussein in the World. We have the Ayatollah. We have a lot of others. And we have to be very careful and ready.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would like to make a few comments on the gentleman from Pennsylvania, earlier when he talked about the conversion and the defense conversion and your questions regarding that issue.

When you talk about history and what we did after World War II, we had the great minds of our society at that time. They created something called the atom bomb. And afterwards, as we wanted to downsize our military after World War II, we did not know and recognize the threat to Korea at the time. And we wanted to channel the great minds of our society and turn them into how it would benefit our society. And we channeled those great minds into rocket science research, and then we created something called NASA. And we have benefited as a society tenfold for the type of investment that we have had.

But when the President is talking about conversion now, I like to think about that part of our history, but that is not what is happening. We do not have that type of a channeling of great minds like was done in history, and that is what needs to be done.

I have great concerns as regards to that. And as I close, I want to make one other comment. And that is, I think the American people look out there and they see, they believe that these defense cuts are being used to pay down on the deficit. And you can go out there and talk to people in America, that is what they think. They think that if everyone is going to share in this sacrifice, and since we are not faced with a great threat of Russia, that we can downsize the military and we can take those dollars and put them on the deficit. But that is not what is happening at all.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, If the gentleman will continue to yield, I think that we have been able to discuss this at some depth. This is just the beginning. We had a special order last night. We will continue, because I think it is important that the American people understand what is going to happen to our national strategic interests, our military, how this budget will affect our military and that we are able and willing to address these issues in a bipartisan manner.

UNITED STATES SHOULD STAND FIRM WITH THE EC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Madam Speaker, the first part of my presentation tonight, which I am going to be talking on international matters, I will yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY] to finish, to discuss the armed services race.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

We will not be very long here so that the others who want to speak can speak at a decent hour.

Mr. WELDON. Madam Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY], a leader in international trade.

I just want to say, in summation, that I think the debate that we are in the middle of here in Washington is very important and critical for the future of this country. Perhaps there are some who are watching and perhaps some of our colleagues who are thinking, "Well, we spend so much on the military in this country. We should be spending on other priorities."

I am a teacher by profession. I spent my life in the public schools, running Chapter 1 programs and working on programs for kids. We have to understand in America when we fund something like health care or education, our local government pays a part of that cost. Our county governments pay a part of that cost. Our State governments pay a part of that cost. And our

Federal Government pays a part of the cost.

In the case of national defense and national security, we do not get one dime of money from local government, one dime of money from county government, one dime of money from State governments. All of that money for national security comes from the Federal Government. So by the nature of the responsibility of our jobs as Members of Congress, it is to provide the security for the health and welfare of the people of this country.

In terms of other issues, sure, we get involved in education. Sure, we get involved in health and welfare. So do all other levels of government, State government, county government. But in terms of national security, there is only one Government that funds that bill, from your National Guard that runs those armories and boards up those crack houses in your cities to the U.S. Army and the Marine Corps, we fund that at the Federal level.

People cannot be misled by the debate that goes on in this body. Our responsibility, first of all, according to our Constitution is to protect the national integrity of this country and provide for the common defense. And that is what we have got to make sure we are, in fact, doing.

I thank my colleagues for joining and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY] for his leadership on this very, very important issue.

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, I have enjoyed being here tonight with the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Pennsylvania and, of course, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island.

I came here to the well tonight. I will continue to come back, because this is a very, very important issue. It is an issue that the American people need to know that the integrity of the military is, in fact, being placed in jeopardy, that Clinton's defense budget is not a budget based upon real threats, and that is a very important item that needs to be highlighted, that it is a budget that is based upon political reasons, to reach into the military, to use those funds for spending and not to be placed on the deficit.

I am excruciatingly concerned about the well-being of our military, and I will continue to come back. And I look forward to doing other special orders with the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Madam Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, I would like to thank my colleagues who have shared with me in trying to make a presentation of what this budget represents to our national security. There should be no mistake that one of the other important aspects of this is that these numbers, which we have discussed, are the ceiling and not the floor. The firewalls in the 1990 budget agreement came down last year.

So Members, as they are going to see our defense budget, can rise up and say, "We want to take more out of the defense budget. We want to start other projects in our home districts. We want to have it go into very important programs and ideas which we have." And they have to understand the significance of where we are in the military, as they begin to whittle down and take nickels, dollars, and dimes—thousands of dollars and millions of dollars out of the defense budget.

I think it was clear by Secretary Aspin's testimony, and I have the greatest respect for him and I cannot think of a better person who has more knowledge to be in that position right now under this current administration than the former chairman of our committee. I think that he will analyze this, along with our military leaders.

I think he will sit down with the President, and I think that they will come up with some resolution; at least I certainly hope so.

□ 2100

In this way, in the 1996–1997 time frame, we are not going to be left with a hollow force. I think this period which we are going to enter, if we do not reverse ourselves, will be very much like the 1920's, and the 1930's, if we read military history. By 1939, this Nation was the 19th in the world in terms of its military power. We were behind Turkey, Spain, and Romania.

Let us get together and make sure that, as the leading Nation of this world, we are protecting our vital interests around this world and that we are reducing our defense in an appropriate and reasonable and a responsible manner, and, most important, that we are not going to send the troops home without a job and without a future.

I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland for yielding additional time.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Madam Speaker, I was pleased to allow the Members to continue their discussion on the military and what is happening in our defense industry, because what I am talking about tonight is trade and jobs, and jobs are involved here, as they are in our defense industry.

Madam Speaker, this piece "Anyone You Know?" was sent to me by Barbara Cueter, a friend from Birmingham, MI. It is self-explanatory of the problems of free trade and how working men and women are affected by trade policies. "Anyone You Know?" has been circulated for the last 4 years in the automobile industry.

ANYONE YOU KNOW?

"Joe Smith" started another day early, having set his alarm clock (made in Japan) for 6:00 a.m. While his coffee pot (made in Japan) is perking, he puts his hair dryer (made in Taiwan) to work and shaves with his electric razor (made in Hong Kong). He puts on a dress shirt (made in Taiwan) his designer jeans (made in Singapore), and a pair of tennis shoes (made in Korea).

After cooking up some breakfast in his new skillet (made in Germany), he sets his water glass (made in Russia) on a cotton place mat (made in the Philippines), selects a plate (made in England), a knife (made in Sweden) and sits down on a chair (made in Italy) to figure out on his calculator (made in Mexico) how much he can spend today. After setting his watch (made in Japan) to the radio (made in Hong Kong), he goes out, gets in his car (made in Japan) buys some gas (from Saudia Arabia) and goes looking, as he has been for a long time, for a good-paying American job.

At the end of another discouraging and fruitless day, Joe decides to relax for awhile. He puts on a pair of sandals (made in Brazil) pours himself a glass of wine (made in France), opens a box of crackers (made in Denmark) and turns on his TV (made in Japan)—and once again ponders why he can't find a good-paying American job.

That summarizes our problems with free trade very well.

Free traders believe they have the answers for trade for the United States, while those raising the issues of domestic economic needs are equally convinced of their cause. The answers to this argument are in the research of what others have said on this subject—and in the events of trade history.

Today, in beginning my remarks I want to add another voice out of the past to our current debate about free trade and its benefits to the country.

Since free trade is the primary Government policy affecting our economy, the following quotation from Professor Alfred E. Eckes, whom I will mention again later, may explain some of the problems now occurring in trade.

In 1848, there was a rally on free trade in Brussels, Belgium, and the speaker at that rally said something interesting. He stated:

The protective system of our day is conservative, while the free trade system is destructive.

It breaks up old nationalities and pushes the antagonism of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie to the extreme point. In a word, the free trade system hastens the social revolution. It is in this revolutionary sense alone * * * that I am in favor of free trade.

That speaker was Karl Marx.

When I read that Marx quote, I thought, there certainly is nothing new. It sounds like some of our social problems today. This is an old story, and perhaps there is a glimmer of truth in the quotation. It is something to bear in mind now in trade debate.

With the recent change in administration, yet another chapter is being written in the continuing 45-year-old trade debate since the United States signed GATT in 1947. The record is being written now for the administration, but one thing has not changed.

Regardless of any reasons given, the real debate is about foreign policy versus domestic economic interests, not

free trade versus protectionism. Professor Alfred Eckes, Ohio eminent research professor at Ohio University, wrote about these differences in his article, Trading American Interests, in the fall issue of Foreign Affairs.

Translated, that means the debate is about industries and jobs for Americans. The industries and jobs that were sacrificed by the U.S. Government for foreign policy reasons in this 45-year period, according to Professor Eckes, includes shoes, fish, machine tools, tableware, ferro-chromium toweling, linen handkerchiefs, clothespins, automobiles, lead and zinc, canned hams, copper—and the list goes on. The same story is continuing today.

Not much has changed since this policy was first initiated in Geneva, Switzerland at the GATT talks 45 years ago. Each succeeding year has meant a loss of American jobs.

You need to look no further than the Wall Street Journal to find out what this foreign policy means today to working Americans and to our excellent professionals who are suddenly facing a bleak future.

In a March 10, 1991, story by G. Pascal Zachardy and Bob Ortega, they spelled out in their series, Down The Up Escalator: Why Some Workers Are Falling Behind, to understand just what those American workers have lost in this race of globalization.

Quoted in the Wall Street Journal article was the Harvard economist James Medoff who said, "Today, people who lose their jobs are history." The authors explained that the quality of jobs is eroding and according to Medoff, only 38 percent of all new jobs offered health benefits, compared with 43 percent in 1979, and only 15 percent offered pension benefits, down from 23 percent.

Just what this means in a global market place was explained in the article by Milton Friedman, the Nobel Prize-winning economist. He said, "It's not widely recognized how enormous this effect is. You've got a billion people in China who suddenly are available for use with capital. You have a half billion behind the (former) Iron Curtain."

Let me remind you this does not include the population in Latin America.

So, American jobs are on the line in the globalization race—and certainly they are in our trade talks. Not much has changed has it since we first signed GATT in 1947. Now additional American business and Government sectors are subjects on the negotiating table, and working Americans and their jobs are again the subject of the debate in the unfolding events between the 12 nation European Community [EC] and the United States.

This current disagreement between EC and the United States over procurement rules offers a clear cut opportunity for Federal Government officials to explain to the American people just what is the agenda of the European Community and the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] and, how it affects Americans.

The Journal of Commerce reported that Ambassador Mickey Kantor, the U.S. Trade Representative has announced, "That Federal agencies will stop buying goods and services from EC companies if the community does not end discrimination against U.S. firms in public procurement contracts by March 22."

Ambassador Kantor is seeking comparability. That has changed several times since the first story came out, but the latest statement is another delay until April 19–20 for threatened traded sanctions by the United States.

Along with that earlier announcement, Ambassador Kantor is soliciting public comments concerning the costs and benefits of continued U.S. participation in the GATT government procurement. These comments are to be coupled with a U.S. study of the desirability and feasibility of withdrawing from the code.

This was a real opportunity for the American public not just the big multinational corporations to offer comments to the U.S. Trade Representative. Perhaps citizens still should call the White House and let their sentiments be known about GATT.

What precipitated this announcement for comments was the issuance on January 1, 1993, of the European Community procurement rules which the Washington Post reported discriminated against U.S. producers of telecommunications and electrical generating equipment.

One paper reported that at stake is "$45 billion of contracts mostly for local services like the operation of cafeterias in Government buildings. European companies typically win only $50 million a year of these contracts."

In this dispute about the procurement rules the United States claims that $16.8 billion in work was offered to European Community contractors under the GATT procurement code in 1990, compared with $7.6 billion in contracts opened to European Community companies.

The Clinton administration is threatening to abandon the GATT code and broaden the retaliation to cover $500 million in European products sold to the U.S. Government annually.

This turn of events occurred because the European Community has not agreed to drop Buy-Europe provisions, and Ambassador Kantor has emphasized the need for comparability in treatment for American business.

The heart of the dispute is a 3-percent preference the European Community grants European companies in bidding on telecommunications and power generation contracts. European Community utilities can also reject non-European Community bids. The European Community also seeks greater access in the United States to urban transport, airport, and water supply contracts in the United States. This is not surprising.

Remember, the European Community targeted the California water districts as an example of a trade barrier which must be eliminated in its 1991 Report on U.S. Trade Barriers and Unfair Practices which was entitled "Problems of Doing Business With the United States." Now we know why—they previously targeted the American contracts. By design the European Community wanted the American water contracts.

In return to the U.S. charges of continuing Buy-Europe policies, the European Community complains about Buy-America provisions for the Pentagon and State government purchases. The European Community objection lacks substance because the National Governors Association announced a year ago the intentions to drop Buy-America or Buy-local provisions.

What no one asked, however, is how the American taxpayer will feel about the dropping of Buy-America provisions. Small businesses have contracts with all levels of government, which will be affected by these talks if Buy-America is indeed removed from American laws.

This action of eliminating Buy-America was taken at the urging of the U.S. Trade Representative's office initiative which was launched, according to the Financial Times, "to convince them (the Governors) that their interests lie in gaining expanded access to the huge European Community public procurement market."

What followed sounds like a description from Professor Eckes paper that I mentioned on Trading American Interests. In his paper, the professor explained that President Eisenhower decided not to give relief to the lead and zinc industry because it would gravely compromise foreign policy objectives. That Mexico and Canada would be disturbed and, therefore, the United States borders would be less secure.

President Eisenhower also rationalized that giving a large part of our fish market to Iceland was necessary to maintain a NATO base. As fish goes, so goes Iceland, was the saying used in justifying the policy.

The nonrubber footwear, shoe industry, suffered a similar fate in the Kennedy round of trade talks. The National Security Advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski, opposed assistance to the shoe industry as harmful to the administration's overall foreign economic policy. Shoe imports from Japan and Spain rose from 18 percent in 1967 to 30 percent in 1970. Professor Eckes has a list of industries in his paper but I wonder what he would list in today's round of negotiations.

Today, we are doing the same thing that President Eisenhower did. We do

not want to compromise the European Community because of markets for American business, but we are sacrificing American jobs to open up the European market, where few Americans will work.

So, given this history, our story today about the European Community and United States dispute is very interesting. The European Community agreed to widen access to utilities contracts if a large number of U.S. States permit foreigners to bid on State and local contracts. At that time in the Bush administration, the Trade Representatives Office also asked the States to drop discriminatory provisions from their State regulations.

In fact, a similar request came from the U.S. Trade Representatives Office in 1982 that a similar request came to the governors.

At that time, according to the Washington Post, the governors were warned by the trade representative that Buy American legislation at the State and Federal level could plunge the world into a depression as serious as that of the 1930's.

The trade representative was wrong—because world has gone on and no 1930's depression occurred. But Government officials in the United States and European Community still continue to wring their hands about dire results if the United States does not sign the GATT.

One of the areas pointed out in a 1991 European Community report on Problems of Doing Business With the United States, were the $200 billion of Buy-American procurement provisions of 37 States and the Federal Government. Remember, only 7 percent of that $200 billion of Buy-American funds is Federal money.

In section VII. (C) of that 1991 report listed the 37 States the European Community targeted as needing to change because of specific business the European Community was interested in.

Some of these States mentioned in the European Community report were Alabama's, public works; California's 1980 Buy California Act; Colorado's American products for highways; Illinois' Domestic Procurement Act; Indiana's 15 percent preference for American steel; and Maryland's call for domestic not foreign steel and cement; and New Jersey's requirement for American cement on public works projects.

The reason for Buy-American for these States rests primarily with home based industries within their borders where the State has a vested interest in keeping its citizens employed. But, Buy-American has now become an item for the negotiating table at GATT and the European Community.

The list I read was from a report 2 years ago. At that time, the EC threatened to retaliate against the United States if we did not abide by the GATT procurement Code.

Corrado Pirzno-Biroli, then deputy head of the European Community's delegation in the United States stated, "The question is whether the U.S. Federal Government can deliver the States." He meant on Buy-America.

In fact, Beverly Vaughn, then Director of Government Procurement in the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, stated "that the expansion of the GATT Government procurement code to include subcentral entities, including U.S. States, is a very top priority for the EC."

So, on the negotiating table at the European Community is the right for States to conduct their own monetary affairs in procurement—for that matter, this also includes county and city authorities. That means, that local entrepreneurs are competing against foreign companies under the GATT procurement Code for Government work.

The story is still the same as it was 2 years ago. Indeed, today, elimination of Buy-America is a top priority for the European Community. Through the new rule, article 29, which was announced on January 1, the European Community acknowledged the rule "as a bargaining chip to gain access to lucrative transport and energy contracts at the State level, or at so-called sub-Federal procurement", according to the Financial Times.

This access the European Community is seeking also includes airport and water supply contracts. Every municipal Government ought to be interested in the access the European Community is seeking for airport contracts and surely California with its vast water supply network should be interested in the water contracts the European Community is seeking.

The National Association of Manufacturers [NAM] has pointed out another facet of the current dispute with the European Community over Government procurement.

In a letter to Ambassador Kantor, the National Association of Manufacturers expressed a concern that the European Community utilities directive "itself violates the GATT * * * That the directive applies to all operating entities in the four utility sectors that operate under public policy supervision, regardless of ownership (public or private)".

The provision that the 3 percent preference for contract bids containing more than 50 percent non-European Community products, the National Association of Manufacturers pointed out is that it is contrary to GATT which prohibits contracting parties from discriminating against imports in favor of domestically produced goods.

The Association also expressed concern that there is no historical or legal justification for the coverage of the procurement activities of the U.S. private sector companies under GATT. In other words, under GATT, private sector procurement would be subject to Government procurement.

This movement to control private business under international organizations is disquieting and worrisome to many businessmen. Even our elected officials are concerned about the effects of our trade agreements on American business.

Governor William Donald Schafer of Maryland wrote me recently about his concern for U.S. companies to successfully compete against Government owned and subsidized ventures, particularly in the context of a free-trade agreement. His immediate concern was about the Canadian Government's intention to build a linear alkylbenezene plant, for SFG, which is a corporation wholly owned by the Quebec Government.

Although there is more than enough production in North America of LAB, which is a cleaning agent used in detergents and cleaning products, Canada will build another plant.

At risk is a Maryland plant, Vista Chemical Co., which employs 200 people in Baltimore, which will be up against the competition from a subsidized Government company.

In fact, the Governments of Canada and Quebec provided $50 million in 2 successive years to an SFG affiliate for their losses.

I wrote the U.S. Trade Representative about this matter. What is important with this case, is what we will do if the Government is subsidizing against business.

Remember that in the binational dispute resolution panels under the Canadian Free-Trade Agreement, that American business has not fared well. In two-thirds of the decisions the Canadians have ruled against American business on pork, swine, and timber.

There in a nutshell, is but a small part of the problems that American business is experiencing in these trade agreements. And, I believe I can safely say, it will only get worse, not better.

Private citizens and companies will not have the right for redress before these binational panels, or GATT dispute resolution panel, only a country. Under the rules, an appealing country must accept the decision of a GATT panel and change its domestic law, or accept GATT sanctions.

Remember, Professor Eckes, explained in his paper why the United States embarked on this course to open up our industry and jobs to foreign companies and governments. He said, "to strengthen free world economies and help contain Soviet expansionism the executive branch has rolled back tariffs and removed trade restrictions, opening the giant American market to the world's manufacturers."

He went on to explain, "Freer trade has its costs. The record suggests that for diplomatic and national security reasons the U.S. Government sacrificed

thousands of domestic jobs to create employment and prosperity elsewhere in the noncommunist world."

This policy has not worked as well as the advertisements for it have claimed. According to the Professor, "From 1893 to 1970 U.S. exports consistently had exceeded imports, but beginning in 1971 the United States generated merchandise trade deficits in 19 of the next 21 years.

Professor Eckes wrote about the consequences of such trade imbalances and the reaction of Senator Russell Long of Louisiana, to this GATT policy. I believe that Senator Long was right.

Professor Eckes wrote that Senator Long warned Secretary of State Henry Kissinger in a 1976 Finance hearing that "If we trade away American jobs and farmers' incomes for some vague concept of a 'new international order,' the American people will demand from their elected representatives a new order of their own, which puts their jobs, their security and their income above the priorities of those who dealt them a bad deal."

So, Ambassador Kantor has a great opportunity not to repeat the mistakes of the past. The prospects are not hopeful. In this current dispute over Government procurement, the Ambassador pointed out that he is a practical person. "I'm neither optimistic nor pessimistic about the ability of the two sides to reach an agreement." He will shortly have to decide what he is. He must be either fish or fowl, but he cannot be neutral.

The EC trade commissioner, Sir Leon Brittan, has stated that the "EC is focusing their market-opening efforts at water and transport contracts offered by states and municipalities." He said, "We are really interested in their transport market."

Ambassador Kantor wants us all "singing from the same song sheet," according to the Financial Times. Well, we should all study Professor Eckes' article, and then make sure that our Government negotiators "sing off the same song sheet" as working Americans who want jobs.

In trade negotiations, the point should be jobs for Americans so they can hope and dream and plan for their future. Care less for the art of the deal.

Americans are angry with their Government policymakers, and I do not blame them. It is time for the Government to take a stand to benefit Americans not just a select few and to provide jobs in this country. If not, the piece "Anyone You Know" will be an—Epitaph—for American society.

□ 2130

BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, first let me commend the gentlewoman from Maryland for her presentation. I listened to it and agree with much of what she said. Her historical perspective on this problem is well placed. I hope, too, that our Government will wake up to the fact that we have to be more competitive and we have to be tougher in our trade policies. I thank the gentlewoman for her contributions.

Mrs. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman for those comments.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, tonight I wish to address the situation in Bosnia.

Madam Speaker, sometimes we want to turn away from the fact that at the very moment we are talking to our children, eating dinner, watching TV, others are undergoing the worst suffering imaginable.

But in the case of Bosnia we must not turn away.

A few weeks ago, much of America was shoveling walks, sledding on the hillsides and building snowmen. But in the eastern Bosnian town of Srebrenica 60,000 Muslins were being starved to death by Serbian blockades. Families were digging down in the snow there to find moss or a few blades of grass to eat, so that their families would not starve. In that town during that time, 30 to 40 people died each day, some from the storm, hunger and cold, most from the shelling. One speaker described a young girl brought into the hospital with the lower half of her face shot away. "I must confess," one man said, "we all hoped she would die. And she did."

Then finally somebody stepped forward to end this inhumane treatment, somebody took responsibility, the French general, Philippe Morillon, the French United Nations commander.

Madam Speaker, leading a convoy along a deserted mountain road, risking the possibility of mines and attacks by Serbian troops, he led his troops and trucks into the town, bringing food and relief.

But the Bosnians should not have to rely on one man's heroism. And this one success should not be confused with a solution.

On Thursday, Bosnian Muslims joined Croats in accepting the Vance-Owens peace plan.

Now we are in the third day of a cease-fire, which seems to be holding for the first time in a very long time. But the Serbs are the only ones who have not signed this plan.

And what do they want? Well, that is clear: The Vance-Owens plan would reduce the amount of territory controlled by the Serbs. It would in fact undo some of the results of what had been a ruthless attempt by the Serbs to impose ethnic cleansing on the Muslims and on the Croats in the region.

The Serbs, now clearly aided by the Yugoslavian Army and all that that army brings to it historically and through the buildup of the post-World War II era, want to keep the territory of course that they seized. Furthermore, they want nothing less than to have it cleansed of Muslims. That is why a week ago they were bombing Bosnian villages—bombing civilian families huddled in basements and in shelters, in violation of the United Nations no-fly zone provisions.

This is despicable. Yes, we live in a world where we are sometimes powerless to prevent the viciousness of human behavior.

We have seen that all too often through our lifetime and centuries preceding us. But we certainly must not be silent. We must not condone it. When it happens, people must speak out and, when possible, they must act. We must never stop trying to do what we can to right this terrible injustice upon a people who only want to live in peace.

We have to applaud the courage of the Bosnian Muslims in accepting a plan that will save lives. At the same time we must sympathize with them because this plan, in my opinion, falls woefully short of granting them the full measure of justice that they so richly deserve. Their acceptance of the plan places a special responsibility on the United States. We should applaud the decision of our Government to double the amount of supplies they airdrop on Srebrenica. We should also urge our country to persuade the Security Council to enforce the ban on flyovers. And I am pleased to report this evening that earlier this afternoon the United Nations Security Council, by a vote of 15 to 0, with only the Chinese abstaining, did in fact vote to enforce the no-fly zone.

NATO should have, and now does have, the power to shoot down aircraft violating this necessary ban.

Madam Speaker, finally, in the absence of a lasting and stable peace, the United States should support lifting the arms embargo on the Muslim population.

For one thing, this will increase pressure on the Serbs to move to the negotiating table.

The pressure was increased by the Muslims and the Croats accepting the proposal. It was increased, I think, again this afternoon by the enforcement by the United Nations, which will take effect, I understand, in 7 days, of the no-fly zone, and we should tighten the screws further, Madam Speaker, so that those who are helpless can defend themselves. And the Muslims have a right to defend themselves. It is in the interest of peace to keep these people, to allow these people to defend themselves, these families who have been kept huddled in bunkers, shelled by armies that deliberately aim at civilian

streets, picked off by snipers who aim at children walking out their front door. They have a right to defend themselves, and they should not be prohibited from defending themselves.

Madam Speaker, much as we would like to settle the conflict in Bosnia by ourselves, we cannot. But the United States can play more of a role than we have played so far.

I urge this administration to move on these steps. We all applaud the responsible actions of General Morillon along the mountain roads outside Srebrenica. We applaud the concessions of the Bosnian Muslims. Now it is time for the Serbs to be responsible. The ball is in their court. It behooves, I think, all peace-loving people who want to end this brutality, this ugly, brutal repression, the rapes, the sniping at children, the starvation of these people in these towns during the winter; we need to end this. It behooves all peace-loving countries and peoples to pressure their governments to engage themselves in trying to put an end to this absolutely horrendous situation that is happening right under the nose of Europe and is being broadcast all over the world. Nobody has an excuse for ignoring the situation. We see it daily on our television screen.

We saw just this evening on national news pictures of Bosnian men, women and children being stored like cattle into trucks and brought out of the hostile zones by the United Nations in such a brutal way that we had a number of children and others killed in the crunch to escape in these armored trucks.

We have to do something to stop this brutality, Madam Speaker.

Now is the time for the Serbs to be responsible; they must involve themselves in the quiet action of the negotiating tables where the outlines of a permanent peace can be drawn.

□ 2140

Things are moving against them and they will continue to move against the Serbs. If they were smart, they would recognize this and come to some agreement. They have been razed on the pedestal of public opinion and the public opinion on these people has now been good. It has been negative and for good reason, the rapes, the shellings, the killings, the starvation, and now of course we are seeing even more the international tribunal take action against war criminals.

So Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues this evening and all those who are interested in this area and the plight of those who are being ethnically cleansed to speak out and to lend their voices so we can get rid of this terrible, terrible experience for these desperate people.

I am pleased, Madam Speaker, to be joined by a number of my colleagues tonight who would like to participate. I am delighted to yield to any of them right now who would like to speak on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY].

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished whip for yielding to me.

I might say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] that it is an inspiration to join him tonight. I think with the gentleman doing some real ground-breaking work here, speaking out, I have been most concerned working on this beyond months now. It has been a great frustration to me that even with the interest increasing that not more people have spoken out. I can sense in recent weeks, even within the last week that there is increasing interest, more people are going to be speaking out, but I am especially gratified that the gentleman from Michigan would take the lead like this, as I say, with no diplomacy involved. The gentleman's name is a synonym for decency and courage, I say to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership, too.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. I just want to amplify on the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] and also to note that with us tonight, I have a significant amount of time after the allotted time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], I have 1 hour and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] with me has 1 hour. I do not know that we will be taking all that, but I think it very definitely is a time to speak out.

Every day the slaughter is going on. Ethnic cleansing by the Serbs constantly accelerates, and we in the West for all the media coverage, which to some degree which to some degree despite the vile atrocities we see on TV as recently as this evening, the media coverage, if you can believe it, is now diminishing. It would seem that we collectively I think nationally and in the West perhaps more so in the European area which had a greater and earlier responsibility acted to avoid responsibility at any cost.

To be concerned for this massive humanitarian and national security issue is not to be anti-Serb. There are many good and wonderful Serbs. We all know that. Many Serbs, particularly some 34 percent some months ago voted against Slobodan Milosevic, but this wily, devious, essentially evil political pro does have a significant majority support of an increasingly embattled Serbian people.

The problem was succinctly stated as recently as today's Washington Post in an article I believe by Peter Maas. This is Mr. Maas quoting Peter Lukovic, deputy editor of Vremya, an independent magazine in of all places Belgrade. Mr. Lukovic says:

> Everyone sees the United Nations and the United States as a paper tiger that roars loudly but does nothing. The problem is that Milosevic has found a toy and the toy is the world, and he has been playing with it in a very Balkan way.

Again, this is from a prominent Serb. Why cannot more of us see this obvious truth?

Or, as President Tudjman of Croatia recently told me in Zagreb, "The number one problem in the Balkans is Serbian aggression."

On three different trips to the Balkans in the last 18 months I have personally witnessed the ongoing and worsening devastation of Serbian aggression.

Although the ongoing slaughter of civilians and ever-worsening tragedy essentially could have been stopped at any time by united and forceful Western actions. This reality was initially and formally recognized by President Clinton and Secretary Christopher.

Although this still remains true, somehow that reality, the reality of that truth was avoided as the Bosnian people face possible extinction, to say nothing of the somewhat blithe response to their national sovereignty by we in the West.

Now, when Bosnia is on the verge of losing much of its territory, spinning off into a greater Serbia and as the military situation even with tens of thousands or more Western peacekeepers in there is likely to temporarily settle down, we in the West can anticipate, and I might say most of these things are very foreseeable in that when there was not one fatality yet in Bosnia, many people, those in the area knew essentially that much more serious slaughter than even in Croatia was going to happen.

So as things are going now, we can anticipate increased ethnic cleansing against the Albanian ethnic majority in Kosovo, Serb aggression in an increasingly isolated Macedonia, and military turmoil on the plains of Macedonia by a host of combatants, possibly and especially tragically even including two NATO allies.

This cannot be allowed to happen. As I have said, increasing numbers in the Congress share my concerns.

We need at this time more than ever President Bill Clinton's forceful leadership.

So, a new holocaust is raging in Europe. Two years of Western handwringing, equivocation, and defeatism have gotten Western media and Western publics accustomed to this holocaust—as if genocide in Europe was again a simple of fact of life beyond our power to prevent.

The ongoing genocide in Bosnia is no longer a front page story. This in itself is an amazing commentary on how much Western policy has broadened the boundaries of tolerable evil, in the heart of Europe at the end of the 20 century.

And yet the reality of what is happening in the Balkans continues to scream out for our attention and our action—both on moral grounds, and for the sake of our own national security.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Balkan crisis is the defining issue of the post cold war world. We are already paying the price for our failure to confront this crisis over the past 2 years. The collapse of a united Europe in 1992, the rise of national chauvinism that has so troubled Germany, are clearly related to the failure of European governments to defend their core values and principles in their own backyard. The growing aggressiveness of hardline, reactionary, irredentist forces in Russia—what observers call the red-brown coalition that is so threatening to Boris Yeltsin and to Russia's future relations with its neighbors and the West—also owes much to Western equivocation in the face of Serbia's version of this coalition.

I am equally certain that we will eventually be compelled to confront the Balkan crisis with force, as it deepens and widens. Indeed, both the Bush and Clinton administration have publicly committed themselves to do so, if and when Serb forces assault Kosovo—even as their passivity in the face of Serb aggression in Croatia and Bosnia encourage Milosevic to call this bluff.

SERBIAN TERRITORY ASPECTS

Contrast to fact Bosnia is an internationally recognized sovereign entity.

What is uncertain is how many more victims must fall to genocidal Serb aggression before we act? How much more difficult and costly we will allow this crisis to grow before we tackle it. I can only hope that our efforts today hasten our Governments coming to grips, finally, with the hard decisions that must be made.

I want to cover four points in my remarks this evening. First I will address the reality of the Balkan crisis, and the stakes at play. Second, I will review the failure of Western policy over the past 2 years, and its consequences. Third, I will examine the state of play right now in Bosnia and in Western policy, and where it points. And fourth, I will summarize what I believe the Clinton administration can still do, and must do, to get us out of this fiasco.

THE REALITY OF THE BALKAN CRISIS

A deep and persistent schizophrenia has marked Western governments' assessments of what has been going on in the Balkans over the past 2 years.

When Western governments use their eyes and listen to their consciences, values, and principles, they acknowledge that we are dealing with Nazi-style aggression.

When Western governments seek to justify their passivity in the face of this aggression, they downgrade the problem to one of age-old ethnic conflicts or civil war.

Lack of backbone and moral courage leads to blindness, defeatists seek to mask their failure with a denial and obfuscation of reality.

Yet public office is a public trust. Western leaders who have sought to downplay or obfuscate the reality of what is going on in the Balkans have violated that public trust, for the sake of short-term political convenience.

The reality is that a petty Balkan dictator, Slobodan Milosevic, with a small army of cowardly thugs and serial killers, has managed to bring genocide back to Europe—a half century after we defeated a much more powerful brand of fascism and swore "never again."

Serb forces are on an insane rampage to create an ethnically pure Greater Serbia. They are grabbing land, eradicating non-Serb life in that land through mass slaughter, rape, forcible starvation and expulsion, and the destruction of all evidence of non-Serb culture.

This is no ethnic feud or civil war. This is not a situation where Serbs, Croats, and Bosnians simply want to kill each other and might exhaust themselves in the process. This is aggression across internationally recognized borders, and this is deliberate genocide.

In Croatia, Serb forces backed by Belgrade have set up terrorist rule over one-third of Croatia. They have done this under the nose of U.N. peacekeepers introduced under the so-called Vance plan of January 1992 which de facto partitioned Croatia. They defy all Vance plan terms that would undermine their rule, whether it be demilitarization, restoring local police forces to reflect prewar local ethnic balances, or the return of displaced persons. Their clear intent is to make their destruction of non-Serb life in these lands a permanent reality, and to join these lands to a Greater Serbia. The Vance plan in Croatia has actually abetted Serb aggression, by protecting Serb forces from Croatian counterattack.

The human cost of Serb aggression in Croatia, and of the failed Western policy response, has been some 20,000 men, women, and children killed, many more wounded, several hundred thousand forcibly expelled from their homes.

I wish Cyrus Vance had taken honest stock of how little was achieved in Croatia, before attempting to apply the same approach to Bosnia.

In Bosnia, Serb forces backed by Belgrade are grabbing about three-quarters of Bosnia. They are besieging and destroying cities, massacring and driving out non-Serbs, running death camps and rape/death camps, and blocking humanitarian aid. Their clear intent is to destroy the Bosnian state, decimate the Bosnian Moslem people, maximize their conquests prior to agreeing to the same kind of de facto partition Mr. Vance blessed in Croatia, and later unite with a Greater Serbia.

What Milosevic and Karadzic are doing in Bosnia is a fascist Serb version of Hitler's so-called Final Solution for Europe's Jews, this time aimed against Bosnia's Moslems.

Serb forces have killed some 200,000 men, women, and children in Bosnia—a death toll in the range of 1 in 10 Bosnian Moslems killed.

Hundreds of thousands of Bosnian Moslems and Croats remain at risk. They are defended only by Bosnian forces that are severely outgunned by the perpetrators of genocide.

Hundreds of thousands more have been driven out of Bosnia into refugee camps in Croatia—the future Palestinians of Europe unless they can return home.

Fascist Serb forces particularly target educated, white collar Bosnian Moslems in the death camps—a systematic attempt at what some have called elitocide or the sociopolitical decapitation of a people—teachers, local leaders, engineers, those who read or wear glasses.

Serb forces particularly target women of child bearing age for destruction in the rape/death camps—what some have called genocide or the attempt to destroy the ability of a people to recreate itself.

This has gone on for 1 year now. It will be the everlasting shame of Western governments, including the United States, that they have not yet acknowledged to themselves and to Western publics that this is genocide.

Instead, the Bush administration equivocated: it concluded that the activity of Serb forces borders on genocide. And the Clinton administration states that "acts tantamount to genocide have taken place in Bosnia."

Why can't Western governments firmly and unequivocally declare the simple truth—a new genocide is underway in Europe?

The only plausible answer for me, unfortunately, is that Western governments avoid truth because the truth obligates them to take more effective action.

There are other truths obscured by Western policy. While Western governments seek to give the impression they are doing something about current Serb aggression outside Serbia. They are leaving Serb repression pretty much unchecked within Serbia.

And the reality there is that in Serbia itself, the one-third of the population that is not ethnically Serb lives in growing isolation and terror. Already severely repressed, they have every reason to believe that fascist Serb ethnic cleansing will target them once Belgrade has consolidated its outside land grabs.

Indeed, this has already begun. Serb forces have transformed Kosovo into one vast ghetto for its 2 million ethnic Albanian inhabitants. Serb forces have been engaged for several years now in what Kosovo leaders aptly describe as silent ethnic cleansing: They have driven out as many as 300,000 ethnic Albanians through political and economic repression as opposed to mass murder. This is already a travesty, but worse is clearly on the way: The same Serb war criminals who led the death squads in Croatia and Bosnia have already set up shop in Kosovo.

Similar conditions obtain in the Moslem-inhabited Sandzak region between Serbia and Montenegro, where one-fifth of the local Moslem population of 350,000 has already had to flee, and in the Hungarian and Croat inhabited Vojvodina region in northern Serbia.

Finally, the independent, democratic State of Macedonia remains unrecognized by either the United States or Europe. Subject already to fascist Serb subversion—and clearly targeted for more overt Serb aggression down the road.

There has been a Serb military buildup over recent months on Macedonia's northern border. Ambassador Whitman, who headed the CSCE spillover mission in Macedonia up to March 24, has reported that he shares Macedonian Government concerns that this Serb military buildup reflects Belgrade's intention to attack Macedonia once it consolidates its aggression in Croatia and Bosnia.

I and some others in the Congress, including Senator DECONCINI, have been calling for the recognition of Macedonia for some time. I would certainly second today the recommendations made by Ambassador Whitman in his CSCE role:

> There can be little doubt that resolution of this problem will make a massive contribution to the political and economic stability of * * * Macedonia. Considering the costly, complicated, and possibly violent measures that some see needed to resolve conflict elsewhere in the former Yugoslavia, a speedy solution to the recognition issue seems a low price to pay indeed to improve security in those parts of the region not yet destroyed and brutalized.

Indeed, I would go further. If the United States and Europe do not recognize and establish diplomatic relations with Macedonia in the very near future, we will bear a heavy historical responsibility for encouraging Serb aggression against that democratic newly independent state.

The driving force behind all the trauma in the Balkans is clear, and has been for 2 years now: genocidal Serb aggression, fueled by a virulent, atavistic nationalism.

Serb Fascist nationalism has much in common with nazism. It reflects legitimate Serb interests just about as much as nazism reflected legitimate German interests. Its ambitions are just about as mindless and endless as those of nazism. Its objectives are not just more land and racial purity, but also as much power as can be asserted and as much violence as can be waged. Like the Nazis, Serb Fascists will engage in repression and aggression until they are defeated. They have no interest in peace, or in joining the European family of nations, or in the economic development of Serbia. They are unfazed by economic sanctions—indeed they exploit them both to line their own pockets, and to reinforce the Serb nationalist psychosis.

They also respond to diplomacy and appeasement much as Nazis did—by becoming more aggressive.

THE FAILURE OF WESTERN POLICY

Western policy in the Balkans has failed. It has failed because it has still not defined unequivocally the problem, and because it has restricted itself to diplomacy, political and economic pressures, and so-called peacekeeping.

In terms of defining the problem, Western governments are still trapped in the schizophrenia I cited earlier; they know they are dealing with aggression and its victims, but continue, with their mediation efforts, to pretend that they are dealing with a morally neutral ethnic conflict.

In terms of the diplomatic tolls of Western policy to date, these have a clear track record in the Balkans over the past 2 years. They have neither deterred, nor reversed, nor contained genocidal Serb aggression.

Instead, toothless Western diplomacy has emboldened the Serb Fascists to escalate their genocidal aggression from its first phase in Croatia, where some 20,000 were killed, to its second phase in Bosnia where the death toll exceeds 200,000.

Western policy has failed because its starting point and ending points are all too clear: to avoid responsibility, and to avoid military intervention.

Worse still, Western governments have sought to preserve the illusion that diplomacy not backed by force can achieve a just and lasting solution for the Balkan crisis, and have therefore maintained the U.N. arms embargo on Macedonia. Slovenia, Croatia, and even Bosnia. That arms embargo was originally applied to all of former Yugoslavia in 1991, when the reality of genocidal Serb aggression was not yet clear to the world community.

This Western policy of maintaining a U.N. arms embargo on Serbia's present and future victims is outrageously immoral and misguided. It makes absolutely no sense. It assures Milosevic not only that he will not face Western military retaliation, but also that the West will continue to hobble his victims so that they cannot fight back themselves. What better way to embolden an aggressor?

Now, President Clinton during his campaign promised more forceful United States action to confront Serb aggression. Secretary Christopher's February 10 statement on U.S. policy toward the Balkans began with a clearer and more honest explanation of the U.S. stake in this crisis than anything I had seen over the previous 2 years. In subsequent statements before the Congress, Secretary Christopher has even warned that the present Balkan crisis threatens us with a new world war.

And yet, the administration's actual policy steps essentially have continued the failed approach of the Bush administration, with its same reliance on diplomacy, sanctions, and U.N. peacekeeping.

This policy is doomed to failure because it is divorced from the reality of what is happening in the Balkans.

The only reality it reflects is the absence of Western political will over the past 2 years, and the paralysis of defeatism which has overcome Western governments.

So what we have now is a kind of Mr. Micawber strategy. Like the character in Charles Dickens' novel, Western governments seem to hope that something will turn up to end Belgrade's rampage. They stick to the same failed diplomatic tools, in the face of obvious Serb contempt and defiance. They seem to have only one clear objective: to postpone the day of reckoning with this evil, no matter what the cost to its victims, no matter what the cost to Western interests in peace, stability, and the spread of democracy in Europe, and no matter what the likely future costs in U.S. lives.

THE STATE OF PLAY ON BOSNIA

At this juncture, Western diplomacy is lined up behind the Vance/Owen settlement proposal. Most objective observers see the Vance/Owen plan is a thinly disguised attempt to buy off the Serb aggressors by giving them most, if not all, of their objectives in Bosnia. United States Special Envoy Reginald Bartholomew has Described it in briefings to the Congress as aimed at securing the appearance—I would stress the word appearance—of preserving the Bosnian State.

Western governments are now promising stronger political and economic pressure to get Bosnian Serb leader Karadzic—a man we all know is a war criminal—to join in signing the Vance/Owen settlement. Vance and Owen are even talking about offering Belgrade a carrot—relaxation of the economic sanctions—if Karadzic will sign.

If past is precedent, we will see the Serb leaders hold out for an even more advantageous Vance/Owen settlement on paper, while continuing to grab and ethnically cleanse Bosnian territory. At some point when they calculate they have gotten all they can from Vance and Owen, they will sign on to the Vance/Owen settlement so that so-called U.N. peacekeepers will come to protect Serb forces from Bosnian and

Bosnian Croat counterattack. They will continue to defy on the ground any implementation of the Vance/Owen package that would weaken their control over the lands they have seized. The situation will stabilize, to the same extent it stabilized in Croatia with the Vance plan: There will be a situation somewhere between war and peace, which leaves Serb forces in de facto control of all territory they have seized. At that point, if not before, Serb forces will assault Macedonia and Kosovo and thereby both expand the slaughter and threaten a wider Balkan war.

And at that point, the United States will either respond militarily—if the Clinton administration is true to its word; or with more of the same futile diplomacy—if past continues to be precedent.

To sum up, Western policy is on a failed track which leads nowhere except to more genocidal aggression in the Balkans, further disintegration of peace and stability in Europe, and a mounting threat to our strategic interests.

WHAT THE UNITED STATES MUST DO

Only the United States can lift Western policy off this hopeless policy track and onto a victory strategy that is equal to our moral values and security interests. For Europe to follow us, we must lead; and for the United States to lead, President Clinton must lead us.

There are five steps President Clinton must take if he is serious about confronting genocidal Serb aggression.

First, he must define the Balkan crisis to the American public for what it is: The resurrection of genocide in Central Europe, a half century after we defeated Nazism and swore never again.

Second, he must establish early deadlines for Serb forces to sign and comply with the Vance/Owen plan on Bosnia—and to implement their earlier commitments under the Vance plan for Croatia. Without such deadlines, the Serb talk/fight tactic will simply go on—as will their on-again, off-again but ever-mounting slaughter and persecution of Bosnian and Croat civilians.

Third, he must establish a credible threat of forceful Western action: The lifting of the U.N. arms embargo from all former Yugoslav Republics except for Serbia and Montenegro, and the use of Western airpower.

Fourth, he must lead the way on Western recognition of independent and democratic Macedonia, and back up that recognition with a real preventive peacekeeping force.

Fifth, he must lead the way on real preventive peacekeeping In Kosovo, and Western insistence that its autonomy be restored.

If President Clinton does not take such steps, the United States and Europe will remain bogged down in the toothless diplomacy, ineffective sanctions, illusory peacekeeping, and pathetically inadequate humanitarian relief that sum up Western policy over the past 2 years.

If President Clinton does not take such steps, genocidal Serb aggression will continue in Bosnia and Croatia, spread to Macedonia and Kosovo, spill over to a wider Balkan war—and continue to embolden the Russian hardliners who are threatening Yeltsin's reform effort.

□ 2210

Madam Speaker, I thank the whip and I thank him, again, for his generosity and leadership. I cannot express in words enough what an inspiration it is for the gentleman to lead us off tonight.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I think I can agree with about 99 percent of what the gentleman said.

I particularly want to engage my friend from Indiana in a colloquy on what leadership we must use here in the United States to bring this butchery and this inhumanity to man to an end.

I think things are happening now, with the decision at the United Nations today. I am hopeful that the arms embargo will be lifted, as the gentleman so eloquently pointed out. It needs to be, and especially under the guise of which it was put in place in the first place back in 1991, I believe.

Things have changed markedly since then. And certainly, defenseless women and children and old and young need to have ability to defend themselves. And by not giving them that opportunity, that, in fact, as you correctly point out, emboldens the Serbians more.

I would go further. I would endorse what my friend has said tonight, that if the Serbs do not sign, if they do not come to the table, if they do not recognize the reality of what is happening to them in world opinion and the vote tonight in the United Nations, that we implore those strikes, airstrikes that the gentleman mentioned.

I am not one who believes that that will lead to a broader ground war, as you will. I hope we do not have to get to that point.

I think nobody wants us to get to that point. But if necessary to bring this carnage to an end, I think it is necessary.

People have sat on the sidelines for too long on this issue. If they will not understand words, then they have to understand something stronger than words, regretful as that might be.

So I applaud my colleague for his comments tonight, and I look forward to keying off his leadership on this and working with him in the days and hopefully not too many months to come before we set ourselves on a course to correct this situation to the extent that we can lead and correct that in the world community, thereby encouraging our European allies, especially some who have been sitting on the sidelines, to engage themselves more on the side of right and justice.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, as he knows, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] have, I think, significant resolutions in the House.

I think if we get more Members aware of that, hopefully get some encouragement for hearings and possible voting out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I think that could show the administration, hopefully inspire President Clinton that as he takes the leadership role on this, that he will have backing in the Congress, that we do care about it and will not walk away from it.

As to airstrikes, as the gentleman knows, I guess I have somewhat of a peace reputation, the nuclear freeze and trimming down the military, and I still think there are real problems with, quite frankly, the way we handled at least going into the dynamics of going into the Iraq war.

So I do not talk about aggressive military action lightly. It is a great turmoil and tragedy for me to talk about killing other human beings. But there is plenty of solid military, political, and diplomatic opinion that says that if we had hit the supply lines, some key military sites and supply lines, as to Serbia and Bosnia, if we had hit, if we had hit the heavy artillery, which is so destroying not the Bosnian military but the Bosnian people, we have an organized military regime, which in effect is massively slaughtering civilians, as the gentleman knows. Even not getting into that, if someone, if it could have been Baker or whoever or Eagleburger, whoever it was a year ago, that could have looked Milosevic in the eye and said, "We really mean it. You will face trouble. You will not get away with this." This would not have happened. This would be over with. It is only going to get worse.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, we clearly waited too long. This past administration waited too long before making the decision on Yugoslavia as an entity and facing the reality of this partitioning and then its breakup and then not choosing correctly the side of justice and righteousness and by giving those who are perpetrating these atrocities a chance to embolden themselves and to cause the havoc that they have clearly caused.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

□ 2220

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the majority whip, for yielding to me.

I appreciate that very much, and I am very pleased to take part in this discussion here tonight on the Bosnian crisis with the distinguished majority whip and my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY].

Madam Speaker, I hope I will be able to finish what I have to say in the remaining portion of this order.

It is time to end the genocide in Bosnia. The Serbian attempt to exterminate or drive Moslems out of Bosnia threatens to ignite a wider war. An unchecked Serbia will next move to ethnically cleanse Kosova, with its 90-percent Albanian population, an area that voted by 99.87 percent in favor of independence. It was at one time an autonomous region within Serbia, yet it has not been allowed to exercise its independence, because it contains an area that has a very small Serb minority.

Unchecked, Serbia could attack Macedonia, which also has a very small Serbian minority, and which also has declared independence. If either of those things happen, then Albania and Bulgaria and our own allies, Greece and Turkey, are likely to be involved in a wider war.

Yes, if unchecked, this attempt to exterminate Bosnian Moslems encourages attacks on national minorities in Slovakia, Bulgaria, Moldova, Romania, and a dozen other places, and in Lithuania and Latvia, and encourages attacks by any powerful neighbor on any small neighbor where a national minority resides. Others will say: "Let's do what the Serbs did. The European Community stood by, the United Nations stood by, NATO stood by. No one did what was needed to stop it."

Who can believe that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, for instance, would be secure and could stand up to a virulent nationalist Russia if the world community is unwilling to stop genocide in Bosnia.

This is really a moral issue. It is a moral issue that is made worse by the acquiescence and even the complicity of the European Community and the United Nations in this genocide. Less than 50 years after the Holocaust, we see ethnic cleansing, which is utterly repugnant to Americans. We see indiscriminate killing of civilian populations. We see people driven from their homes and communities, communities where they have lived for generations, and in fact, centuries. That to me is genocide.

We see the Bosnian capital of Sarajevo, that beautiful city that hosted the winter Olympics only 5 years ago, targeted for systematic destruction. We see Catholic churches and Moslem mosques destroyed all over Bosnia. We see deliberate bombardment of hospitals. That is genocide.

We see the massacre, really, the butchering by knives, and the cutting of throats, of men, women, and children. We see thousands of Moslems who have been slaughtered, their bodies dumped in the Drina River. We see territory which was 75 percent or more populated by Bosnian Moslems now cleansed of its inhabitants.

We see civilian refugee populations that have been concentrated in enclaves and then bombarded with heavy artillery and tanks. There is no other word to me to describe it but genocide. We see the bombardment of civilians at hospitals, at food distribution centers, in schools and churches where people have sought refuge.

We see concentration camps. Think of it: After 50 years, only 50 years after the Holocaust, we see concentration camps again, and we see the systematic use of rape and forced impregnation on thousands of Bosnian women. There is no other word for this but genocide.

Hundreds of thousands have died of starvation and from the bombardments on civilian population by heavy artillery trained directly on towns and cities. Over 1 million refugees have been produced by this action; 600,000 of those have been displaced and now are in Croatia, which has a normal population of about 4½ million people.

At the end of 1992, almost another 600,000 were in other Western European nations, chiefly in Germany and Austria and Switzerland and Sweden and Hungary; all told, well over 1 million people have been turned into refugees, and all of that in the name of "ethnic cleansing."

How did we get to this? Frankly, we got here by the utter impotence of the European Community and the United Nations. Mr. Vance and Mr. Owen are experienced negotiators, who surely remember Chamberlain and Munich in 1938. The question is, did they learn anything from the rape of Czechoslovakia in 1938, as they devised a plan which appeased the vicious dictatorship intent upon expansion and aggression and ethnic purity?

How can we forget, and can we ever forget, the images of the elected vice president of Bosnia, taken from a U.N. convoy and executed by Serbian thugs while the United Nations did nothing? How can we forget the continuous bombardment, now for almost a year, of the capital city of Bosnia, Sarajevo, that city of half a million people. How can we forget the bombardment of hospitals and communications centers and water systems, the newspaper, the religious and educational centers in that city? How can we forget that the United Nations refused to enforce the European Community-brokered resolution, the London accords, an agreement signed by all sides to this complicated conflict, which mandated the surrender of heavy weapons to the United Nations? How can we forget that later, after refusing to enforce the London accords, the United Nations even refused to enforce its own resolutions involving the impoundment of heavy weapons in that area.

We need to remember that U.N. personnel have been monitoring the bombardment by counting the number of shells that are fired on the city of Sarajevo and that fall on that martyred city each day. How can we forget the image of entire extended families going to their deaths: the 3-year-old hiding behind her grandmother's skirts, only vaguely comprehending what was about to happen, the grandfathers and the elders of the extended families, people who have seen two vicious world wars, each lined up in turn and shot, men, women, and children of all ages?

How can we forget the concentration camps still operating even after U.N. resolution after resolution has demanded total access. We need to remember the camps that have not been entered, that still operate, because there has been no enforcement at all of U.N. resolutions.

Mr. Milosevic might as well have relied on the United Nations when he planned and directed Serbia's actions during 1991 and 1992. He could not have devised a more effective program to accomplish Serbia's goals of ethnic cleansing, the destruction of Bosnia, and the destruction of a population of Slavs who happened to practice the Moslem religion.

The U.N.'s actions have themselves become the linchpins to ensure the success of Serbian policy. During 1991, U.N. resolution after resolution was passed yet was not enforced. The Croatian city of Yukovar was destroyed, the ancient historic city of Dubrovnik was bombarded for many weeks; agreements were signed, resolutions were passed, and then ignored for months at a time.

Then finally, in December 1991, after the Serbs had taken one-third of Croatian territory, they agreed to the placement of a U.N. force. This merely ratified the taking by force of that one-third of the territory, because the Serbs refused and have continued to refuse to comply with the provisions of the creation of the U.N. force to normalize relations, to put the heavy artillery under U.N. surveillance, and most importantly, to let people who had been driven from their homes return to those homes.

□ 2230

Serbia did not intend then nor does it intend now to allow any of the people who were driven from their homes in 1991 in Croatia to return to their homes. One U.N. action, one of those resolutions, the arms embargo on the former Yugoslavia which was imposed early in 1991, before even the beginning of the Bosnian action, has profoundly affected the course of this genocide. No other single act could so completely compromise the independence and security of U.N. members such as Croatia and Bosnia. It denied their effective self-defense because both Croatia and

Bosnia required arms from outside. Cut off, they were nearly defenseless against a Serbian-dominated Yugoslavia that was armed to the teeth.

First Croatia and now Bosnia, have been denied access to the tools of their own defense and, in the case of Bosnia, survival. They have been denied access to the tanks and the artillery that would have been necessary to balance the forces in this war, while the Bosnian Serbs have always had access to former Yugoslav arms and to modern weaponry that has moved freely across the borders within Yugoslavia. Those arms now in the hands of the Bosnian Serbs have been readily supplied by Serbia. Yet the Croatians first, and then more recently the Bosnians, have been unable to get anything like the arms necessary to defend their national existence.

At the same time, Serbian and Bosnian Serbs together have maintained a cordon on humanitarian supplies needed by hundreds of thousands of people, supplies that have been stopped in a most frustrating manner for days at a time. Convoys have been held up and supplies needed by starving people have not gotten through.

U.N. policy has been one of selective enforcement. The U.N. arms embargo denied Croatia and Bosnia what was needed for their defense, but U.N. resolutions that demanded the opening of concentration camps and the delivery of relief supplies to the needy population went unenforced. So did resolutions on turning over heavy artillery to the United Nations, and on the airports being opened for humanitarian aid, and on enforcement of the no-fly zone—until today, when the U.N. again passed a resolution—it will be interesting to see whether there is any enforcement of that resolution. While all of those actions and resolutions by the United Nations have gone unenforced, U.N. policy has contributed, and we have acquiesced, in the genocide comprising the massacre of family after family and the bombardment of civilians seeking refuge in schools and churches, and the rape and murder of women and children. The impression has been left, and what other impression could possibly have been reached by Slobodan Milosevic and his hierarchy, what other impression could be reached but that the United Nations is never going to enforce any of the resolutions.

We have one chance left. There is a ceasefire which has held for a couple of days. By all indications of anything that has happened previously, it probably will not hold because it does not serve Serbian interests, and Serbian interests on the part of Mr. Milosevic continue to be ethnic cleansing and the seizure of as much territory as possible. But if that ceasefire does not hold, then it really is time to take some steps.

These are the steps that I would suggest need to be taken. First, freeze every asset of Serbia and Montenegro, wherever it is outside that nation. Second, close the borders of Serbia and Montenegro, to strengthen the sanctions. The borders should be closed at Hungary, and Bulgaria, and Romania, and Macedonia, and once and for all close the port at which every once in a while some very extensive materials seem to get through into Montenegro, and thereby into Serbia.

Third, place sanctions on all travel and commerce to Serbia and Montenegro.

Fourth, demand the turnover of the artillery and the tanks that are in the hands of the thugs and the war criminals, now not in two weeks or a month, in the forlorn hope that maybe this whole thing will go away within that two weeks or a month, but now. And if those weapons are not turned over, then we really have to consider one of two other things. Air strikes on that artillery and air strikes on those tank emplacements that surround Sarajevo and other places where bombardments of civilian populations occur; or an end of the embargo on arms to Bosnia so that they can defend themselves if it becomes absolutely clear that the United Nations does not intend to enforce its resolutions. Most important, we have to close the concentration camps, and send U.N. forces in to escort the inmates out of those concentrations camps.

If we do not do those simple things, if the present ceasefire does not hold up, and if this does not lead to the end of this genocide and this ethnic cleansing that is going on, then we can expect that Serbia will go forward, that it will attack Kosovo because the United Nations will virtually have invited it. Kosovo, with its 90 percent Albanian population, would end up being an incredible bloodbath as the Serbs continue the process of ethnic cleansing. Who in Serbia would believe that the European Community, or the United Nations, or NATO, or anyone else would do anything in Kosovo, given the lack of enforcement of U.N. resolutions in Bosnia?

Those are the steps that I think we really have to take if the present cease-fire does not hold up and if the Serbian militias in Bosnia do not sign the Vance-Owen agreement, and then abide by the Vance-Owen agreement, flawed though it happens to be.

But then why should Americans care about what happens in Bosnia and Kosovo? Genocide is a profound, moral issue and ethnic cleansing is repugnant to American principles. Genocide poisons the relationships among peoples and the acceptance of genocide as a political tool destroys international relationships and sanctions mass murder. That is very clear.

But this is also a critical strategic issue, because if this attempt to wipe out Bosnia and exterminate Bosnian Moslems is allowed to succeed, then Bosnia will stand as an open invitation to attacks on national minorities in countries all over Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

If Mr. Milosevic uses the Bosnian example to then continue his ethnic cleansing in Kosovo and Macedonia, then Albania, and Bulgaria, and our allies, Greece and Turkey, will be dragged into the battle on different sides, and we will indeed have an avoidable but expanding war.

So it is time, in my view, to end the genocide in Bosnia, and the time could not be any more appropriate now, except that if it could have happened a year ago.

I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my friend for his comments, and they were right on the mark. And I share his views, and I share his thoughts on Kosovo especially. That is next, and there is, as we all know today in Kosovo the Albanian population which is the vast, vast majority and is suffering under tremendous human rights abuses and brutality of all sorts.

□ 2240

It can only accelerate, given the emboldened situation of Milosevic and the Serbs vis-a-vis the inaction of the international organizations that have had the obligation to enforce these sanctions.

So I thank my friend for his comments, and I look forward to working with him and the gentleman from Indiana on this issue.

Mr. OLVER. I thank very much the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership on this issue and for reserving the time and yielding the time for us to make these comments tonight.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a large number of my congressional colleagues to address an issue of ongoing deep concern: the bloody conflict in the Balkans.

After nearly 2 years, the crisis in the Balkans continues to rage and reports of atrocities committed against Croat and moslem civilians continue to surface. This weekend, Americans watched their nightly news and again saw the hungry, frightened, and bloodied faces of the victims of this brutal war. This time, the Serb aggression was centered in eastern Bosnia and the town of Srebrenica.

The direct victims of this war number in the hundreds of thousands: Those who have been driven from their homes; those who have been systematically raped, tortured, and killed; and those who will have to live with deep emotional scars from having witnessed the atrocities of this war.

The United States has recently adopted a more aggressive approach to combating the hardship in the Balkans. The Clinton administration has initiated critical humanitarian airdrops to areas besieged by Serb forces and cut off from U.N. ground convoys. The admin-

istration is promoting the enforcement of a no-fly zone over Bosnia and stronger sanctions against Serbia.

However, these actions are not enough. The United States must end the arms embargo of Bosnia and Croatia in order to enable the people to defend themselves. The current arms embargo of the former Yugoslav states has only served to give Serb forces a military advantage over Bosnian and Croat forces. These nations must be allowed the fundamental right to self-defense.

It is also critical that all nations reevaluate the role of the United Nations in maintaining the peace. For we are all victims to this conflict if the international community cannot respond to crises of this proportion and brutality. When the United Nations was constituted in the 1940's, the international community was united in its desire to prevent the recurrence of the horrors and atrocities committed during World War II. Yet, today we are seeing these same atrocities repeated in the former Yugoslavia—and the world community is paralyzed and unwilling to act.

The community of nations must reassess their obligations to humanity and international law in order to ensure that the United Nations functions effectively in promoting world peace. At a time when ethnic rivalries rage in the former Yugoslavia and threaten to ignite in other countries, the world community must unify and empower the United Nations to prevent the spread of atrocities.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, today I wish to join my fellow colleagues from both parties in condemning the horrible atrocities that have been occurring in the Balkans for almost 2 years now. Since June 1991, the Government of Yugoslavia and its Serb allies in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina have been carrying out a horrific campaign of violence against the peoples of Croatia and Bosnia.

It is not the people of Serbia who are responsible for these crimes against humanity, however; the majority of Serbs doubtlessly oppose this war. But the people of Serbia have been denied a voice in this matter because they have the misfortune of being one of the last countries on Earth to be under the thumb of communism.

Their thuggish leader, Slobodan Milosevic, has replaced Marxist ideology with that of Greater Serbian nationalism, but the reality of Communist rule remains the same: unelected leadership, massive internal repression, and nervous neighbors. What have Mr. Milosevic and his comrades accomplished in the last 2 years? At least 30,000 dead—by some estimates, as many as 160,000 dead—2 million refugees, and the devouring of 30 percent of one country and 70 percent of another. All of this has been perpetrated through the systematic use of terror, rape, and, of course, the odious ethnic cleansing.

Not since the late 1940's and early 1950's, when the East European Communist regimes were cleansing their societies, has Europe seen something so atrocious. And what has Europe done about this? Nothing. Towns are emptied forcibly, women are raped, men rot in concentration camps, children are killed, maimed, or emotionally scarred, Sarajevo is shelled relentlessly, Dubrovnik is ruined, and Europe watches. Yes, the European Community, the United Nations, and the United States have attempted to deliver humanitarian aid and mediate the conflict.

But these efforts have reached the point of absurdity. There are reports that as much as 25 percent of the aid has gone to Serb soldiers. United Nations convoys are regularly tied up for days and weeks so that the Serbs can inspect them. The recent airdrops from 10,000 feet are literally a drop in the bucket. Besides, this aid, while well-intentioned, doesn't even get close to the root of the problem.

The root is, of course, Mr. Milosevic and his Communist nationalist cronies. So far, efforts to mediate the conflict have afforded Milosevic equal status with the Bosnians and Croatians. This is preposterous. He is the aggressor. This is why all of the various plans the West has brokered so far have failed so miserably. This man, recently described in the American Spectator as aloof, obsessed, and devoid of human compassion, is not part of the solution; he is the problem.

The West must reject appeasement of Milosevic and his allies. The West has an interest in stopping this aggression. Not only humanitarian and moral interests, but real, hard political interests as well. There is a real danger that if Milosevic brings the war to Kosovo or Macedonia, several other countries, including two NATO allies, will be sucked in. Clearly, we want to prevent a situation that would pit Greece and Turkey against one another.

Likewise, appeasement of Serb aggression sends all of the wrong signals to Moscow. If you think about it, Serbia is but a microcosm of Russia. Both are formerly dominant republics of now defunct empires. Both peoples are scattered throughout numerous former republics which are now independent countries. Probably the only thing preventing a repeat of a Yugoslav-type situation in the former Soviet Union is the decency and civility of Boris Yeltsin and his foreign minister, Mr. Kozyrev. Remove these two from the equation and you just may have ethnic cleansing in the Ukraine and the Baltics.

Given the profound implications, both moral and geopolitical, of appeasing aggression in the Balkans, it is time for the West to take a stand. It is time to rise up in unison and really help the victims of the Serb onslaught. Now I have been and remain opposed to using U.S. troops to solve this problem. If anybody sends in troops to defeat the Serbs, it should be the Europeans.

But it seems to me that there is much we can do short of invading Serbia to halt their aggression. How about invoking the Reagan Doctrine? This policy proved its mettle time and again in the 1980's. It drove the Soviets from Afghanistan, the Cubans from Angola, and forced the Sandinistas to cry uncle. The Bosnians have demonstrated their courage and their love for their homeland, but they are totally outgunned by the Serbs. Let's level the playing field by giving them the arms with which to defend themselves.

We can also take steps to further isolate Serbia and destabilize the Milosevic dictatorship. Sanctions to date have been toothless. Let's upgrade them and really tie the noose around Serbia. There is a definable democratic opposition to Milosevic, one that he has been trying to crush for years. Let's work with them to mobilize opposition to the regime and its war policies.

The time is now, Mr. Speaker, before it is too late. Bosnia is on the verge of extinction. Kosovo and Macedonia nervously await their fate. Boris Yeltsin is on the ropes.

Serbian victory will make not only a mockery, but a shambles of the new world order.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DE LUGO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

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. HUFFINGTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:),

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, on April 21 and 22.

Mr. THOMAS of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TALENT, for 60 minutes, on April 1.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, for 5 minutes each day, on April 1 and 2.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLYBURN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAUGHLIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BONIOR, for 60 minutes each day, on July 2, 12, 13, 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. HUFFINGTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROGERS.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

Mr. CRANE in two instances.

Mr. BONILLA.

Mr. MCKEON.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. MICHEL in two instances.

Mr. HORN in two instances.

Mr. OXLEY in two instances.

Mr. BATEMAN.

Mr. GINGRICH in two instances.

Mr. LAZIO.

Mr. KYL in two instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. ROBERTS.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

Mr. COBLE.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
Mr. SMITH of Texas.
Mr. PORTER.
Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLYBURN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BARCIA.
Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.
Mr. TAUZIN.
Mr. ENGEL.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.
Ms. SLAUGHTER.
Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.
Mr. TRAFICANT in two instances.
Mr. SARPALIUS.
Mr. MARKEY in two instances.
Mr. PENNY.
Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.
Mr. MANTON.
Mr. BORSKI in two instances.
Mr. ORTIZ.
Mr. MARTINEZ.
Mr. ACKERMAN.
Mr. FORD of Michigan.
Mr. TEJEDA.
Mrs. MALONEY.
Mr. VENTO.
Mr. RICHARDSON.
Mr. BOUCHER.
Mr. COYNE.
Mrs. MINK.
Mr. FAZIO.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

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. 252. An act to provide for certain land exchanges in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

S. 284. An act to extend the suspended implementation of certain requirements of the food stamp program on Indian reservations, and for other purposes.

S. 662. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, and title XIX of the Social Security Act to make technical corrections relating to the Veterans Health Care Act of 1992.

S.J. Res. 27. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Hanna Holborn Gray as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 28. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Barber B. Conable, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 29. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Wesley S. Williams, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution designating March 1993 and March 1994 both as "Women's History Month."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 1, 1993, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

990. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting notification making available emergency appropriations in budget authority for the Departments of Agriculture, Education, and the Interior and Related Agencies pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 102-368; Public Law 103-381 (H. Doc. No. 103-60); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

991. A letter from the Acting Director, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting a list of property that is covered by the Corporation as of September 30, 1992, pursuant to Public Law 101-591, section 10(a)(1) (104 Stat. 2939); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

992. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Thomas J. Pickering, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to Russia, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

993. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a copy of their management report, pursuant to Public Law 101-576, section 306(a) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Government Operations.

994. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

995. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

996. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the report and recommendation concerning the claim of Mr. Kris Murty for reimbursed relocation expenses, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3702(d); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

997. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the 14th annual report on the activities of the Board during fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1209(b); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

998. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Domestic Finance, Department of the Treasury, transmitting notification of the Secretary's determination that the current permanent debt limit will be sufficient only until early April, and that in the absence of a debt limit increase by that time, Treasury will be unable to invest or roll over maturing investments of trust funds and other Government accounts, including the civil service retirement and disability fund of the Federal Employees' Retirement System, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 8348(1)(2); jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABO: Committee of Conference. Conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 64. Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998 (Rept. 103-48). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BEILENSON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 145. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany 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, and against consideration of such conference report (Rept. 103-49). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 147. Resolution providing for the consideration of (H.R. 1430) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit (Rept. 103-50). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. NUSSLE (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. INGLIS, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT):

H.R. 1545. A bill to make applicable to the Congress certain laws relating to the terms and conditions of employment, the health and safety of employees, and the rights and responsibilities of employers and employees; and to repeal and prohibit certain privileges and gratuities for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, the Judiciary, and Government Operations.

By Mr. NUSSLE (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. INGLIS):

H.R. 1546. A bill to provide that pay for Members of Congress shall be reduced whenever total expenditures of the Federal Government exceed total receipts in any fiscal year, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Post Office and Civil Service, and Rules.

H.R. 1547. A bill to eliminate the franking privilege for the House of Representatives, to establish a spending allowance for postage for official mail of the House of Representatives and to limit the amount and type of mail sent by Members of the House of Representatives; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1548. A bill to provide for the adjournment of Congress by September 30 each year; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1549. A bill to amend the act of September 30, 1961, to exclude professional baseball from the antitrust exemption applicable

to certain television contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONIOR:

H.R. 1550. A bill to provide that no Federal funds may be obligated for any purpose with respect to the Berz-Macomb Airport in Macomb County, MI, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 1551. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from unrelated business taxable income for certain sponsorship payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. POMBO, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. KYL, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. FAWELL, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. BOEHNER:

H.R. 1552. A bill to repeal the Helium Act, to require the Secretary of the Interior to sell Federal real and personal property held in connection with activities carried out under the Helium Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 1553. A bill to provide for daylight saving time on an expanded basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1554. A bill to amend title 3, United States Code, and the Uniform Time Act of 1966 to establish a single poll closing time in the continental United States for Presidential general elections, set Presidential general elections on the first Saturday in November, and extend daylight saving time to the first Sunday in November; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1555. A bill to terminate the Ground-Wave Emergency Network [GWEN] Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 1556. A bill to extend until December 31, 1998, the temporary suspension of duties on 7-Acetyl-1,1,3,4,4,6-hexamethyltetrahydronaphthalene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1557. A bill to suspend until December 31, 1998, the duty on pectin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1558. A bill to suspend until December 31, 1998, the duty on 6-Acetyl-1,2,3,3,5-hexamethylindan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

H.R. 1559. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an investment tax credit for stage 3 aircraft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PENNY (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. WALSH, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FROST, Mr. HAMILTON, and Mr. MURPHY):

H.R. 1560. A bill to authorize an endowment grant to support the establishment of area program centers to promote and organize locally based, volunteer operated, private citizens' scholarship programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 1561. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a program for the research, interpretation, and preservation of various aspects of colonial New Mexico history, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

H.R. 1562. A bill to amend title V of Public Law 96-550, designating the Chaco Culture Archeological Protection Sites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA (for herself and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 1563. A bill to establish a comprehensive policy with respect to the provision of health care coverage and services to individuals with severe mental illnesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MICA, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. FOWLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CANADY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mrs. MEEK):

H.R. 1564. A bill to save Florida Bay; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 1565. A bill to prohibit the importation of foreign-made flags of the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 1566. A bill to amend the wetland conservation provisions of the Food Security Act of 1985, establish a Gulf of Mexico Commission, and establish a Gulf of Mexico Program Office within the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 1567. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that tax-exempt interest shall not be taken into account in determining the portion of Social Security benefits subject to income taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 1568. A bill to prohibit the importation of semiautomatic assault weapons, large capacity ammunition feeding devices, and certain accessories, to provide for the public safety of the citizens of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H.R. 1569. A bill to authorize States to regulate certain solid waste; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAROCCO:

H.R. 1570. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Idaho as wilderness, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Natural Resources and Agriculture.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself and Mr. KLEIN):

H.R. 1571. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the possession, transfer, and certain exports of restricted weapons, the manufacture of firearms capable of accepting a silencer or bayonet without alteration, and the possession and transfer of large capacity ammunition feeding devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYL (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. GINGRICH):

H.R. 1572. A bill to award grants to States to promote the development of alternative dispute resolution systems for medical malpractice claims, to generate knowledge about such systems through expert data gathering and assessment activities, to promote uniformity and to curb excesses in State liability systems through Federally mandated liability reforms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 1573. A bill to strengthen the international trade position of the United States by extending the Super 301 provision of U.S. trade law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 1574. A bill to permit national banks to underwrite municipal revenue bonds; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1575. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for Social Security taxes imposed on wages paid for dependent care services in the home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.R. 1576. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate the excise tax on certain vaccines and extend the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ORTIZ (for himself and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 1577. A bill to amend the Foreign Trade Zones Act to clarify that crude oil and derivatives thereof consumed in refining operations are not subject to duty under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NUSSLE (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. INGLIS):

H.J. Res. 170. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the number of consecutive terms a person may serve as a Representative or Senator, which shall be known as the Citizen Representative Reform Act New Blood Provision; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE:

H.J. Res. 171. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States establishing English as the official language of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.J. Res. 172. Joint resolution designating the month of May 1993 as "U.S. Armed Forces History Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.J. Res. 173. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding school prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MANTON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BARLOW, Mr.

HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. KING, Mr. TALENT, Mr. GRANDY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HAMILTON, and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana):

H. Res. 146. Resolution objecting to any further increase in the inland waterway fuel tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

71. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact; 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. 5: Mr. VOLKMER and Mr. KREIDLER.

H.R. 15: Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 43: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 58: Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 59: Mr. HOKE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CASTLE, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 118: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 139: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BONILLA, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 142: Mr. EWING.

H.R. 150: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 166: Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 207: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 214: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 300: Mr. TALENT, Mr. ISTOOK, and Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 325: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GALLO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. STUDDS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 326: Mrs. MINK, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 334: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. WATT, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 349: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 419: Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 437: Ms. SCHENK.

H.R. 477: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. SWIFT.

H.R. 509: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 513: Mr. WELDON, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. HOKE, Mr. CANADY, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 535: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. DANNER, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MANN, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. TORRES, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SHARP, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 562: Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 651: Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

H.R. 709: Mr. CARR, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 723: Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 727: Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. MEEK, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 728: Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 749: Mr. TRAFICANT and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 760: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 762: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HERGER, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 767: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 814: Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. QUINN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. ISTOOK, and Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 857: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 883: Mr. CRAPO.

H.R. 885: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOKE, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. HORN, Mrs. FOWLER, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. LAZIO.

H.R. 915: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 930: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. DORNAN.

H.R. 959: Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 962: Mr. HOKE, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HAYES, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. CALLAHAN, MR. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. KYL, Mr. COPPERSMITH, and Mr. BREWSTER.

H.R. 967: Mr. SHAW, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HOUGHTON, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. CANADY, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 977: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 998: Mr. INHOFE and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 999: Mr. ROYCE, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. HOAGLAND.

H.R. 1026: Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 1067: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 1076. Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 1080: Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1086: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 1120: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 1122: Mr. KYL and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1123: Mr. KYL and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1124: Mr. KYL and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1126: Mr. KYL and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1127: Mr. KYL.

H.R. 1128: Mr. KYL, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H.R. 1129: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1141: Mr. SHAW and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1151: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 1169: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1208: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1222: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LEVY, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 1237: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FROST, and Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 1260: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1295: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MINGE, Mr. HOKE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. WELDON, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. ARMEY, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. GOSS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. SHEPHERD, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1296: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 1311: Mr. LINDER, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 1443: Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.R. 1520: Mr. SYNAR.

H.J. Res. 6: Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIM, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. ROGERS, MR. ROWLAND, Mr. SABO, Mr. STARK, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SWETT, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. QUINN, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SLATTERY, Ms. LONG, Ms. WATERS, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.J. Res. 77: Mr. HANCOCK.

H.J. Res. 78: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. WELDON.

H.J. Res. 84: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. ISTOOK, and Mr. PARKER.

H.J. Res. 94: Mr. MCCRERY.

H.J. Res. 133: Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.J. Res. 148: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FISH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CLYBURN, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H. Con. Res. 3: Mr. HANCOCK.

H. Con. Res. 5: Mr. REED.

H. Con. Res. 6: Mr. HOLDEN.

H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 70: Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. BYRNE.

H. Res. 11: Mr. ZELIFF and Mr. KYL.

H. Res. 35: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. NADLER.

H. Res. 108: Mr. STUMP.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1430

By Mr. CASTLE:

—At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO RESCISSION AUTHORITY

SECTION 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 1993".

SEC. 202. LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO RESCISSION AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the provisions of part B of title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, and subject to the provisions of this section, the President may rescind all or part of any discretionary budget authority for fiscal years 1994 or 1995 which is subject to the terms of this title if the President—

(1) determines that—

(A) such rescission would help balance the Federal budget, reduce the Federal budget deficit, or reduce the public debt;

(B) such rescission will not impair any essential Government functions;

(C) such rescission will not harm the national interest; and

(D) such rescission will directly contribute to the purpose of this rule title of limiting discretionary spending in fiscal years 1994 or 1995, as the case may be; and

(2) notifies the Congress of such rescission by a special message not later than twenty calendar days (not including Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays) after the date of enactment of a regular or supplemental appropriation Act for fiscal year 1994 or 1995 or a joint resolution making continuing appropriations providing such budget authority for fiscal year 1994 or 1995, as the case may be.

The President shall submit a separate rescission message for each appropriations bill under this paragraph.

SEC. 203 RESCISSION EFFECTIVE UNLESS DISAPPROVED.

(a) Any amount of budget authority rescinded under this title as set forth in a special message by the President shall be deemed canceled unless during the period described in subsection (b), a rescission disapproval bill making available all of the amount rescinded is enacted into law.

(b) The period referred to in subsection (a) is—

(1) a congressional review period of twenty calendar days of session during which Congress must complete action on the rescission disapproval bill and present such bill to the President for approval or disapproval.

(2) after the period provided in paragraph (1), an additional ten days (not including Sundays) during which the President may exercise his authority to sign or veto the rescission disapproval bill; and

(3) if the President vetoes the rescission disapproval bill during the period provided in paragraph (2), an additional five calendar days of session after the date of the veto.

(c) If a special message is transmitted by the President under this title and the last session of the Congress adjourns sine die before the expiration shall not take effect. The message shall be deemed to have been retransmitted on the first day of the succeeding Congress and the review period referred to in subsection (b) (with respect to such message) shall run beginning after such first day.

SEC. 204. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title—

(a) the term "rescission disapproval bill" means a bill or joint resolution which only disapproves a rescission of discretionary budget authority for fiscal year 1994 or 1995, in whole, rescinded in a special message transmitted by the President under this title; and

(b) the term "Calendar days of session" shall mean only those days on which both Houses of Congress are in session.

SECTION 205. CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO RESCISSIONS.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL SPECIAL MESSAGE.—Whenever the President rescinds any budget authority as provided in this title, the President shall transmit to both Houses of Congress a special message specifying—

(1) the amount of budget authority rescinded;

(2) any account, department, or establishment of the Government to which such budget authority is available for obligation, and the specific project or governmental functions involved;

(3) the reasons and justifications for the determination to rescind budget authority pursuant to this title;

(4) to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated fiscal, economic, and budgetary effect of the rescission; and

(5) all factions, circumstances, and considerations relating to or bearing upon the rescission and the decision to effect the rescission, and to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated effect of the rescission upon the objects, purposes, and programs for which the budget authority is provided.

(b) TRANSMISSION OF MESSAGES TO HOUSE AND SENATE.—

(1) Each special message transmitted under this title shall be transmitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate on the same day, and shall be delivered to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House is not in session, and to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session. Each special message so transmitted shall be referred to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Each message shall be printed as a document of each House.

(2) Any special message transmitted under this title shall be printed in the first issue of the Federal Register published after such transmittal.

(c) REFERRAL OF RESCISSION DISAPPROVAL BILLS.—Any rescission disapproval bill introduced with respect to a special message shall be referred to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as the case may be.

(d) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

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

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

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

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

(e) POINTS OF ORDER.—

(1) It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any rescission disapproval bill that relates to any matter other than the rescission budget authority transmitted by the President under this title.

(2) It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any amendment to a rescission disapproval bill.

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

By Mr. MICHEL:

—Page 1, strike line 4 and insert the following: "This title may be cited as the 'Enhanced Rescission/Receipts Act of 1993.'".

—Page 1, line 9, after "1995" insert "or veto any targeted tax benefit within any revenue bill".

—Page 1, lines 13, 14, and 17, insert "or veto" after "rescission" each place it appears.

—Page 2, line 3, insert "or a revenue bill containing a targeted tax benefit" after "1995,".

—Page 2, line 9, strike "rescission" and insert "rescission/receipts".

—Page 2, line 7, insert "(1)" after "(a)" and after line 10 add the following:

(2) Any provision of law vetoed under this Act as set forth in a special message by the President shall be deemed repealed unless, during the period described in subsection (b), a rescission/receipts disapproval bill restoring that provision is enacted into law.

—Page 2, lines 13, 17, and 18, strike "rescission" each place it appears and insert "rescission/receipts".

—Page 2, line 23, insert "or veto" after "rescission".

—Page 3, strike lines 3 through 7 and insert the following:

(1) The term "rescission/receipts disapproval bill" means a bill or joint resolution which—

(A) only disapproves a rescission of budget authority, in whole, rescinded, or

(B) only disapproves a veto of any provision of law that would decrease receipts,

in a special message transmitted by the President under this Act.

(2) The term "calendar days of session" shall mean only those days on which both Houses of Congress are in session

(3) The term "targeted tax benefit" means any provision which has the practical effect of providing a benefit in the form of a differential treatment to a particular taxpayer or a limited class of taxpayers, whether or not such provision is a number by its terms to a particular taxpayer or a class of taxpayers. Such term does not include any benefit provided to a class of taxpayers distinguished on the basis of general demographic conditions such as income, number of dependents, or marital status.

—Page 3, line 9, insert "or vetoes any provision of law" after "authority".

—Page 3, line 12, insert "or the provision vetoed" before the semicolon.

—Page 3, line 16, insert "or veto any provision" after "authority".

—Page 3, line 19, insert "or veto" before the semicolon.

—Page 3, line 21, insert "or veto" after "rescission" each place it appears.

—Page 4, strike lines 9 through 11 and insert the following:

(c) REFERRAL OF RESCISSION/RECEIPTS DISAPPROVAL BILLS.—Any rescission/receipts disapproval bill introduced with respect to a special message shall be referred to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as the case may be.

—Page 4, lines 13 and 15, strike "rescission" each place it appears and insert "rescission/receipts".

—Page 5, line 8, strike "rescission" the first time it appears and insert "rescission/receipts".

—Page 5, line 9, strike "budget authority" and insert "of budget authority or veto of the provision of law".

—Page 5, line 11, strike "rescission" and insert "rescission/receipts".