

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 16, 1996

The House met at 9:15 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HASTINGS of Washington].

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
May 16, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable RICHARD "DOC" HASTINGS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### PRAYER

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

O gracious God, from whom we have come and to whom we belong, we place before You in this our prayer, our ambitions and our hopes, our dreams and our desires, asking that You bless that which is good and faithful and correct and amend what is selfish or unkind. We have so many plans for our lives and ideas for what ought to be and yet many of our wishes are not accomplished and we feel discouraged. May Your good spirit, O God, that gives life to each new day, refresh us and inspire us to go forward knowing that Your power will bless us and make us whole. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DOGGETT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, an-

nounced that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to request the House to return to the Senate the bill (H.R. 2202) "An Act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve deterrence of illegal immigration to the United States by increasing border patrol and investigative personnel, by increasing penalties for alien smuggling and for document fraud, by reforming exclusion and deportation law and procedures, by improving the verification system for eligibility for employment, and through other measures, to reform the legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States, and for other purposes", including the Senate amendment thereto.

The message also announced that in accordance with sections 1928a-1928d of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. BROWN and Mr. AKAKA as members of the Senate delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly during the 2d session of the 104th Congress, to be held in Vouliagmeni, Athens, Greece, May 16-20, 1996.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 102-246, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, appoints Julie Finley, of Washington, DC, as a member of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, effective June 30, 1996, vice Edwin L. Cox.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94-201, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints James F. Hoy, of Kansas, and Charles E. Trimble, of Nebraska, as members of the Board of Trustees of the American Folklife Center.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain ten 1-minute on each side.

### A POP QUIZ

(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, it is the end of the week, and in that great American school yard tradition it is time for a pop quiz. This might be hard for those suffering from left-wing brain deficiency disorder, but let us give it a go anyhow. Which sum is greater, \$190 or \$304 billion? On the Republican side, \$304 is greater than \$190 billion.

Now, if Mr. KASICH's budget increased Medicare spending from \$190 to \$304 billion, would he be doing, A, cutting Medicare; B, increasing Medicare; C, I am sorry, what was the question?

The answer is, of course, Mr. KASICH's budget increases Medicare from \$190 to \$304 billion. It is an increase. Excellent job. A little quiet over here on this side.

Student loans are increasing, Medicaid is increasing, Medicare is increasing under the Kasich budget. Yet we are going to hear over and over again cut, cut, cut. The only thing I would like for y'all to cut out today is the line. Let us be honest; both budgets increase the spending. Let us have a good dialog on this.

### CONTINUING THE QUIZ

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, BOB DOLE took the same quiz and he had a different answer: D, leave school before finals are over.

Desperate times demand desperate actions, and it is little wonder that Mr. DOLE would decide to distance himself from this Gingrich Congress. After all, this is a Congress that does not seem to learn its lessons. It is a Congress that has failed, that failed last year when it set out to cut Medicare in order to provide tax breaks for the rich. It failed last year when it got government shutdown fever and took its political shenanigans to the extreme of costing taxpayers \$1.5 billion.

It failed even yesterday when once again it refused to give America a raise. Today the failure is that it has not learned those lessons, and it is back with a bad old budget that proposes to cut Medicare, that still has tax breaks, that still has cuts in education. The real failure is the failure to learn, and it is little wonder that BOB DOLE left.

### PASS THE KASICH BUDGET

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, listening to my colleague from Texas brings to mind his first comment with reference to the majority leader in the other body. I think that the President should follow Senator DOLE's example and he too should resign so we could have a good campaign.

□ 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.

My good friend from Texas in his litany, in which he got a little bit tripped up, still follows this simple philosophy: If the Federal Government takes more of the everyday American's paycheck, it is good. If the Washington bureaucrats have more and more and more of your money, Mr. Speaker, it is good. To our friends on the other side, that is justice.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. In the midst of all the arcane arguments offered by the liberal side, remember one thing. We have to save this country for today's seniors and for generations yet unborn, and we do not do so by engaging in playground taunts and failing to own up to the serious problems we confront as a nation. Pass the Kasich budget. Reject the old-style order.

#### DOLE LEAVES EXTREMIST CONGRESS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I heard what my colleague from Arizona just said. The bottom line is the President is not leaving. He is not going anywhere, because he has to stay here and protect the average American from the hurt that is being inflicted by this Republican extremist Congress. What BOB DOLE knew and we all know is that he could not stick around because, after this budget was unveiled again last week, the one we are going to be voting on again, he realized that the same old song, if you will, of cutting Medicare, cutting Medicaid, trying to cut back on education and also on environmental protection was not something that the American public wanted to hear. They realize that they are being hurt severely by this Republican plan.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is environmental enforcement is going to be cut back. Educational programs are not going to be cut back. Educational programs are not going to be available to the average American. Of course, for seniors, they have to suffer once again under the Republican proposal to cut back on Medicare and change Medicare so they will not have choice of doctor. They will be paying more out of their pocket or maybe they are going to be forced into a managed care system that they do not like.

So BOB DOLE had to leave; he could not live with the extremist agenda. The President will stay and protect the average American.

#### PROMISES KEPT

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, Bill Clinton is fooling the American people by saying that he is reforming the Gov-

ernment and cutting down on big Government spending.

By Clinton's own numbers, he would increase discretionary spending next year by \$8 billion. Bill Clinton is increasing the size of the Government, increasing its power over your life, and he's paying for it with the taxpayer's own money.

Bill Clinton has vetoed tax cuts for working families and vetoed welfare reform twice. He claims to be for working families and for tax relief. He vetoed both of these when he vetoed the balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, the next time you hear Bill Clinton talking about balancing the budget and cutting taxes, he is not doing this. His 1997 budget is proof that he is increasing Federal spending and raising taxes. He increases Washington bureaucracy and creates 14 new Federal programs. Bill Clinton is protecting big Government and the status quo. Whose promises has he kept?

#### DOLE LEAVING SCENE OF THE CRIME

(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, BOB DOLE can run but he cannot hide. For the last year and a half, BOB DOLE has led this Congress to cut Medicare, cut education, destroy the environment, attack a woman's right to choose, and pander to the gun lobby.

Why is BOB DOLE leaving the scene of the crime? Because he is getting caught in the crossfire, minimum wage, health care, Medicare. He knows what he should do but he cannot. The Republican right will not let him. Senator DOLE is caught in the right wing's claws, and the reach of the right is long, and their hold is tight. Make no mistake about it. Leaving Washington will not break the Gingrich grip, BOB DOLE. BOB DOLE can run but he cannot hide.

#### MEDICARE

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, this is not about the left wing, this is not about the right wing. Today as we stand here, it is not about BOB DOLE or NEWT GINGRICH or Bill Clinton. This is about Medicare; not medicare, Mr. Speaker, but Medicare. We are not taxing Medicare, we are not cutting Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, let us tell the truth about Medicare. We want to stand up for the seniors because the system is going bankrupt. This debate has been so politicized and that is so wrong. We have to stand up for seniors in our country. We have to make changes in the system because it is going bankrupt.

The President just this week said, well, the press made me do it. The press made me say cut. Finally it has been acknowledged by the President we are not cutting the system. We need to change the system. We need to put aside politics. We need to quit talking about the Speaker or the majority leader or the President and stand up for senior citizens in this country, do the right thing, make some changes in the system to protect seniors.

We are increasing Medicare. We said that last year; we were telling the truth. People can distort and lie louder. We can tell the truth longer.

#### CORRECT THE TRADE IMBALANCE

(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, last year over trade ripoffs the White House threatened Japan. After the smoke cleared, Japan laughed all the way to the bank. In fact, Japan now owns all of the top 10 banks in the world. This year the White House is threatening China. The soap opera continues. Threats to Japan, threats to China.

The truth is the White House is talking like John Wayne and performing like Barney Fife. There is only one way to get the attention of these Chinese dictators that are destroying American jobs, and that is a 2 by 4 right between the eyes. Neither party will balance the budget as long as we compete for \$5 an hour jobs.

#### REPEAL GAS TAX INCREASE

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that Americans should be able to earn more, keep more and do more with their families, their churches and communities. In that regard we are looking toward relief to help working families.

Specifically, we are taking the lead in repealing the President's harmful gas tax increase, a gas tax increase which is costing taxpayers \$4.8 billion a year. What is the President doing? Well, he is calling for a government investigation. But keep in mind that the era of big government is over. President Clinton said so. The increase in revenues from the President's tax increase is funding more big government spending, not the maintenance of our Nation's highways, our roads and bridges, as is historically the case.

Mr. Speaker, the worst thing is that this tax increase especially hurts lower income families. According to the Joint Economic Committee, the lowest 20 percent of taxpayers pay 7.1 percent of their income on gasoline while the

top 20 percent pay only 1.6 percent. In other words, lower income families in America pay four times as much as others. I strongly urge the repeal of this tax.

**ESCAPING A FAILED CONGRESS**

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, BOB DOLE's decision to quit the Senate to campaign full time for President is like leaving the scene of an accident. BOB DOLE and NEWT GINGRICH have been the leaders of this extremist Congress for a year and a half. Now, after 18 months of doing harm to working people in this country, cutting Medicare and Medicaid, education and the environment, Senator DOLE is desperate to disassociate himself from his own party, from his own failed Congress. It is a desperate move to escape.

Let me read a quote from Senator DOLE in Congress Daily. He says he is leaving because he is tired of the minimum wage. "My God. I'm tired of listening to minimum wage. Isn't there anything else in the world?"

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Presidential candidate that on the road, on the campaign trail, 80 percent of the American people support a minimum wage increase. Seniors do not want to see the Medicare cuts for tax breaks for the wealthy. This is what candidate DOLE will find on the campaign trail. He cannot escape his failed Congress.

□ 0930

**ADMINISTRATION'S NEW DRUG STRATEGY: OLD WINE IN NEW BOTTLES**

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration's latest drug strategy is nothing more than old wine in new bottles.

By emphasizing demand at the expense of supply, interdiction and eradication, while drug abuse soars among our young is a strategy destined for failure.

Spending three times as much for treatment and corrections as on interdiction and international activities, including eradication is just plain wrong.

The illicit drugs that are destroying our neighborhoods and youth, originate primarily overseas. We must eradicate these addictive substances at their source and interdict them before they reach our shorelines and cause addiction.

We need to fight both supply and demand simultaneously. We must not shortchange one for the other.

Drugs not only kill our young people, and cause violent crime, but also threaten our national security as well as the stability of democracy in many countries overseas. Let's wage a real war.

**REJECT BUDGET REHASH**

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, when you prepare a budget, if you do not allocate as much funds as are projected, that is called a cut. You can ask the generals when you talk about defense spending. If you do not allocate projected funds, it is called a cut.

The same is true in Medicare, and that is why once again I would say that in fact the Republicans are cutting Medicare. Their budget cuts Medicare by \$167 billion. That is \$44 billion more than the President's budget, and therein lies the differential. The fact of the matter is that under the Republican budget, another rehash of their last year's proposal, they will threaten seniors' health security.

They want to talk about your future. I want to talk about your parents. Your parents are going to have to pay Medicare premiums that are going to go up under the Republican budget proposal. Your parents are going to have higher out-of-pocket costs under the proposal that the Republicans are advocating. Hospitals are going to close that your parents would use because the Republicans have not allocated adequate funds. There is a difference. We should reject the Republican budget rehash.

**WE MUST PROTECT MEDICARE WHILE SLOWING ITS GROWTH**

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the Medicare Program is going bankrupt and the problem is worse than we were originally told. This is not a partisan issue. For me this is a personal issue. My wife and I are both senior citizens and will depend on Medicare. We must find a solution that protects Medicare for current retirees and future beneficiaries.

We all agree that we must slow the growth of Medicare. Our plan to save Medicare and the President's plan only differ by just 1.4 percent. By spending more carefully, we can find \$24 billion of waste and fraud over the next years. Any senior citizen can tell you a personal illustration of waste in the Medicare Program. Seniors across America know there are problems with Medicare. They do not want us to attack each other and turn this into a partisan battle.

Seniors know that Medicare is in trouble; they expect us to fix it. They do not want a political issue; they want a Medicare solution.

**LEAVING CONGRESS**

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, over the last couple of weeks Senator BOB DOLE has looked at the failed record of this Republican Congress that he and Speaker GINGRICH have led for the last 18 months, and BOB DOLE is now following the American people, because the American people have looked at the record of this Congress and the intent of the Republicans in their efforts to slash Medicare, to slash Medicaid, hurting working families, refusing to raise the minimum wage, taking school lunches away from children, and savaging the environment, and the American public is running away from the Republican congress in overwhelming numbers.

BOB DOLE has now decided he is going to run away from the Republican Congress, that he is going to get away from this Congress that has represented the worst that the American people have come to expect from their Government, not the best, the Congress that seeks to continue to divide America, not bring America together.

BOB DOLE has looked at the Congress and is running away. The American people should continue to do the same.

**ATTACK WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN MEDICARE**

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

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, we need to move beyond the harsh rhetoric, the sound bites, the slick language that emanates from focus groups. We have got to be honest. Medicine is in deeper trouble than we realized before. It began losing money last year a full 2 years earlier than anyone had thought it would, and it will be bankrupt in just 5 years unless we find a solution and begin to spend smarter.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan issue. Medicare is a program that is paid for by taxes on the wages of working people and by seniors through their premiums. We must find a solution to protect it, not only for current seniors but also for future generations. We owe it to our workers and our seniors and the needs of the future generations of this country.

Mr. Speaker, the key to the solution is to attack waste, fraud, and abuse. We need to spend smarter. If we can just slow the growth of Medicare by spending smarter, we can save the system and give seniors in Maine and

across the country a better program. But what we cannot do is make Medicare a partisan issue.

#### COMMITMENT TO A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleagues, we do not need to make Medicare a partisan issue. The problem that we have is that last year it was a partisan issue, and it continues to be.

Let me give you an example of how this administration is dealing with the Medicare crisis. Here in Congress we were unable to come up with an agreement on the Medicare insolvency, and yet there is a program called Operation Restore Trust not only in my State of Texas but a number of States. That program was just given over \$4 million last year, and yet it returned 10 times that amount to the Medicare trust funds.

I believe this is an area that we need to devote more resources. The President has requested \$597 million for antifraud activities, which is \$150 million more than current spending. Let us give him that in this budget agreement we are talking about today so we can deal with Medicare fraud.

The problem we have is that they will not do it. Last year they wanted to cut the effort for Medicare fraud, and that is where the seniors know that we can get the money to protect Medicare. There is no silver bullet for balancing the budget. You have to do it every day, every year, and leaving the scene of the battle is not the way to do it.

#### MR. PRESIDENT, WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THAT MIDDLE-CLASS TAX CUT?

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, every now and then, I like to thumb through my copy of "Putting People First" then-candidate Bill Clinton's book of promises to the American people. And I couldn't help but notice when I last picked it up that the centerpiece of the Clinton campaign was a middle-class tax cut.

Let me read a little bit from the section entitled "Rewarding Work and Families" middle-class taxpayers will have a choice between a children's tax credit or a significant reduction in their income tax rate." That was candidate Clinton speaking.

Well, candidate Clinton became President Clinton and that one-time champion of the middle-class soon began singing an altogether different

tune. This Congress passed a middle-class tax cut; 89 percent of that tax cut would go to families earning under \$75,000 per year. President Clinton said no and vetoed it. He called it a tax cut for the rich.

Mr. Speaker, as President Clinton gears up to become candidate Clinton again, I think the American people might want to join me in asking him. "Mr. President, whatever happened to that middle-class tax cut?"

#### MAKING A DIFFERENCE BY LEAVING

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, most of America's eyes were focused on Washington yesterday, when a public servant of many years indicated he was through. Oh, yes, he is running for the Presidency of the United States of America, but, frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think he was through with a logjam Republican Congress, one that did not have the sense of temperment of a moderate approach to running this Government, of ensuring that there would be a balanced budget, but yet having the face of respect and love for senior citizens, for this budget of 1997 posed by the Republicans will cut Medicare, will make cuts of \$167 billion in Medicare.

Frankly, I hope we will benefit from Senator DOLE running against this Republican Congress. In fact, instead of providing for those working poor who have made a commitment not to be on welfare, they are cutting taxes to those who are the working poor by \$20 billion by decreasing the earned income tax credit. Yes; education is out again, 22 percent below the 1996 budget. Last, no more summer jobs for our youth, who want to make a difference in their lives.

Yes; I hope his leaving will make a difference in Congress.

#### STOP DRUG PRODUCTION AT ITS SOURCE

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the major issues facing America today is drugs and crime that is caused by drugs. They say there is a war against drugs, but we really do not have a war against drugs, and if we do, we are losing it.

If we really wanted to deal with the drug problem, we would attack it not only here in our country and at the borders but at its source. In Peru and Bolivia, 90 percent of the world's coca is produced. Ninety percent, we know exactly where it is grown. We could

take U.S. airplanes and use environmentally safe herbicides and fly over the fields and drop them, and within 1 to 2 weeks knock out 90 percent of the world's coca and crack. And yet we do not do it.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to everybody in the House and administration, if we really want to have a war on drugs, let us attack it. Let us really win the war on drugs. Let us go to Peru and Bolivia and eradicate the drugs at its source. It will never get to our kids, it will not cause crime in America, and it will solve a big problem.

#### PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Committee on Commerce, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Committee on House Oversight, Committee on International Relations, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Resources, Committee on Science, and Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 3259, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1997

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

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

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

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

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that

their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

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

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1997

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 435

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 0945

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

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

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

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

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

Three complete substitutes were presented to the Committee on Rules, one

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

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

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

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

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

Since the debt limit has already been set, it will not be necessary to have a further increase until at least October 1997. By that time the House will have adopted the third year budget of our glidepath to a balanced budget over a 7-year period. And if we have in any way veered off that glidepath, I, for one, will lead the fight and will refuse to vote for any increase in the debt limit. I have only done it once in 18 years and, hopefully, will never have to do it again.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the budget resolution itself, first I want to commend the Committee on the Budget and particularly the gentleman from Ohio, Chairman KASICH, for making the tough choices necessary to keep this Government on the glidepath to a balanced budget. In the past there have

been efforts to reach a balanced budget by setting statutory deficit reduction levels, for example in the Gramm-Rudman statute, but the Democrat-controlled Congress proved unable to stick to the glidepath toward a balanced budget over that 5-year period back in 1985. The urge to spend was just too strong.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In this budget for the veterans it recommends \$5.1 billion more than Presi-

dent Clinton for Veterans' Affairs spending, which is principally for hospital, for outpatient care, medical care. It calls for improvements to the Veterans Administration mandatory programs, including things like an increase in auto allowances for certain severely disabled veterans and improved compensation payments for surviving spouses.

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

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

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

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

Why is a balanced budget so terribly important? I see some Members on that side of the aisle who strongly support a balanced budget, the gentleman from Utah, [Mr. ORTON] as well. It means their children and our children will not have to spend the rest of their lives under an ever-increasing crushing burden of interest payments. Today we have a \$5 trillion debt that has accumulated over the years. To pay for the interest, just the annual interest, the

yearly interest on that \$5 trillion today is costing as much, almost, as we spend on our national defense budget. The real reason we need a Federal Government is to provide for a common defense for our States, and we spend almost as much on interest as we spend on the defense of our country, \$250 billion.

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

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

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

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

□ 1000

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

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

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

I, for one, am going to do everything I can to make sure we do that and that we succeed in passing it for the next 4 years as well so that we try to bring

some fiscal sanity and an end to this sea of red ink which is literally bankrupting not only the Government but

local governments as well, and the private sector even more so.

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

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,<sup>1</sup> 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of May 15, 1996]

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

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

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

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

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

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of May 15, 1996]

| H. Res. No. (Date rept.) | Rule type | Bill No.         | Subject  | Disposition of rule                    |
|--------------------------|-----------|------------------|--|--|
| H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)     | O         | H.R. 5           | Unfunded Mandate Reform                        | A: 350-71 (1/19/95).                   |
| H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)     | MC        | H. Con. Res. 17  | Social Security                                | A: 255-172 (1/25/95).                  |
|                          |           | H.J. Res. 1      | Balanced Budget Amdt                           |  |
| H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)     | O         | H.R. 101         | Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians             | A: voice vote (2/1/95).                |
| H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)     | O         | H.R. 400         | Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve | A: voice vote (2/1/95).                |
| H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)     | O         | H.R. 440         | Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif.          | A: voice vote (2/1/95).                |
| H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)      | O         | H.R. 2           | Line Item Veto                                 | A: voice vote (2/2/95).                |
| H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)      | O         | H.R. 665         | Victim Restitution                             | A: voice vote (2/7/95).                |
| H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)      | O         | H.R. 666         | Exclusionary Rule Reform                       | A: voice vote (2/7/95).                |
| H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)      | MO        | H.R. 667         | Violent Criminal Incarceration                 | A: voice vote (2/9/95).                |
| H. Res. 65 (2/9/95)      | O         | H.R. 658         | Criminal Alien Deportation                     | A: voice vote (2/10/95).               |
| H. Res. 75 (2/10/95)     | MO        | H.R. 728         | Law Enforcement Block Grants                   | A: voice vote (2/13/95).               |
| H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)     | MO        | H.R. 7           | National Security Revitalization               | PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).     |
| H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)     | MC        | H.R. 831         | Health Insurance Deductibility                 | PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).     |
| H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)     | O         | H.R. 830         | Paperwork Reduction Act                        | A: voice vote (2/22/95).               |
| H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)     | MC        | H.R. 889         | Defense Supplemental                           | A: 282-144 (2/22/95).                  |
| H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)     | MO        | H.R. 450         | Regulatory Transition Act                      | A: 252-175 (2/23/95).                  |
| H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)     | MO        | H.R. 1022        | Risk Assessment                                | A: 253-165 (2/27/95).                  |
| H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)    | O         | H.R. 926         | Regulatory Reform and Relief Act               | A: voice vote (2/28/95).               |
| H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)    | MO        | H.R. 925         | Private Property Protection Act                | A: 271-151 (3/2/95).                   |
| H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)     | MO        | H.R. 1058        | Securities Litigation Reform                   |  |
| H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)     | MO        | H.R. 988         | Attorney Accountability Act                    |  |
| H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)     | MO        |                  |  | A: voice vote (3/6/95).                |
| H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)     | Debate    | H.R. 956         | Product Liability Reform                       | A: 257-155 (3/7/95).                   |
| H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)     | MC        |                  |  | A: voice vote (3/8/95).                |
| H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)    | MO        | H.R. 1159        | Making Emergency Supp. Approps                 | PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).      |
| H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)    | MC        | H.J. Res. 73     | Term Limits Const. Amdt                        | A: 242-190 (3/15/95).                  |
| H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)    | Debate    | H.R. 4           | Personal Responsibility Act of 1995            | A: voice vote (3/28/95).               |
| H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)    | MC        |                  |  | A: 217-211 (3/22/95).                  |
| H. Res. 125 (4/2/95)     | O         | H.R. 1271        | Family Privacy Protection Act                  | A: 423-1 (4/4/95).                     |
| H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)     | O         | H.R. 660         | Older Persons Housing Act                      | A: voice vote (4/6/95).                |
| H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)     | MC        | H.R. 1215        | Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995   | A: 228-204 (4/5/95).                   |
| H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)     | MC        | H.R. 483         | Medicare Select Expansion                      | A: 253-172 (4/6/95).                   |
| H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)     | O         | H.R. 655         | Hydrogen Future Act of 1995                    | A: voice vote (5/2/95).                |
| H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)     | O         | H.R. 1361        | Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996                      | A: voice vote (5/9/95).                |
| H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)     | O         | H.R. 961         | Clean Water Amendments                         | A: 414-4 (5/10/95).                    |
| H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)    | O         | H.R. 535         | Fish Hatchery—Arkansas                         | A: voice vote (5/13/95).               |
| H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)    | O         | H.R. 584         | Fish Hatchery—Iowa                             | A: voice vote (5/15/95).               |
| H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)    | O         | H.R. 614         | Fish Hatchery—Minnesota                        | A: voice vote (5/15/95).               |
| H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)    | MC        | H. Con. Res. 67  | Budget Resolution FY 1996                      | PQ: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95).     |
| H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)    | MO        | H.R. 1561        | American Overseas Interests Act                | A: 233-176 (5/23/95).                  |
| H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)     | MC        | H.R. 1530        | Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996                     | PQ: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95).     |
| H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)    | O         | H.R. 1817        | MilCon Appropriations FY 1996                  | PQ: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95).     |
| H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)    | MC        | H.R. 1854        | Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996                   | PQ: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95).     |
| H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)    | O         | H.R. 1868        | For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996                     | PQ: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95).     |
| H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)    | O         | H.R. 1905        | Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996                | A: voice vote (7/12/95).               |
| H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)    | C         | H.J. Res. 79     | Flag Constitutional Amendment                  | PQ: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95).     |
| H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)    | MC        | H.R. 1944        | Emer. Supp. Approps                            | PQ: 236-194; A: 234-192 (6/29/95).     |
| H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)    | O         | H.R. 1577        | Interior Approps. FY 1996                      | PQ: 235-193; D: 192-238 (7/12/95).     |
| H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)    | O         | H.R. 1577        | Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2                   | PQ: 230-194; A: 229-195 (7/13/95).     |
| H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)    | O         | H.R. 1576        | Agriculture Approps. FY 1996                   | PQ: 242-185; A: voice vote (7/18/95).  |
| H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)    | O         | H.R. 2020        | Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996               | PQ: 232-192; A: voice vote (7/18/95).  |
| H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)    | C         | H.J. Res. 96     | Disapproval of MFN to China                    | A: voice vote (7/20/95).               |
| H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)    | O         | H.R. 2002        | Transportation Approps. FY 1996                | PQ: 217-202 (7/21/95).                 |
| H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)    | O         | H.R. 70          | Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil                   | A: voice vote (7/24/95).               |
| H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)    | O         | H.R. 2076        | Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996               | A: voice vote (7/25/95).               |
| H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)    | O         | H.R. 2099        | VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996                        | A: 230-189 (7/25/95).                  |
| H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)    | MC        | S. 21            | Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia        | A: voice vote (8/1/95).                |
| H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)    | O         | H.R. 2126        | Defense Approps. FY 1996                       | A: 409-1 (7/31/95).                    |
| H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)     | MC        | H.R. 1555        | Communications Act of 1995                     | A: 255-156 (8/2/95).                   |
| H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)     | O         | H.R. 2127        | Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996                    | A: 323-104 (8/2/95).                   |
| H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)     | O         | H.R. 1594        | Economically Targeted Investments              | A: voice vote (9/12/95).               |
| H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)     | MO        | H.R. 1655        | Intelligence Authorization FY 1996             | A: voice vote (9/12/95).               |
| H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)    | O         | H.R. 1162        | Deficit Reduction Lockbox                      | A: voice vote (9/13/95).               |
| H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)    | O         | H.R. 1670        | Federal Acquisition Reform Act                 | A: 414-0 (9/13/95).                    |
| H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)    | O         | H.R. 1517        | CAREERS Act                                    | A: 388-2 (9/19/95).                    |
| H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)    | O         | H.R. 2274        | Natl. Highway System                           | PQ: 241-173; A: 375-39-1 (9/20/95).    |
| H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)    | MC        | H.R. 927         | Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity                | A: 304-118 (9/20/95).                  |
| H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)    | O         | H.R. 743         | Team Act                                       | A: 344-66-1 (9/27/95).                 |
| H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)    | O         | H.R. 1170        | S-Judge Approps.                               | A: voice vote (9/28/95).               |
| H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)    | O         | H.R. 1601        | Internat. Space Station                        | A: voice vote (9/27/95).               |
| H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)    | C         | H.J. Res. 108    | Continuing Resolution FY 1996                  | A: voice vote (9/28/95).               |
| H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)    | O         | H.R. 2405        | Omnibus Science Auth                           | A: voice vote (10/11/95).              |
| H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)   | MC        | H.R. 2259        | Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines               | A: voice vote (10/18/95).              |
| H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)   | MC        | H.R. 2425        | Medicare Preservation Act                      | PQ: 231-194; A: 227-192 (10/19/95).    |
| H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)   | C         | H.R. 2492        | Leg. Branch Approps                            | PQ: 235-184; A: voice vote (10/31/95). |
| H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)   | MC        | H. Con. Res. 109 | Social Security Earnings Reform                | PQ: 228-191; A: 235-185 (10/26/95).    |
|                          |           | H.R. 2491        | Seven-Year Balanced Budget                     |  |

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

[As of May 15, 1996]

| H. Res. No. (Date rept.) | Rule type | Bill No.         | Subject                           | Disposition of rule                  |
|--------------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)   | C         | H.R. 1833        | Partial Birth Abortion Ban        | A: 237-190 (11/1/95).                |
| H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)   | MO        | H.R. 2546        | O.C. Approps.                     | A: 241-181 (11/1/95).                |
| H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)    | C         | H.J. Res. 115    | Cont. Res. FY 1996                | A: 216-210 (11/8/95).                |
| H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)    | MC        | H.R. 2586        | Debt Limit                        | A: 220-200 (11/10/95).               |
| H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)    | O         | H.R. 2539        | ICC Termination Act               | A: voice vote (11/14/95).            |
| H. Res. 261 (11/9/95)    | C         | H.J. Res. 115    | Cont. Resolution                  | A: 223-182 (11/10/95).               |
| H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)    | C         | H.R. 2586        | Increase Debt Limit               | A: 220-185 (11/10/95).               |
| H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)   | O         | H.R. 2564        | Lobbying Reform                   | A: voice vote (11/16/95).            |
| H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)   | C         | H.J. Res. 122    | Further Cont. Resolution          | A: 229-176 (11/15/95).               |
| H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)   | MC        | H.R. 2606        | Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia   | A: 239-181 (11/17/95).               |
| H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)   | O         | H.R. 1788        | Amtrak Reform                     | A: voice vote (11/30/95).            |
| H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)   | O         | H.R. 1350        | Maritime Security Act             | A: voice vote (12/6/95).             |
| H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)    | C         | H.R. 2621        | Protect Federal Trust Funds       | PQ: 223-183 A: 228-184 (12/14/95).   |
| H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)   | O         | H.R. 1745        | Utah Public Lands                 |                                      |
| H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)   | C         | H.Con. Res. 122  | Budget Res. W/President           | PQ: 230-188 A: 229-189 (12/19/95).   |
| H. Res. 313 (12/19/95)   | O         | H.R. 558         | Texas Low-Level Radioactive       | A: voice vote (12/20/95).            |
| H. Res. 323 (12/21/95)   | C         | H.R. 2577        | Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge     | Tabled (2/28/96).                    |
| H. Res. 366 (2/27/96)    | MC        | H.R. 2854        | Farm Bill                         | PQ: 228-182 A: 244-168 (2/28/96).    |
| H. Res. 368 (2/28/96)    | O         | H.R. 994         | Small Business Growth             |                                      |
| H. Res. 371 (3/6/96)     | C         | H.R. 3021        | Debt Limit Increase               | A: voice vote (3/7/96).              |
| H. Res. 372 (3/6/96)     | MC        | H.R. 3019        | Cont. Approps. FY 1996            | PQ: voice vote A: 235-175 (3/7/96).  |
| H. Res. 380 (3/12/96)    | MC        | H.R. 2703        | Effective Death Penalty           | A: 251-157 (3/13/96).                |
| H. Res. 384 (3/14/96)    | MC        | H.R. 2202        | Immigration                       | PQ: 233-152 A: voice vote (3/21/96). |
| H. Res. 386 (3/20/96)    | C         | H.J. Res. 165    | Further Cont. Approps             | PQ: 234-187 A: 237-183 (3/21/96).    |
| H. Res. 388 (3/20/96)    | C         | H.R. 125         | Gun Crime Enforcement             | A: 244-166 (3/22/96).                |
| H. Res. 391 (3/27/96)    | C         | H.R. 3136        | Contract w/America Advancement    | PQ: 232-180 A: 232-177 (3/28/96).    |
| H. Res. 392 (3/27/96)    | MC        | H.R. 3103        | Health Coverage Affordability     | PQ: 229-186 A: Voice Vote (3/29/96). |
| H. Res. 395 (3/29/96)    | MC        | H.J. Res. 159    | Tax Limitation Const. Amdmt.      | PQ: 232-168 A: 234-162 (4/15/96).    |
| H. Res. 396 (3/29/96)    | O         | H.R. 842         | Truth in Budgeting Act            | A: voice vote (4/17/96).             |
| H. Res. 409 (4/23/96)    | O         | H.R. 2715        | Paperwork Elimination Act         | A: voice vote (4/24/96).             |
| H. Res. 410 (4/23/96)    | O         | H.R. 1675        | Natl. Wildlife Refuge             | A: voice vote (4/24/96).             |
| H. Res. 411 (4/23/96)    | O         | H.J. Res. 175    | Further Cont. Approps. FY 1996    | A: voice vote (4/24/96).             |
| H. Res. 418 (4/30/96)    | O         | H.R. 2641        | U.S. Marshals Service             | PQ: 219-203 A: voice vote (5/1/96).  |
| H. Res. 419 (4/30/96)    | O         | H.R. 2149        | Ocean Shipping Reform             | A: 422-0 (5/1/96).                   |
| H. Res. 421 (5/2/96)     | O         | H.R. 2974        | Crimes Against Children & Elderly | A: voice vote (5/7/96).              |
| H. Res. 422 (5/2/96)     | O         | H.R. 3120        | Witness & Jury Tampering          | A: voice vote (5/7/96).              |
| H. Res. 426 (5/7/96)     | O         | H.R. 2406        | U.S. Housing Act of 1996          | PQ: 218-208 A: voice vote (5/8/96).  |
| H. Res. 427 (5/7/96)     | O         | H.R. 3322        | Omnibus Civilian Science Auth     | A: voice vote (5/9/96).              |
| H. Res. 428 (5/7/96)     | MC        | H.R. 3286        | Adoption Promotion & Stability    | A: voice vote (5/9/96).              |
| H. Res. 430 (5/9/96)     | S         | H.R. 3230        | DoD Auth. FY 1997                 | A: 235-149 (5/10/96).                |
| H. Res. 435 (5/15/96)    | MC        | H. Con. Res. 178 | Con. Res. on the Budget, 1997     |                                      |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

dent loans cut, and their Pell grants and their work study frozen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And the Republican medical savings accounts are basically health care for

the healthy and wealthy once again at the expense of the seniors who remain in traditional Medicare and people who are either sick or lower income.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The rule allows for three complete substitutes, as Chairman SOLOMON has

said, all of which comply with the prerequisites of obtaining balance in the budget by the year 2002. That is wonderfully good news for Americans. We should stop and think about that for a moment. This Congress has accomplished a truly remarkable feat in changing the focus of the discussion here in Washington from if we should balance our budget to how we will balance the budget.

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

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

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

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

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

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

While I firmly believe that we cannot use process to avoid the tough substantive decisions we must make to achieve a balanced budget, I believe

just as firmly that the process that we are using today can be greatly improved to help force us to make those tough decisions and to ensure they stick. I look forward to working with Chairman SOLOMON on this effort and with my friend, the Budget Committee chairman, Mr. KASICH, and all of our many colleagues who have expressed interest.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking member on the Committee on rules, for yielding me time.

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

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

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

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

tified by the CBO that we would achieve a balanced budget, including the tax cuts.

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1015

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

When we discuss the budget situation in America today, it seems to me to be

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

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

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

Does that make sense? I do not think so.

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

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

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I support a balanced budget. I voted for a

balanced budget. But I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget and the tremendous harm it would do on American families.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On the other hand, the President's budget achieves the requirement of

keeping Medicare solvent in the same way as the Republican budget, but it does not make these radical changes to Medicare that will hurt the average senior citizen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Republican plan would do that by cutting Medicare and Medicaid substantially; by

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Has this growth in spending and Government programs kept America on the right track? I think the answer is, sadly, no. While we are ready to shrink government and return decisions back to our communities, the President's budget plan does just the opposite. It expands Government, shifts financial burden to future generations, and I am amazed that the same President who

came to this Chamber in January and declared that the era of big government is over has sent us a budget that continues the Washington knows best approach to dealing with America's priorities.

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

□ 1030

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Orton amendment would make any tax cuts dependent upon the Con-

gressional Budget Office certifying that the total budget would in fact be balanced by 2002. We should not be promising tax cuts until we are sure that the budget is balanced.

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

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

The material referred to is as follows: PREVIOUS QUESTION AMENDMENT TEXT: H. RES. 435 FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 178, BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR FY 1997

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

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

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

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

At the end, add the following new section: SEC. 15. BUDGET SURPLUS ALLOWANCE.

(a) CBO CERTIFICATION OF LEGISLATIVE SUBMISSIONS.—

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

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

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

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

(b) PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In section 2(1)(A), increase the recommended level of Federal revenues by \$15,031,000,000 for fiscal year 1997, by \$17,817,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, by \$21,488,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, by \$21,291,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, by \$21,114,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and by \$14,466,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In section 3(13) (relating to income security, functional category 600), increase the

levels of new budget authority by \$1.7 billion for fiscal year 1997, by \$1.8 billion for fiscal year 1998, by \$1.8 billion for fiscal year 1999, by \$1.9 billion for fiscal year 2000, by \$1.9 billion for fiscal year 2001, and by \$2 billion for fiscal year 2002.

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

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

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A gas tax repeal, is that going to help the very, very rich? I know in the Hudson Valley where I live and over in Connecticut where the Speaker pro tempore lives, people drive in my district about 100 miles a day to work. Is

repealing that Clinton gas tax, is that for the very, very rich? I do not think so. We ought to stop all this rhetoric.

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

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

Should we Republicans be allowed to amend the Black Caucus budget or any of those others and water it down with what they want to do? No. They ought to have an up-or-down vote on their proposal. That is exactly what this rule calls for. So in fairness, I want everybody to come over here. I want Members to defeat this ridiculous attempt to defeat the previous question. I want Members to vote for the previous question and then vote for this very fair rule. Let us get on with the debate on this very responsible Republican budget.

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

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

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

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

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

[Roll No. 175]

YEAS—227

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

NAYS—196

|              |             |              |
|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| Abercrombie  | Boniior     | Clyburn      |
| Ackerman     | Borski      | Coleman      |
| Andrews      | Boucher     | Collins (IL) |
| Baesler      | Brewster    | Collins (MI) |
| Baldacci     | Browder     | Condit       |
| Barcia       | Brown (CA)  | Conyers      |
| Barrett (WI) | Brown (FL)  | Costello     |
| Becerra      | Brown (OH)  | Coyne        |
| Bellenson    | Bryant (TX) | Cramer       |
| Bentsen      | Cardin      | Cummings     |
| Berman       | Chapman     | Danner       |
| Bevill       | Clay        | de la Garza  |
| Bilbray      | Clayton     | DeFazio      |
| Bishop       | Clement     | DeLauro      |

|               |               |               |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Dellums       | Kennedy (MA)  | Rahall        |
| Deusch        | Kennelly      | Rangel        |
| Dicks         | Kildee        | Reed          |
| Dingell       | Kleczka       | Richardson    |
| Dixon         | Klink         | Rivers        |
| Doggett       | LaFalce       | Roemer        |
| Dooley        | Lantos        | Rose          |
| Doyle         | Levin         | Roybal-Allard |
| Durbin        | Lewis (GA)    | Rush          |
| Edwards       | Lincoln       | Sabo          |
| Engel         | Lipinski      | Sanders       |
| Eshoo         | Lofgren       | Sawyer        |
| Evans         | Lowey         | Schroeder     |
| Farr          | Luther        | Schumer       |
| Fattah        | Maloney       | Scott         |
| Fazio         | Manton        | Serrano       |
| Fields (LA)   | Markey        | Sistisky      |
| Filner        | Mascara       | Skaggs        |
| Flake         | Matsui        | Skelton       |
| Foglietta     | McCarthy      | Slaughter     |
| Ford          | McDermott     | Spratt        |
| Frank (MA)    | McHale        | Stark         |
| Frost         | McKinney      | Stenholm      |
| Furse         | McNulty       | Stokes        |
| Gedjenson     | Meehan        | Studds        |
| Gephardt      | Meek          | Stupak        |
| Geren         | Menendez      | Tanner        |
| Gibbons       | Miller (CA)   | Tauzin        |
| Gonzalez      | Minge         | Taylor (MS)   |
| Gordon        | Mink          | Tejeda        |
| Green (TX)    | Moakley       | Thompson      |
| Gutierrez     | Mollohan      | Thornton      |
| Hall (OH)     | Montgomery    | Thurman       |
| Hall (TX)     | Moran         | Torres        |
| Hamilton      | Murtha        | Torricelli    |
| Harman        | Nadler        | Towns         |
| Hastings (FL) | Neal          | Trafficant    |
| Hefner        | Oberstar      | Velazquez     |
| Hilliard      | Obey          | Vento         |
| Hinchey       | Olver         | Visclosky     |
| Holden        | Ortiz         | Volkmer       |
| Hoyer         | Orton         | Ward          |
| Jackson (IL)  | Owens         | Waters        |
| Jackson-Lee   | Pallone       | Watt (NC)     |
| (TX)          | Pastor        | Waxman        |
| Jacobs        | Payne (NJ)    | Weller        |
| Jefferson     | Payne (VA)    | Wilson        |
| Johnson (SD)  | Pelosi        | Wise          |
| Johnson, E.B. | Peterson (MN) | Woolsey       |
| Johnson       | Pickett       | Wynn          |
| Kanjorski     | Pomeroy       | Yates         |
| Kaptur        | Poshard       |               |

NOT VOTING—10

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

□ 1100

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Paxon for, with Mr. Williams against.

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

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

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 435 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 178.

□ 1101

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 178) establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1997 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, with Mr. CAMP in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 178 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 178

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).*

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

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

**SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

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

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

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

- Fiscal year 1997: \$1,085,363,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998: \$1,130,426,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999: \$1,176,236,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000: \$1,229,666,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001: \$1,288,998,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002: \$1,358,219,000,000.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

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

(1) National Defense (050):

- Fiscal year 1997:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$267,183,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$264,846,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$268,958,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$263,618,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$271,677,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$267,049,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$192,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(2) International Affairs (150):

- Fiscal year 1997:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$13,732,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$14,963,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,333,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$18,110,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

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

Fiscal year 1999:

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

Fiscal year 2000:

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

- Fiscal year 1997:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$16,537,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$16,697,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1998:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$16,428,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$16,494,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

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

Fiscal year 2000:

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(4) Energy (270):

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

- Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,441,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,078,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,039,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,034,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,327,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,045,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,697,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$815,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,036,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,782,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$740,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,000,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,430,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$231,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,031,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,529,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,322,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$37,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,902,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,654,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$41,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,713,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,409,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$38,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,399,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,950,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$38,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,994,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,205,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$38,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,860,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,910,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$38,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- (6) Agriculture (350):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,840,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,238,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$7,794,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$5,870,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,750,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,855,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,346,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,637,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,367,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,483,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,743,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,586,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,714,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,843,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,736,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,652,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,497,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,730,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,595,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,641,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,964,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,181,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,570,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,709,000,000.
- (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,838,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$2,319,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,856,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$197,340,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,464,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,752,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,787,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$196,750,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,476,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,043,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,763,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$196,253,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,448,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,320,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,759,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$195,883,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,268,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,283,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,745,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$195,375,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,598,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,218,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,740,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$194,875,000,000.
- (8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,737,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,007,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,541,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$37,635,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,961,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,111,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,103,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,236,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,531,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,526,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,045,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,042,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,672,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,149,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,231,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,133,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,605,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,640,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,257,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,133,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,559,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,820,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,287,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$1,171,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,595,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,040,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,365,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$1,171,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,243,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,655,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,404,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,202,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,153,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,161,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,430,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,202,000,000.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,965,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$49,504,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,219,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$15,469,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,416,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$48,112,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$19,040,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,046,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$47,817,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,696,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$48,209,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,410,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$48,704,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,092,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$49,335,000,000.

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

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

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$129,918,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$130,276,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$137,726,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$138,064,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$144,995,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$145,168,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$152,961,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$152,890,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$161,114,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$160,789,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$167,926,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$167,476,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$193,165,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$191,481,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$207,183,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$205,458,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$217,250,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$214,978,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$229,309,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$227,560,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$241,641,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$239,907,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$255,121,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$252,720,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$232,612,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$240,107,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$241,254,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$244,185,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$244,842,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$251,716,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$262,510,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$263,060,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$262,260,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$265,271,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$281,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$277,213,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,812,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,543,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,476,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,213,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,219,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,922,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,979,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,662,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,775,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,458,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,607,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,290,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,117,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,654,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$935,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$26,362,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,458,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,321,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$962,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$25,925,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,712,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,063,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$987,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$25,426,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,713,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,427,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,021,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$24,883,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,002,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,882,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,189,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$24,298,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,713,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,912,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,194,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$23,668,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,125,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,930,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,302,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,162,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,186,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,241,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,235,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,944,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,746,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,704,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,740,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,372,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,747,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,314,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,640,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,592,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,928,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,987,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,364,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,549,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,454,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,020,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,321,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$282,653,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$282,653,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$288,947,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$288,947,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$292,607,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$292,607,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$294,004,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$294,004,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$298,041,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$298,041,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$302,443,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$302,443,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1997:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$1,032,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$833,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$183,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$271,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$1,770,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$2,139,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1997:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$45,574,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1998:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$35,574,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1999:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$34,762,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$36,540,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$38,322,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$40,586,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

#### SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—

(1) WELFARE AND MEDICAID REFORM.—Not later than May 24, 1996, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to provide direct spending for welfare and medicaid reform to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the

House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) MEDICARE PRESERVATION.—Not later than June 14, 1996, the House committees named in subsection (c) shall submit their recommendations to provide direct spending for medicare preservation to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(3) TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS DIRECT SPENDING REFORMS.—Not later than July 12, 1996, the House committees named in subsection (d) shall submit their recommendations to provide direct spending, deficit reduction, and revenues to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(4) CONTINGENT INSTRUCTION.—In addition to any bill described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3), if the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget submits a letter to the Speaker which sets forth an additional submission date for an omnibus reconciliation bill carrying out all instructions under subsections (b), (c), and (d) and that letter is printed in the Congressional Record, then the House committees named in those subsections shall promptly submit (or resubmit) recommendations to carry out those subsections to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS FOR WELFARE AND MEDICAID REFORM.—

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

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

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

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

2002, and \$2,810,370,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(c) INSTRUCTIONS FOR MEDICARE PRESERVATION.—

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

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

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

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

(B) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: \$0 in fiscal year 1997, \$115,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and \$305,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$316,013,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$419,609,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$2,213,093,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

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

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

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

(5) COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.—The House Committee on International Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not

exceed: \$13,025,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$10,311,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$67,953,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$2,784,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$4,586,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$24,982,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

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

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

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

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

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

(12) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$373,764,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$509,912,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$2,638,286,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: \$1,050,476,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1997, \$1,319,852,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and \$7,047,865,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(e) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "direct spending" has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

## SEC. 5. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

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

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "sale of an asset" shall have the same meaning as under section 250(c)(21) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) TREATMENT OF LOAN ASSETS.—For purposes of this section, the sale of loan assets or the prepayment of a loan shall be governed by the terms of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

## SEC. 6. CREDIT REFORM AND DIRECT STUDENT LOANS.

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

- (1) loan disbursements;
- (2) repayments of principal;
- (3) payments of interest and other payments by or to the Government over the life of the loan after adjusting for estimated defaults, prepayments, fees, penalties, and other recoveries; and
- (4) direct expenses, including—
  - (A) activities related to credit extension, loan origination, loan servicing, management of contractors, and payments to contractors, other government entities, and program participants;
  - (B) collection of delinquent loans; and
  - (C) writeoff and closeout of loans.

## SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BASELINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that:
 

- (1) Baselines are projections of future spending if existing policies remain unchanged.
- (2) Under baseline assumptions, spending automatically rises with inflation even if such increases are not mandated under existing law.
- (3) Baseline budgeting is inherently biased against policies that would reduce the projected growth in spending because such policies are depicted as spending reductions from an increasing baseline.

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

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

## SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EMERGENCIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that:
 

- (1) The Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 exempted from the discretionary spending limits and the Pay-As-You-Go requirements for entitlement and tax legislation funding requirements that are designated by Congress and the President as an emergency.
- (2) Congress and the President have increasingly misused the emergency designation by—

- (A) designating as emergencies funding requirements that are predictable and do not pose a threat to life, property, or national security,
- (B) designating emergencies with the sole purpose of circumventing statutory and congressional spending limitations and

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

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

**SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON LOAN SALES.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) reject any illusory financing schemes;

(4) continue Federal minimum standards for nursing homes;

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

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

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

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) **LEGISLATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPACT ON CHILDREN.**—In the event legislation enacted to comply with this resolution results in an increase in the number of hungry,

homeless, poor, or medically uninsured by the end of fiscal year 1997, Congress shall revisit the provisions of such legislation which caused such increase and shall, as soon as practicable thereafter, adopt legislation which would halt any continuation of such increase.

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

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

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

(2) Congress should enact a plan that balances the budget, and then also develops a regimen for paying off the Federal debt;

(3) after the budget is balanced, a surplus should be created which can be used to begin paying off the debt; and

(4) such a plan should be formulated and implemented so that this generation can save future generations from the crushing burdens of the Federal debt.

**SEC. 14. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMITMENT TO A BALANCED BUDGET BY FISCAL YEAR 2002.**

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. PAYNE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

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

**SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Fiscal year 1997: \$267,340,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998: \$266,819,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999: \$266,088,000,000.

- Fiscal year 2000: \$267,079,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001: \$267,982,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002: \$269,051,000,000.

**SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

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

(1) **National Defense (050):**

- Fiscal year 1997:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$240,300,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$237,300,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$233,300,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$235,200,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$227,400,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$228,300,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$223,400,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$220,400,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$219,500,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$216,400,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$219,500,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$216,500,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$200,000,000.

- (2) **International Affairs (150):**
- Fiscal year 1997:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$15,800,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,342,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$18,251,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$18,300,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$17,500,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,417,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$18,628,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$18,500,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,518,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$19,030,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$22,100,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$19,600,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,618,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$19,406,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$22,000,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$20,000,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,739,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$19,858,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$22,000,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$20,000,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,739,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$19,858,000,000.

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,000,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,891,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$20,431,000,000.

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

- Fiscal year 1997:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$15,800,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$15,400,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1998:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$15,300,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$15,400,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$15,200,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$14,900,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$14,900,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$14,900,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

- (4) **Energy (270):**
- Fiscal year 1997:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$3,300,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$2,200,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,033,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1998:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$1,800,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,050,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$3,300,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$2,000,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,078,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$3,100,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$1,700,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,109,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$3,300,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$1,800,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,141,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$1,500,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,179,000,000,000.

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

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$22,200,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$27,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$21,900,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$41,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$21,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$21,400,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$41,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,600,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$41,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,500,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$44,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,400,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$44,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$10,900,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$7,810,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$5,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$10,000,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,387,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,765,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$10,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$8,800,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,808,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,836,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$10,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$8,300,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,825,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$8,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$7,100,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,708,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,983,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,100,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,706,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$7,060,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$8,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,300,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,910,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,096,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$10,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,700,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,900,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,218,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,000,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,954,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,427,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$7,100,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,015,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,723,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$7,600,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,072,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,876,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$8,200,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,134,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$199,111,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$42,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$39,000,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$43,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$38,100,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$43,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$36,800,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$44,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$33,900,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$17,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$45,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$33,800,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$17,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$46,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$33,700,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$18,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,200,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,230,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,187,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,800,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,257,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,229,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$2,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$12,200,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,287,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,315,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$12,700,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,365,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,369,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$13,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$13,100,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,404,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,448,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$13,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$13,300,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,430,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,496,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,800,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,257,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,229,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$2,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$12,200,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,287,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,315,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$12,700,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,365,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,369,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$13,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$13,100,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,404,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,448,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$13,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$13,300,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,430,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,496,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$62,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$61,800,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,219,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$15,469,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$64,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$63,700,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$69,700,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$14,760,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$68,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$66,400,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$21,781,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$13,854,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$70,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$68,700,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$22,884,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$14,589,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$71,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$69,700,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$23,978,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$15,319,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$73,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$71,100,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$25,127,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$16,085,000,000.

(11) Health (550):



(A) New budget authority, \$15,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$15,100,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(18) Net Interest (900):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$281,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$281,400,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$285,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$285,600,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$287,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$287,300,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$286,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$286,800,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$289,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$289,500,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$293,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$293,500,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(19) Allowances (920):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$0.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$0.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

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

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

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

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

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

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$43,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$43,300,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$7,900,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$33,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$33,500,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$8,838,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$8,838,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$31,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$31,100,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$3,600,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$32,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$32,600,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$33,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$33,800,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

#### SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

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

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

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

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

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

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

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

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

(5) over half of the women surveyed stayed with their batterers because they lacked the resources to support themselves and their children; the surveys also found that the

availability of economic support is a critical factor in poor women's ability to leave abusive situations that threaten them and their children; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] will be recognized for 30 minutes in opposition. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am proud to join my distinguished colleague from New York, MAJOR OWENS, and our friends in the Progressive Caucus, in offering a budget plan to renew America by reordering our national priorities.

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

After many months of hard work, we have produced a plan which is both fiscally sound and morally responsible.

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

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

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

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

Our caring majority budget continues these important domestic investments.

We also recognize America's role as a champion of democracy worldwide. In the area of international affairs, we provide support for emerging democracies in Eastern Europe and other nations in this post-cold-war-era. We maintain the current level of foreign assistance to Africa and support foreign aid grants to Egypt and Israel. We encourage efforts to reach a fair and

just peace in places like Northern Ireland. In addition, in keeping with America's tradition of lending a helping hand to those in need, we provide humanitarian assistance through the Public Law 480 food programs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

Just to set the tone, and hopefully it will work this way, hopefully you are not going to come out and say Medicare cuts. We do not cut Medicare. We

can talk about reductions, we can talk about reductions in growth, we can talk about saving, we can talk about lots of things like that. But please do not come out with that, because we think we can sincerely have a debate over your budget and our budget without using the kind of rhetoric.

□ 1115

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We are not going to wait for the Federal Government. We are not going to wait for the State government. We are not going to wait for Congress to pass a bill or get its act

together or debate the budget. We are going to clean up our community today. We are going to solve local problems today.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The caring majority budget of the Congressional Black Caucus and the House Progressive Caucus meets the mandate that we produce a balanced budget. But this budget does not produce a murder of Medicaid. It does not reduce EITC or wipe out the summer youth employment programs. The budget is again balanced by eliminating corporate welfare and closing corporate tax loopholes.

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

By continuing to insist that the Medicaid entitlement be eliminated, the Republican budget poses a clear and present threat to the health and life of millions of Americans. By abandoning health care to the States, the Repub-

lican budget opens the door to decentralized genocide. Instead of going forward into universal health care, we will be leaving the children and the elderly to die for lack of vital health care.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And look what they have to deal with; a value-neutral Federal Government that hands out dollars and does not provide for any stability or secu-

rity in this country. I am sorry, but this is the kind of budget that we are considering now that is being offered.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

One of the reasons we have a major deficit crisis today is that during the 1970's and 1980's we already gave huge

breaks to the rich. The wealthiest 1 percent of the population now owns more wealth than the bottom 90 percent. They do not need more tax breaks. Corporate profits are soaring while workers' wages are in decline. We do not have to give large corporations more tax breaks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1130

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the floor manager for his generosity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

His belief was a fairly simple two-part formula. He said first, you got to get government out of my pocket; and, second, you got to get government out of my way. I think that this budget reflects that. There is a saying back

home farmers use, you can only squeeze so much blood out of a turnip that talks about taxes, and I think we all know the detrimental effect of taxes on economic growth.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me time. I want to begin by commending the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], our colleague, and the Committee on the Budget for

the magnificent job they have done in keeping us headed down the road toward balancing the budget over the period leading to 2002.

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

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

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

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

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

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

We protected funding for the administration of the Social Security Administration so that they could do a better job of helping the American people. In a time of working to balance the budget, which is our job here, to take responsibility for the bottom line, we also have to choose priorities. I believe

this Congress in the last year and a half has done that job very, very well. It has provided very strong support for the programs that work for people, and it has only cut those that really do not do the job or waste the taxpayers money.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And I also want to note that the cuts assumed for energy efficiency initiatives are unwise and should not be adopted. These initiatives make our economy more productive and

competitive overseas, while saving jobs and resources. This type of activity—which is proenvironment and proeconomic growth—is what we should be supporting, not discouraging.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Last year, that same troupe gave us the balance the budget on the backs of

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Why should not people have some choices? Welfare, what works in Sara-

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

□ 1145

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Second, it maintains the safety net. Health care for the poor and the elderly would be maintained and indeed

strengthened by credible spending and sending savings back into the system—instead of sending this money on a big, fat tax cut for the wealthiest people in America.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

me. I thank those speakers earlier in the well who said that this was an honest alternative and they said it was about the difference in priorities. Indeed it is.

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

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

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

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

We in the Progressive and Black Caucuses are offering the only genuine alternative to business as usual. We demand that foreign corporations doing business here get out of the wagon, as a famous gentleman on the other side

of the aisle likes to say, and start pulling with the rest of us. We close loopholes and encourage job exports to the Far East and Mexico. We make foreign mining companies pay their fair share for valuable minerals they mine on our public lands.

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

Mr. Chairman, let's talk about something that none of the sponsors of any of the other budgets on the floor of this House want to discuss.

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

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

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

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

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

There are two distinct paths to a balanced budget.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, America needs the Republican budget before us today, a budget that shifts money and power

and influence out of Washington and gives it back to the people. This is a historic debate about the role and the scope of Government in our lives, a debate of whether Washington will continue to tax more, spend more and regulate more or whether we will finally begin to reduce the size and scope and power of Washington.

Support the Republican budget.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the Black Caucus for at least producing a balanced budget unlike the President's budget. But I think that Colin Powell would enlighten the Congressional Black Caucus on what the needs for national security are within this country. Our committee, Republicans and Democrats, by a vote 49 to 2, 49 to 2 Republicans and Democrats, came together and said that after the cold war these are the needs of our Nation, and it was supported by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Shalikashvili in a memo to the Presidents. When the Democrats' task is studied, the Bottom-Up Review

of what we would need after the military drawdown to fight two conflicts at the same time, a level was stationed. A \$50 billion cut according to Colin Powell, Dick Cheney, and then-candidate Clinton would put us into a hollow force. The President cut defense \$177 billion, and then with what was left put in nondefense spending. We spend billions of dollars in Haiti, which is military operations. There is another \$2 billion just in administrative costs, as the one in Haiti. Take a look at Somalia and all the other expansions. Operation Tempo has increased 150 percent over Vietnam. The Air Force has not bought a single airplane in 3 years, gentleman. The AV-8's; we are losing them, almost a third of them, the new ones with the upgrades.

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

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

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

□ 1200

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

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

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

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

As this chart here demonstrates, the share of the national tax burden paid

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of a budget for the United States of America, for it is not the Congressional Black Caucus' budget, it is a budget offered by the Congress-

sional Black Caucus on behalf of those constituents that we represent, who know all too well that the biggest deficit that we have in this country is not the trade deficit or the budget deficit, but the human capital deficit; the fact that we want to see future Colin Powells have an opportunity to get an education, to be able to grow up in decent neighborhoods and have affordable housing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So as we move to solve the problems, let us have the courage to acknowledge that in contrast to the budget offered here, all answers do not emanate from Washington, DC. All answers do not confuse compassion and commitment. The most compassionate thing we can do for this generation of seniors, for generations yet unborn, is to adopt a sensible, rational budget that at long last has Washington live within its limits and the American people truly compassionately live within their means.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am one of the GOP freshmen that voted against the defense authorization. I have voted

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The President, in his State of the Union Address, told us three times that

the era of big government was over. Yet, the budget proposal that he has made and the other alternatives that we have before us from the Democratic side of the aisle do not reflect that the era of big government is over.

□ 1215

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Which budget, Mr. Chairman, speaks to the realities of the pain and human

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

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

We must lift ourselves to a larger vision, a larger vision about where this country ought to go as we travel to the 21st century. I believe the budget before us does that. It reverses the wrong trends and with compassion and dignity and vision and forthright thought speaks to the reality of the pain and the human misery and the needs of our people, whether they are senior citizens, whether they are middle-class human beings, whether they are farmers in rural America or whether they are young children trapped in the mire of the violence of urban America. This budget, it seems to me, does that.

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

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

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

When I was elected from the State government to the Federal government, I thought the Federal Government could do it better. It cannot do it better because what it does is, it adds up all the people in a room, adds up their entire shoe size, divides the number of people by the shoe size, and say, "Here is 8½, wear it. If your shoe size is 10, I'm sorry. Here is 8½, wear it." We have a society that is going in the wrong direction.

Our budget changes that. We increase the student loans, we increase Medicare, we increase Medicaid, we increase welfare payments. But ultimately what we are trying to do, as a columnist said, in the final analysis, it is not

what we do for our children but what we have taught them to do for themselves that will make them successful human beings.

We are looking to transform our caretaking social and corporate welfare state into a caring opportunity society, a caring opportunity society where we teach people how to grow the seeds so they can do it for themselves. So I compliment my colleagues on the other side. There is compassion in that budget, but it is headed in the wrong direction.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Sabo substitute to the budget resolution. Although it is much more appealing than the Republican proposal, it certainly isn't the best substitute we had the opportunity to consider today.

The Congressional Black Caucus-Progressive Caucus budget offered a 6-year balanced budget that proposed to increase investments in education, job training, infrastructure and at the same time protected Medicare and Medicaid. To pay for these investments the substitute proposed to modestly reduce the defense budget and closed tax loopholes that create corporate welfare. It made investing in the working class, the middle class, the poor, our children a priority. The CBC-Progressive Caucus budget proved that we can invest in education, job training, infrastructure, while protecting health security and still achieve a balanced budget.

The CBC-Progressive Caucus budget also provided sufficient military funding to keep national defense strong while eliminating large amounts of waste through a thorough analysis and projection for future world security and peacekeeping needs. But the Sabo substitute still spends \$251 billion more than CBC-Progressive budget over 6 years. In fact, the Sabo military provision is virtually indistinguishable from the Republican defense budget. The \$251 billion the CBC saves allows us to invest more in education, job training, transportation, and health care. Without the savings, we will not have the resources to make the necessary human investments, even as we move toward a balanced budget.

In the CBC-Progressive budget substitute, we proposed to invest more than \$80 billion over 6 years in education and job training—to assure that we have the most advanced and competitive work force in the 21st century. We protected large job-creating programs like transportation and public works—investments that not only create work but also improve our Nation's standard of living by improving our infrastructure. We protected Medicare and Medicaid, assuring its effectiveness for our Nation's elderly population. Until we get real health care reform, spending on Medicare and Medicaid cannot be compromised. We just can't afford the cuts that the Republican budget leaders are prescribing.

Mr. Chairman, this budget debate is about priorities. I believe the CBC-Progressive Caucus defense budget fairly reflects our Nation's security needs, while offering this country the peace dividend it has earned. Without the savings realized by a more efficient Defense Department, we are not able to make the kinds of investments that will truly help working people in America.

Americans have rejected the extreme ideas of the Republican majority. Democrats have the responsibility to represent the middle class, the working class, the poor, the elderly, and our children. The CBC-Progressive Caucus budget emphasized a commitment to these priorities and deserves our support.

But yet how do we account for the fact that the CBC-Progressive budget garnered only 63 votes and the Blue-Dog Democrats were able to manage twice as many votes? I urged my Democratic colleagues to vote for the CBC-Progressive budget so we could in turn vote for the President's budget—but they refused. What kind of message does this send to 40 million people who are represented by members of the Black and Hispanic caucuses, that endorsed the CBC-Progressive budget? I ask our esteemed leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, to share with me the serious dichotomy that honestly reveals at bottom that most of the Democrats have very little vision of how we would discharge the most important responsibility as legislators, if we were in power. We're run over now, and unless things change, we will be run over when we win on November 5, 1996. I have asked Mr. GEPHARDT to meet with me on this subject at his earliest convenience.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus alternative budget.

When President Reagan, in 1981, challenged anyone who did not accept his program to come up with an alternative that offered a greater chance of balancing the budget, the Congressional Black Caucus sent him their answer in a month.

With that first budget they set the tone for fiscally sound, economically fair, and realistically feasible budgetary options for this country in its attempts to recover from serious economic deficits and high inflation.

The Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus have joined to offer an alternative budget for fiscal year 1997 that does not engage in the economic cannibalism of our Nation's poor, elderly, or children.

This budget opposes all attempts by the "elite conservative minority" of the Republican Party to reduce the value of Social Security. This budget would ensure that current coverage for Medicaid and Medicare is not cut or further compromised.

This budget would maintain current services, where the Republican budget would have \$240 billion in Medicaid cuts.

To encourage commerce through the creation of small and women and minority owned businesses this budget would add another \$300 million for each fiscal year. They would freeze Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation moneys at fiscal year 1996 levels rather than allow it to decrease in funding.

This budget would oppose any attempts to erode the value of Social Security, including any extension of the age for eligibility.

They would balance the budget with a fair application of revenue increases through the elimination of loopholes for multinational and foreign controlled corporations, reform taxation of income of multinational corporations and capital gains reform just to mention a few. Their recommended changes would result in a total of additional revenue of \$486.7 billion.

The American people need and want a reasoned and balanced plan for addressing this country's serious deficit problems, and this budget is that plan.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus substitute budget for fiscal year 1997. This alternative reflects the vision of a caring majority. Unlike the Republican majority budget which dramatically threatens the health of millions of Americans, the CBC and Progressive Caucus' substitute protects the health of those in the dawn of life, our children, and those in the twilight of life, our seniors.

The Republican measure continues their assault on the health of the weakest among us by gutting \$158 billion from Medicare, gutting \$72 billion from Medicaid, forcing seniors to pay more for less health care, denying health care services to children aged 13 to 18, and eliminating the guarantee of coverage for all low-income seniors who cannot afford Medicare. The list of pain and suffering goes on and on.

Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus alternative budget overturns the assault on the health of the American people, while also balancing the budget. The CBC budget increases funding for the program authorized under the Disadvantaged Minority Health Improvement Act in an effort to ensure an adequate supply of health care professionals in medically underserved areas; provides the resources necessary to adequately address the toxic waste disposal problem as outlined in the Environmental Justice Act and provides funding for historically black colleges' hospitals which have traditionally provided health care services for disadvantaged populations. To further progress in addressing the Nation's substance abuse problem, the measure increases funding to provide for a more comprehensive substance abuse treatment and prevention initiative.

With respect to Medicare and Medicaid the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus substitute ensures that current coverage of Medicaid and Medicare is preserved and strengthened. All savings generated from these programs are reinvested into strengthening these critical health care programs, not destroying them.

To ensure continued improvements in the health of the American people, the measure also retains strong support for funding initiatives to further advances in the early detection, diagnosis, and prevention of disorders and diseases, from cancer, to diabetes, to aids, by enhancing funding for the Centers for Disease Control and the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus caring budget. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this substitute budget which strengthens the Nation's fiscal policy and priorities in a responsible and compassionate manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 63, noes 362, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 176]

AYES—63

|              |               |            |
|--------------|---------------|------------|
| Becerra      | Ford          | Nadler     |
| Bishop       | Frank (MA)    | Oberstar   |
| Bonior       | Gibbons       | Owens      |
| Brown (FL)   | Gutierrez     | Payne (NJ) |
| Clay         | Hastings (FL) | Rangel     |
| Clayton      | Hilliard      | Rush       |
| Clyburn      | Hinchee       | Sanders    |
| Collins (IL) | Jackson (IL)  | Schroeder  |
| Collins (MI) | Jackson-Lee   | Scott      |
| Conyers      | (TX)          | Serrano    |
| Coyne        | Jefferson     | Stark      |
| Cummings     | Johnson, E.B. | Stokes     |
| DeFazio      | Johnston      | Studds     |
| Dellums      | Lewis (GA)    | Thompson   |
| Dixon        | Markey        | Torres     |
| Engel        | Martinez      | Velazquez  |
| Evans        | McDermott     | Waters     |
| Fattah       | McKinney      | Watt (NC)  |
| Fields (LA)  | Meek          | Waxman     |
| Flner        | Millender-    | Wynn       |
| Flake        | McDonald      | Yates      |
| Foglietta    | Moakley       |            |

NOES—362

|              |               |               |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie  | Coble         | Furse         |
| Ackerman     | Coburn        | Galleghy      |
| Allard       | Coleman       | Ganske        |
| Andrews      | Collins (GA)  | Gejdenson     |
| Archer       | Combest       | Gekas         |
| Armey        | Condit        | Gephardt      |
| Bachus       | Cooley        | Geren         |
| Baesler      | Costello      | Gilchrest     |
| Baker (CA)   | Cox           | Gillmor       |
| Baker (LA)   | Cramer        | Gilman        |
| Baldacci     | Crane         | Gonzalez      |
| Ballenger    | Crapo         | Goodlatte     |
| Barcia       | Cremeans      | Goodling      |
| Barr         | Cubin         | Gordon        |
| Barrett (NE) | Cunningham    | Goss          |
| Barrett (WI) | Danner        | Graham        |
| Bartlett     | Davis         | Green (TX)    |
| Barton       | de la Garza   | Greene (UT)   |
| Bass         | Deal          | Greenwood     |
| Bateman      | DeLauro       | Gunderson     |
| Bellenson    | DeLay         | Gutknecht     |
| Bentsen      | Deutsch       | Hall (OH)     |
| Bereuter     | Diaz-Balart   | Hall (TX)     |
| Berman       | Dickey        | Hamilton      |
| Bilbray      | Dicks         | Hancock       |
| Billrakis    | Dingell       | Hansen        |
| Bliley       | Doggett       | Harman        |
| Blute        | Dooley        | Hastert       |
| Boehlert     | Doolittle     | Hastings (WA) |
| Boehner      | Dornan        | Hayworth      |
| Bonilla      | Doyle         | Hefley        |
| Bono         | Dreier        | Hefner        |
| Borski       | Duncan        | Heineman      |
| Boucher      | Dunn          | Henger        |
| Brewster     | Durbin        | Hilleary      |
| Browder      | Edwards       | Hobson        |
| Brown (CA)   | Ehlers        | Hoekstra      |
| Brown (OH)   | Ehrlich       | Hoke          |
| Brownback    | Emerson       | Holden        |
| Bryant (TN)  | English       | Horn          |
| Bryant (TX)  | Ensign        | Hostettler    |
| Bunn         | Eshoo         | Houghton      |
| Bunning      | Everett       | Hoyer         |
| Burr         | Ewing         | Hunter        |
| Buyer        | Farr          | Hutchinson    |
| Callahan     | Fawell        | Hyde          |
| Calvert      | Fazio         | Inglis        |
| Camp         | Fields (TX)   | Istook        |
| Campbell     | Flanagan      | Jacobs        |
| Canady       | Foley         | Johnson (CT)  |
| Cardin       | Forbes        | Johnson (SD)  |
| Castle       | Fowler        | Johnson, Sam  |
| Chabot       | Fox           | Jones         |
| Chambliss    | Franks (CT)   | Kanjorski     |
| Chapman      | Franks (NJ)   | Kaptur        |
| Christensen  | Frelinghuysen | Kasich        |
| Chrysler     | Frisa         | Kelly         |
| Clement      | Frost         | Kennedy (MA)  |
| Clinger      | Funderburk    | Kennedy (RI)  |

|             |               |             |
|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| Kennelly    | Morella       | Shadegg     |
| Kildee      | Murtha        | Shaw        |
| Kim         | Myers         | Shays       |
| King        | Myrick        | Shuster     |
| Kingston    | Neal          | Sisisky     |
| Klecza      | Nethercutt    | Skaggs      |
| Klink       | Neumann       | Skeen       |
| Klug        | Ney           | Skelton     |
| Knollenberg | Norwood       | Slaughter   |
| Kolbe       | Nussle        | Smith (MI)  |
| LaFalce     | Obey          | Smith (NJ)  |
| LaHood      | Oliver        | Smith (TX)  |
| Lantos      | Ortiz         | Smith (WA)  |
| Largent     | Orton         | Solomon     |
| Latham      | Oxley         | Souder      |
| LaTourette  | Packard       | Spence      |
| Laughlin    | Pallone       | Spratt      |
| Lazio       | Parker        | Stearns     |
| Leach       | Pastor        | Stenholm    |
| Levin       | Payne (VA)    | Stockman    |
| Lewis (CA)  | Pelosi        | Stump       |
| Lewis (KY)  | Peterson (FL) | Stupak      |
| Lightfoot   | Peterson (MN) | Tanner      |
| Lincoln     | Petri         | Tate        |
| Linder      | Pickett       | Tauzin      |
| Lipinski    | Pombo         | Taylor (MS) |
| Livingston  | Pomeroy       | Taylor (NC) |
| LoBiondo    | Porter        | Tejeda      |
| Lofgren     | Poshard       | Thomas      |
| Longley     | Pryce         | Thornberry  |
| Lowe        | Quillen       | Thornton    |
| Lucas       | Quinn         | Thurman     |
| Luther      | Radanovich    | Tiahrt      |
| Maloney     | Rahall        | Torkildsen  |
| Manton      | Ramstad       | Torrice     |
| Manzullo    | Reed          | Trafficant  |
| Martini     | Regula        | Upton       |
| Mascara     | Richardson    | Vento       |
| Matsui      | Riggs         | Visclosky   |
| McCarthy    | Rivers        | Volkmer     |
| McCollum    | Roberts       | Vucanovich  |
| McCrary     | Roemer        | Walker      |
| McDade      | Rogers        | Walsh       |
| McHale      | Rohrabacher   | Wamp        |
| McInnis     | Ros-Lehtinen  | Ward        |
| McIntosh    | Rose          | Watts (OK)  |
| McKeon      | Roth          | Weldon (FL) |
| McNulty     | Roukema       | Weldon (PA) |
| Meehan      | Royal-Allard  | Weller      |
| Menendez    | Royce         | White       |
| Metcalf     | Sabo          | Whitfield   |
| Meyers      | Salmun        | Wicker      |
| Mica        | Sanford       | Williams    |
| Miller (CA) | Saxton        | Wilson      |
| Miller (FL) | Scarborough   | Wise        |
| Minge       | Schaefer      | Wolf        |
| Mink        | Schiff        | Woolsey     |
| Mollohan    | Schumer       | Young (AK)  |
| Montgomery  | Seastrand     | Young (FL)  |
| Moorhead    | Sensenbrenner | Zeliff      |
| Moran       |               | Zimmer      |

NOT VOTING—8

|           |         |        |
|-----------|---------|--------|
| Bevill    | Hayes   | Talent |
| Burton    | Molinar | Towns  |
| Chenoweth | Paxon   |        |

□ 1241

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Towns for, with Mr. Paxon against.

Messrs. EWING, CHRYSLER, and RADANOVICH, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute designated in paragraph 2 of section 2 of House Resolution 435.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. ORTON.

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

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

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

|                   |                      |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| Fiscal year 1997: | \$1,107,513,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 1998: | \$1,165,720,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 1999: | \$1,214,661,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 2000: | \$1,269,637,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 2001: | \$1,330,292,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 2002: | \$1,392,543,000,000. |

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

|                   |                   |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| Fiscal year 1997: | \$7,157,000,000.  |
| Fiscal year 1998: | \$17,170,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 1999: | \$16,303,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 2000: | \$17,838,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 2001: | \$19,192,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 2002: | \$18,645,000,000. |

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

|                   |                      |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| Fiscal year 1997: | \$1,316,223,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 1998: | \$1,364,054,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 1999: | \$1,405,593,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 2000: | \$1,448,718,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 2001: | \$1,480,821,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 2002: | \$1,529,237,000,000. |

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

|                   |                      |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| Fiscal year 1997: | \$1,313,391,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 1998: | \$1,352,476,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 1999: | \$1,388,058,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 2000: | \$1,428,498,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 2001: | \$1,453,221,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 2002: | \$1,501,530,000,000. |

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

|                   |                    |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| Fiscal year 1997: | \$205,878,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 1998: | \$186,756,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 1999: | \$173,397,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 2000: | \$158,861,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 2001: | \$122,929,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 2002: | \$108,987,000,000. |

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

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

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

|                   |                   |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| Fiscal year 1997: | \$41,432,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 1998: | \$39,420,000,000. |
| Fiscal year 1999: | \$42,470,000,000. |

Fiscal year 2000: \$43,895,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$45,292,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$46,718,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$267,340,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$266,819,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$266,088,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$267,079,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$267,982,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$269,051,000,000.

### SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$259,235,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$262,484,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$263,733,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$259,351,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$267,996,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$261,560,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$273,082,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$267,858,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$272,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$265,703,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$272,372,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$269,364,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,178,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,008,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,342,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$18,251,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,682,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,566,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,417,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$18,628,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,838,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,552,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,518,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$19,030,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,749,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,461,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,618,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$19,406,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,879,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,669,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,739,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$19,858,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,124,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,727,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,891,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$20,431,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,840,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,894,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,841,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,852,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,843,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,776,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,844,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,822,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,845,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,844,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,846,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,845,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

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

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,728,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,080,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,033,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,654,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,695,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,050,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,220,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,180,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,078,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,167,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,035,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,109,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,337,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,179,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,141,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,065,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,816,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,174,000,000.

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

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,359,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,969,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$37,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,131,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,846,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$41,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,277,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,921,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$41,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,150,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,630,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$41,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,032,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,253,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$44,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,019,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,089,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$44,000,000.

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

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,617,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,778,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$7,810,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$5,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,663,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,677,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,387,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,765,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,481,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,529,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,808,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,836,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,933,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,026,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,825,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,889,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,081,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,708,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,983,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,646,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,816,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,706,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$7,060,000,000.  
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,928,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$826,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,910,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,096,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,878,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,381,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,900,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,218,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,622,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,713,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,954,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,427,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,421,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,686,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,015,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,723,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,984,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,198,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,072,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$198,876,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,325,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,837,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,134,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$199,111,000,000.  
 (8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,944,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,307,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,651,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,616,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,544,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,014,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,240,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,526,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$17,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,854,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,788,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$17,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,582,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,440,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$18,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,733,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,409,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,231,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,181,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,268,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,024,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,257,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,229,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,556,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,464,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,287,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,315,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,621,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,163,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,365,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,369,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,610,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,671,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,404,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,448,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,498,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,149,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,430,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,496,000,000.  
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,099,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$51,302,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,219,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$15,469,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$54,914,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$53,764,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$19,040,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$14,760,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,631,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$55,520,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$21,781,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$13,854,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,968,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$56,675,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$22,884,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$14,589,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,496,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$57,975,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$23,978,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$15,319,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,089,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$59,302,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$25,127,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$16,085,000,000.  
 (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$130,271,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$129,859,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$187,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$137,102,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$136,870,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$94,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$146,449,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$146,486,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$155,462,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$155,232,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$163,952,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$163,535,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$174,717,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$174,167,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
 (12) Medicare (570):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$191,735,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$190,051,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$205,671,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$203,946,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$219,739,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$217,467,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$233,083,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$231,334,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$249,351,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$247,617,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$266,091,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$263,690,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
 (13) Income Security (600):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$231,135,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$238,848,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$243,312,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$247,097,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$252,613,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$256,017,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$266,923,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$268,708,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$273,393,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$273,190,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$288,716,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$286,757,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- (14) Social Security (650):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,813,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,001,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,477,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,664,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,220,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,369,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,980,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,129,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,776,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,925,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,608,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,757,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,074,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,570,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$935,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$26,362,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,910,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,387,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$962,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$25,925,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,420,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,603,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$987,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$25,426,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,548,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,235,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,021,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$24,883,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,803,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,655,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,189,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$24,298,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,005,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,268,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,194,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$23,668,000,000.
- (16) Administration of Justice (750):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,127,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,930,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,302,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,162,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,186,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,241,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,235,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,944,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,119,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,461,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,143,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,085,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- (17) General Government (800):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,655,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,362,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,661,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,522,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,311,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,299,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,149,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,346,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,086,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,046,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,147,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,104,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- (18) Net Interest (900):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$282,011,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$281,971,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$287,083,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$286,933,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$289,332,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$289,032,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$289,637,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$289,162,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$292,873,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$292,190,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$297,178,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$296,252,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- (19) Allowances (920):  
 Fiscal year 1997:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$0.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$0.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$6,000,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$7,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$7,000,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$8,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$8,500,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$9,000,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, —\$9,000,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, —\$9,500,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, —\$9,500,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
  - Fiscal year 1997:
    - (A) New budget authority, —\$43,258,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, —\$43,258,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$7,900,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, —\$34,878,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, —\$34,878,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,350,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, —\$33,685,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, —\$33,685,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, —\$35,974,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, —\$35,974,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, —\$37,759,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, —\$37,759,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, —\$39,435,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, —\$39,435,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

**SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.**

(a) Not later than June 21, 1996, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b)(1) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$2,082,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$15,117,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$18,852,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(2) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$367,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$2,428,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$3,026,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(3) The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$10,717,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$158,844,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$226,598,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(4) The House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities shall report

changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$220,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$2,454,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$3,198,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(5) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$2,600,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$40,278,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$50,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(6) The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$0 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$357,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$476,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(7) The House Committee on National Security shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$84,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$493,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$649,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(8) The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$74,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$308,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$332,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(9) The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$19,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$810,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$885,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(10) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$117,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$2,378,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$3,232,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(11) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit, as follows: by \$14,766,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, by \$172,990,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and by \$231,595,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "direct spending" has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

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

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

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

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

(3) domestic violence is often intensified as women seek to gain economic independence

through attending school or training programs; batterers have been reported to prevent women from attending these programs or sabotage their efforts at self-improvement;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TAX CUTS.**

It is the sense of Congress that changes in tax laws which promote job creation, economic growth, and increased savings and investment should be enacted and be offset by changes which close tax loopholes and eliminate corporate welfare.

**SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE DEBT.**

It is the sense of Congress that eliminating the deficit by producing a balanced budget is only the first step toward the ultimate goal of reducing and eventually eliminating the public debt.

**SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TRUST FUND SURPLUSES.**

It is the sense of Congress that—

(2) all recent-year Federal budgets, as well as both fiscal year 1996 budget resolutions reported out by the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, have masked the magnitude of annual

deficits by counting various trust fund surpluses; and

(2) upon reaching a balance in the Federal budget, the Government should move toward balance without consideration of trust fund surpluses.

#### SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BALANCED BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that, in order to ensure that a balanced budget is achieved by fiscal year 2002 and that the budget remains in balance thereafter, title XIV of H.R. 2530 establishing strict budget enforcement mechanisms should be enacted. Such language would—

(1) require the Federal Government to reach a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2002 and remain in balance thereafter;

(2) establish procedures for developing honest, accurate, and accepted budget estimates;

(3) require that the President propose annual budgets that would achieve a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2002 and for each year thereafter, using accurate assumptions;

(4) require the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate to report budget resolutions that achieve a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2002 and for each year thereafter, using accurate assumptions; and

(5) require Congress and the President to take action if the deficit targets in this resolution are not met.

#### SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MEDICARE REFORM.

It is the sense of Congress that any legislation reforming medicare should reflect the policies and distribution of savings contained in H.R. 2530. Specifically, that legislation should—

(1) reform policies for medicare risk contracting to expand the choice of private options available to all medicare beneficiaries, including individuals in rural areas;

(2) contain regulatory reforms to facilitate the creation of provider-sponsored networks;

(3) contain reasonable reductions in the growth of payments to providers that do not threaten the availability or quality of care;

(4) require higher income medicare beneficiaries to pay a greater portion of medicare premiums without establishing a new bureaucracy for the collection of premiums;

(5) expand coverage of preventive benefits under medicare;

(6) provide a demonstration project for Medical Savings Accounts for medicare beneficiaries; and

(7) prohibit managed care plans from charging medicare beneficiaries additional premiums beyond the part B premium.

#### SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MEDICAID REFORM.

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

(1) continue guaranteed coverage for low-income children, pregnant women, the elderly, and the disabled;

(2) continue the guarantee of an adequate benefits package for all medicaid beneficiaries;

(3) provide States with greater flexibility in the delivery of services and administration of the program;

(4) contain a financing mechanism in which the Federal Government fully shares in changes in program costs resulting from changes in caseload;

(5) require States to maintain current levels of financial effort to preserve the current joint Federal-State partnership in meeting the costs of this program;

(6) continue current restrictions on the use of provider taxes and donations and other illusive State financing schemes;

(7) continue Federal minimum standards for nursing homes;

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

(9) continue coverage of medicaid premiums and cost sharing for low-income seniors.

#### SEC. 13. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING WELFARE REFORM.

It is the sense of Congress that any legislation reforming welfare programs pursuant to this resolution should—

(1) impose tough work requirements on able-bodied recipients;

(2) provide sufficient resources for job training, child care, and other programs necessary to help welfare recipients make the transition from welfare to work;

(3) require States to maintain levels of financial support sufficient to operate an effective program;

(4) contain effective counter-cyclical mechanisms to assist States facing economic downturns or increases in population;

(5) include provisions holding States accountable for the use of Federal funds and the effectiveness of State programs;

(6) contain strong child support provisions; and

(7) maintain the integrity of the food stamp program as a national safety net.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be coming shortly, and he will be opposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, last night after general debate on the budget, I was talking with one of my constituents who after watching several hours of debate was totally confused over what the argument was all about. While the budget and alternatives may be clear to those of us here in this Chamber, the people have a hard time following us.

Therefore, as simply as I can, I will now outline the principal differences between the various budgets we are considering.

All of the budgets offered would achieved balance in 2002. The differences are in the details of how much is cut each year, how much is spent or cut from each program, and how the programs are changed to achieve these savings.

Last year, at the beginning of the budget debate, the President's budget and the Republican's budget were \$600 billion different between now and 2002. The coalition budget was a centrist budget, with numbers between the

President's and Republican's, designed to bridge the gap between the two and facilitate an agreement which the President could sign into law.

Since that time, in an effort to resolve their differences, both the President and the Republicans have changed their proposals significantly toward one another. In fact, their numbers on spending have collapsed to virtually mirror the coalition budget. Today, the difference between the President and the coalition is only 0.6 percent and between the Republicans and the coalition is only 0.9 percent in an \$11 trillion budget over the next six years.

Being so close, then why isn't there agreement? The answer is found in the policy decisions—how you change each program to achieve the savings. Here again, the coalition budget has set forth proposed policy changes designed to bridge the gap with real common-sense solutions. In a moment, my colleagues will outline those solutions in welfare, Medicaid, Medicare, and other areas.

There is another major difference between the coalition budget and the others under consideration. That is how quickly the deficit is reduced and how much additional Government borrowing is necessary.

The coalition budget borrows \$137 billion less than the Republicans and \$200 billion less than the President over the next six years.

How is that done? The coalition budget cuts spending first. Both the Republicans and the President backload their spending cuts. What is backloading? That means that most of the spending cuts come in the last years of the budget. In fact 80 percent in the last 3 years. And they don't bring the deficit down below \$100 billion until the next century—when some future Congress and President will have to make the tough choices of spending cuts. According to CBO the Republican deficits will go up \$4 billion next year and then drop to only \$1 billion below today's level in 2 years. That is a net increase in the deficit of \$3 billion 2 years from now, leaving almost all of the tough decisions to the next Congress.

We have also heard a lot about tax cuts. The coalition budget does not include tax cuts, not because we oppose tax cuts, but rather we believe we should cut spending and achieve a balanced budget first. Next we should reform our tax system for fairness and simplicity. To try to combine both balancing the budget and tax cuts will guarantee neither and probably prevent either. In an effort to guarantee both, last year the budget contained the provision "Tax Reduction Contingent on Balanced Budget", but this year they refuse to include even those guarantees. Why? Because they promise tax cuts which the Joint Tax Committee says will cost \$216 billion, but

only provide numbers in the budget for \$122 billion. That is not "truth in budgeting". The Republican plan is apparently to being a tax cut package first, an obvious benefit in an election year, and then separately try to change entitlements. This is the same approach used in the 1980's when deficits quadrupled the debt to over \$4 trillion.

I urge my colleagues to support the coalition budget.

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

□ 1245

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Connecticut, and I listened with interest to my colleague from Utah. I share the lament of one of his constituents, who, if I understand my friend correctly, said the argument seemed to be escaping the American people, by and large. We get caught up in too many arcane terms with reference to the budget.

So we will attempt to both respond to my colleague from Utah and to his constituent; and, indeed, Mr. Chairman, to the American people. I think there is simply this fundamental difference. It may be a matter of degrees on the liberal side of the aisle, but essentially what our friends in the coalition are saying is this: "We can change the way we spend money, but let us maintain control here in Washington, and let us maintain control," they say, "with the vast Federal bureaucracy."

Indeed, they use the same mechanisms of the past. Even in trying to have numbers meet in the middle, they have a philosophy which is more of the same: more taxing, more spending.

The budget offered by my friends who call themselves Blue Dog would raise taxes \$211 billion. The budget offered by the coalition would raise spending \$74 billion. And of great concern to the seniors in the Sixth District of Arizona and nationwide, the coalition budget would give seniors \$51 billion less over 6 years.

The remedy is the same. It is regrettable. Our colleagues who call themselves the Blue Dogs seek more of the green stuff from home. They want more of our money in taxes; they want more spending; and they want control here in Washington.

Our budget saves our children's future, empowers people to be self-reliant, and shifts the money, power, and influence out of the hands of the Washington bureaucrats and back home to Main Street, to local government, to solve problems.

With that in mind, I urge my colleagues to reject the budget of the Blue Dogs and stay with the new vision for the future.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Utah for yielding me the time.

I want to quickly respond to my colleague from Arizona and say there are no tax increases in the coalition budget, and that we save or we have \$140 billion more in deficit reduction than the Republican budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to that Republican budget and in strong support of the coalition substitute. The coalition substitute balances the budget in 6 years in an honest, straightforward manner, no detours, no gimmicks, and without any unnecessary tax cuts.

The coalition's budget balances our fiscal responsibility with our social responsibility, and the balance is perhaps best illustrated by our Medicare policy. The coalition budget ensures Medicare solvency for the same number of years as the Republican plan, yet without harsh Republican policies. Our Medicare plan is fair to seniors, does not allow managed care companies or doctors to extra bill them, and it only increases premiums for those with the highest incomes. It provides over \$2 billion for preventive benefits for cancer screening and diabetes testing, an investment that will make sense and will save both lives and money.

Our Medicare plan is also fair to providers. It is supported by numerous health care providers as the most equitable and reasonable way to save the trust fund. Let me read from a letter I received this morning from the American Hospital Association:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PAYNE: The American Hospital Association, representing 5,000 hospitals, health systems and other providers, believes the Coalition's budget alternative is the best choice available to Congress for balancing the Federal budget. We applaud your efforts and urge the Congress to adopt your fiscal year 1997 budget plan.

The Coalition alternative is compatible with the Medicare and Medicaid budget principles that the American Hospital Association has consistently supported.

We appreciate the thoughtful approach the Coalition has taken to deficit reduction, particularly as it pertains to Medicare and Medicaid.

Signed, Rick Pollack, executive vice president.

Mr. Chairman, seniors and providers of health care support our budget as the most equitable and most responsible, and I urge my colleagues to support the coalition Medicare plan and the coalition substitute budget.

Mr. Chairman, I include the letter from the American Hospital Association for the RECORD:

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, May 15, 1996.

Hon. L.F. PAYNE,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PAYNE: The American Hospital Association (AHA), representing 5,000 hospitals, health systems, and other providers of care, believes the Coalition's

budget alternative is the best choice available to the Congress for balancing the federal budget. We applaud your efforts and urge the Congress to adopt your fiscal year 1997 budget plan.

The Coalition alternative is compatible with the Medicare and Medicaid budget principles that the American Hospital Association has consistently supported, including:

Assuring access to care for vulnerable populations—the Coalition preserves the Medicaid program as an entitlement and guarantees reasonable payment to providers for the care they deliver to Medicaid patients.

Giving hospitals the tools they need to compete in the future health care system—the Coalition alternative contains provider-sponsored organization (PSO) language that creates real options for Medicare patients.

Providing for shared responsibility among all stakeholders in the Medicare program.

Creating an independent citizens' commission to help Congress make the tough choices for Medicare's next 30 years.

Not cutting Medicare and Medicaid too fast or too deep—the Coalition's reductions to these two critical programs, while still deeper than we might prefer, are more balanced than those in the Republican or Administration plans.

We appreciate the thoughtful approach the Coalition has taken to deficit reduction, particularly as it applies to Medicare and Medicaid.

Sincerely,

RICK POLLACK,  
Executive Vice President.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, this issue of whether or not we should pass the blue dog budget is really a very, very simple matter. When put into perspective, under the blue dog budget the American people would pay \$211 billion more in taxes as compared to the Republican plan that we are going to be voting on later on today.

Second, the people in Washington, DC, will spend \$74 billion more over the next 6 years than under the Republican plan that we will be voting on later on today.

So it both taxes the American people more and it spends more, and our people in Wisconsin do not want to pay more taxes and they do not think the people in Washington, DC, need to spend more.

But that is not the biggest problem with the blue dog budget. The biggest problem is its impact on the Social Security benefits paid to our senior citizens. And to all of the senior citizens listening here today, I would like to caution them about some Washington jargon that should be a red flag. It is called the CPI adjustment.

Whenever anyone hears this Washington language, they need to know that what they are really talking about is reducing the amount of money that is available to be paid to our senior citizens in the future.

Let me make this very, very simple. If the blue dog budget passes today, and the CPI, that is the cost of living adjustment, would be 3 percent, under

the blue dog plan it would be reduced to 2.5 percent. So instead of going up by 3 percent, an individual's Social Security payments would only go up by 2.5 percent instead.

Folks, this needs to be very, very clear; that under the blue dog budget Social Security benefits are impacted. To me, this is a very simple matter. The blue dog budget taxes more, it spends more, and it reduces the amount of money compared to current law that would be paid to our senior citizens from where we are today.

Clearly, this is a budget we should be voting against for those three reasons: It taxes more, spends more, and reduces the benefits to our senior citizens.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. BLANCH LAMBERT LINCOLN].

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, today, I come and rise in strong support of the blue dog coalition budget, and I oppose the other budgets being offered. I do that as a mother expecting two youngsters soon, and I am especially proud of the coalition's work on a fair balanced budget proposal.

One of the biggest selling points, and it is very clear to everyone, is that the coalition budget has less debt burden placed on our children, my children, everyone's children, in the future. The Republican budget will run up \$137 billion more in debt, which our children will have to pay; or the \$200 billion in the President's budget.

Regardless of what this extra debt is used for, tax cuts, spending, whatever, it will mean higher interest payments and, therefore, less money for our children. Anyone knows that less money down on a house means a larger payment; more interest that is not even deductible.

The coalition alternative balances the budget while being more responsible. The prime example is Medicaid. We maintain guaranteed coverage for those who need it, including disabled children. We allow Medicaid dollars to follow demand, keeping costs down by focusing our dollars on individuals and their needs. We guarantee adequate benefit packages to recipients.

Our guarantees of coverage and benefits will be enforceable through the Federal Government. The Republican proposal contains enforcement loopholes. We still give the States the flexibility that they need to create the savings. We retain Federal nursing home standards to protect our elderly citizens, which the Republican plan does not. We do all of this while still slowing the rate of growth in Medicaid, creating a total savings of \$70 billion over 6 years in Medicaid.

That is what the coalition budget is all about, balancing budget using common sense and fair approaches while doing all that we can to ease the bur-

den on future Americans by taking responsibility for spending now.

If we are concerned about the future for our children, which my colleagues over here claim they are, no one can argue that ours is the only budget that leaves the least amount of debt to our children, all of our children.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], the chairman of the committee that is reforming housing.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment but also to congratulate my colleagues who have put forward this amendment in an effort to try to find a constructive solution.

Let me say, ladies and gentleman, that we do not go the whole route with this alternative. In 1950, ladies and gentlemen, a family of four making an inflation-adjusted \$50,000 in current dollars paid about 4 percent of their income in Federal taxes. Guess what it is now: 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18? If Members guessed any of those, they would be wrong. Twenty-six percent in the last 40 years; a 6-fold increase in the Federal tax burden.

Is there any wonder why moms cannot spend more time with their children after school to go over homework or dads have to work overtime just to meet that Federal burden?

The Republican budget meets this challenge. It begins to say that Americans who earn more will be able to keep more so they can do more. They can make their own decisions. They can help their families. They can have more time to spend going over homework and going to clubs and organizations with their children.

In 1993 this body passed the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation. Now we are going down another path, a path where Americans can keep more of what they earn and help their families.

Alan Greenspan, the chairman of the Federal Reserve board, said in testimony before us that families can look forward to their children doing better than they, and that is the American dream.

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the ranking member and former chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I congratulate the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], and other Members of the coalition for the budget that they present. If our goal is to balance the budget by 2002, this is the alternative that might actually do it.

Mr. Chairman, we need a little humility when we project 6 years into the future. Many things can change. But if

there is any plan that can actually work, it is the Orton proposal. It is tough, it is realistic, but it is also fair to people.

It means less interest costs for the Federal Government. It is the one plan that might actually result in happening what we talk about; that a young family buying a new home might actually have lower mortgage payments because of lower interest rate costs.

It is a good proposal, it is fair, it is workable, it is the one that can achieve our goals. I, in the strongest way I can, urge people to vote for this good alternative, and I congratulate the gentleman from Utah.

□ 1300

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my friends, the blue dogs on this side of the aisle, for bringing forth this budget today. I think it is a great improvement over the budget we are going to see next, which is the President's budget. I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] is going to bring it to the floor.

I say that because the President's budget does not even balance over the 6-year period based on CBO numbers, unless you add some late year gimmicks the last 2 years on some contingencies. So I commend them for having a product that does get to balance. I have a few problems with it as I look at it.

No. 1, in the entitlement area, which is where most of our spending increases are now, they do not get at the real problems, in my view, in Medicaid. I think there could be an unfunded mandate in Medicaid because there is a lack of flexibility, as compared with the Republican approach.

With regard to Medicare, you cannot tell how long the part A trust fund remains solvent based on this approach. It looks like we have a shift from the part A trust fund to the taxpayer-paid part B trust fund.

Finally, and this is the fundamental point, it has higher taxes and higher spending than the Republican plan which gets to balance in the same time period. So why vote for something that does not have the attributes of the Republican plan in terms of entitlement reform, fundamental reforms and has higher taxes and higher spending and gets there at the same time?

I guess my view is, why not the best? We have a plan that has lower taxes and less spending that gets us to balance. That is what we need to do.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues in the House to vote for the coalition budget. Let me suggest three reasons why they should.

First, there is no question that the coalition budget reduces the Federal deficit greater than any of the other proposals before us. Just compare the facts. After 3 years under the Republican budget, the deficit will be reduced by just \$35 billion, from \$150 billion to \$115 billion. Then they would have us believe that Congress is going to jump off a cliff in the next 3 years and eliminate that \$115 billion deficit.

Compare that to the coalition budget which reduces the deficit during the first 3 years by almost one half, down from \$150 billion to \$80 billion.

The true measure as to whether we are serious about deficit reduction is what we do up front. The coalition budget does the best job of keeping us on a glide path to really get the budget deficit over with. Over the next 6 years the Republican committee budget will increase the national debt by \$140 billion more than the coalition budget. The American people want us to end the flood of red ink. The coalition budget is the serious proposal to get that done.

The CBO, OMB, and outside interest groups all agree that this is the best approach, if reducing the deficit is our top domestic priority.

The second reason I urge my colleagues to support this approach is that this approach protects the priorities that are important to the American people. It protects priorities in education, environment, and health care. It protects student loans and provides \$45 billion more for education and training programs to help prepare American children and workers for the economic challenges of the future.

The third reason is that the coalition budget can pass. Democrats and Republicans can come together on the coalition budget and we can really get the job done. If we want to accomplish a balanced budget by the year 2002, this is the way to go. We can come together as Democrats and Republicans, and I urge my colleagues to support the coalition budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. Very briefly, if the Democrats or the coalition or the blue dogs had presented this budget 2 years ago, I suspect most everybody on this side of the aisle would have voted for it.

The reason I suggest we should not vote for this blue dog budget is because it would replace an even better budget passed by the Budget Committee. Here is why I think the Republican budget is better. The Democrat proposal has higher taxes. It has increased spending and that means returning to a tax and spending philosophy.

We had a tax increase in 1993. All of this side of the aisle voted for the tax

increase. That tax increase, according to the Heritage Foundation, cost Americans 1.2 million additional private sector jobs and \$208 billion in economic output. The Democrat coalition budget continues all of the 1993 tax increases.

We have such huge budget problems. I compliment the coalition Members for looking at Social Security. That could be the next catastrophe to hit this country. We need to start dealing with it. I say we have got to have a tax change policy that encourages job expansion for more and better jobs to assist our effort to solve these budget problems.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me. I thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] for his leadership on the coalition on putting this budget together.

We in the coalition have struggled for this entire Congress and we had the luxury, quite frankly, of being called sometimes a minority within a minority, to put forth a public policy document free of as much partisan politics as is possible in this city of Washington, DC.

You will hear a lot of rhetoric. I will not get into it. The Republicans say this raises taxes, this does not, welfare is better or worse in our plan or yours. But my colleagues, there is one good reason why about 40 major newspapers and the Concord Coalition, which is a bipartisan group dedicated to the balancing of this Nation's budget, has endorsed the coalition plan. They have no ax to grind. They take it seriously. I really know of nobody who has credibility on this issue more in our country than the Concord Coalition. They say the blue dog budget is the way to go.

Why? No. 1, we stop borrowing money quicker. We do not keep going into debt as both the Republican and the White House budgets do. That is uncontroverted.

No. 2, we have in our plan an enforcement mechanism, the only one on the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, I was here for part of Gramm-Rudman 2. We had Gramm-Rudman 1. We had the budget summit of 1990, all well-intentioned by good-meaning people to try to get something done, and what happened? We had a big announcement that things were going to get better and because of lack of enforcement, it did not happen.

We put an enforcement mechanism in our budget. We are not interested in going out here and having a press conference and making an announcement that the budget is going to be balanced in 6 years unless it actually happens. We try to do it.

Please support our plan.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ari-

zona [Mr. KOLBE], my colleague on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to restore a comment that was made earlier by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. I think if this were the budget that were proposed 2 years ago, we would all be up here enthusiastically endorsing it. But that was 2 years ago today, we think there is a better alternative that is available.

The chief difference between this alternative budget proposed by the conservative Democrat coalition and the Republican budget comes in the area of tax relief for American citizens. The coalition talks about how we are going to achieve greater deficit reduction. They say their deficit reduction numbers are bigger. The Concord Coalition endorses it. That is true. It does make a faster reduction in the deficit at least initially.

Mr. Chairman, what the coalition budget does not do is give necessary relief to American taxpayers. American taxpayers are paying too much in taxes today. Whereas a few years ago, a generation ago, Americans were sending 4, 5 percent of their income to Washington, today they are sending over 20 percent. When you add in local and State taxes, for a one-income family, 36 percent of their income goes to taxes, 39 percent for a two-income family. It is too much.

We need to stimulate the economy. We need to stimulate growth by putting some money back in people's pockets. That is the difference between these two budget proposals.

We believe we can achieve a balanced budget. We get to a balanced budget at the same time as the coalition budget. We believe we can achieve a balanced budget. We can do it while giving at the same time some tax relief to American citizens.

Mr. Chairman, there is another difference. If you look at this proposal over the very long run, even longer than our budget horizon goes, you do not get the fundamental changes that you must make to entitlement programs in order to have longstanding, long lasting, budget deficit reduction.

That is one of the big differences here. We have got to change programs. We have got to make changes to entitlements if we are ever going to really see a balanced budget. For those two reasons, tax relief for American citizens and fundamental changes to entitlement programs, the Republican budget proposal should be supported.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the coalition budget.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, a number of Members have used this chart. Our plan will help Americans earn more, keep more, so they can do more. That has been the rhetoric. Let me suggest to my friends that this rhetoric was copyrighted in 1981. It was called supply-side economics. It was copyrighted at a time when we had \$945 billion in debt that confronted the American public. Twelve years later, when not a nickel was spent in America that Ronald Reagan and George Bush did not approve, not a nickel, we had an additional \$4 trillion in debt.

I suggest that the Republican budget is an easy budget to vote for. You get the candy without a promise of medicine later on. Politicians and people like to do that. Do it easy. It is tough to say we are going to constrain entitlements. I understand that. There has been some demagoguery, very frankly, on this side of the aisle where Social Security is being cut, although Medicare, we are slowing the growth, give me a break. How dumb do we think the American public is?

Mr. Chairman, we need to have courage. We need to be honest. We need to trust the people. I am not going to vote for the President's budget because I think, like the Republican budget, it makes early promises and early ease for long-term greater pain. That is what we did in 1981. And we did it together. Let us together be honest with the American public. The coalition budget is not perfect. No budget will be perfect because it is a consensus. We work together.

But the coalition budget is honest in that it says we have a problem. We have a deficit that is too high, that is slowing growth, undermining America's ability to grow and to earn more. Let us confront the tough questions first and then reap the benefits later. Vote for the coalition budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to correct my colleague.

On Medicaid, we are increasing spending from \$95 billion to \$140 billion. My colleague may call that a cut but it is not. It is an increase in spending. We increased Medicare from \$196 billion to \$284 billion. We are increasing Medicare.

My colleague took a chart and then proceeded to mislead, in my judgment, the facts. Medicare is growing from \$196 to \$284 billion. That is not a cut. It is a 45-percent increase in spending. Medicaid is going from \$95 billion to \$104 billion. The student loan program is going from \$24 billion to \$36 billion. We do have a cut, \$500 tax cut for children for families making under \$100,000. We pay for that tax cut. It is not like 1981, like my colleague would try to imply. We pay for it. We set aside the money by making further reductions in the budget.

Mr. Chairman, this coalition budget spends more. It raises more money in

revenue. It goes after senior citizens by going and paying them less in their Social Security benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER].

□ 1315

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], for yielding this time to me, and I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], in saying that if 2 years ago the Blue Dog Coalition budget had been offered, it would have passed in a tremendous vote of confidence with the Democrats in charge, and I will tell my colleagues the Democrats could very well still be in charge of this House if they had followed the advice of the Blue Dog Coalition.

But I will also tell my colleagues that there is a lot of rhetoric on both sides. People are made up of 99-percent water, so I think it is kind of a natural phenomenon that people, they act like water, they follow the course of least resistance, and that is what we are doing in a lot of ways around this place.

I am really struck though by the fact that everybody says we have got a choice between the President's budget, the Blue Dog budget, the Black Coalition budget and the Republican budget as though one of those plans is going to be all and end all.

Now, my personal belief is the Republican plan takes the first big step, but anyone in this Chamber, anyone in this country, who believes that the Republican plan, as draconian as all the Democrats are saying that it is, if my colleagues think that that is going to be the panacea, they are wrong. The Republican plan is just the first step.

If we are going to get this budget in balance, if we are going to control the spending of our Government and create an economy where our children and grandchildren can prosper, the only way it can be done is to take very severe steps. The Republican plan is not a severe measure in any way, shape or form. Everybody in this Chamber had better start looking at this from an adult perspective and quit playing politics. We are talking about the future of our Nation.

The Republican plan takes just the first steps. There are more drastic steps that are going to have to be taken, and I am more than willing to take those steps because I think that the payoff that we will have as a Nation, it will be more than worth it.

We need to quit playing politics. We need to vote for the Republican plan.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the conservative coalition budget alter-

native. Of all the budget alternatives the House will consider this year, this is by far the most favorable in its treatment of research and development.

I make this point not just because I happen to be an advocate of science and technology. The more important issue is that this budget alternative directly and clearly recognizes that investing in R&D will stimulate economic growth. That is, it treats R&D as an integral part of their overall plan to eliminate the deficit, create jobs, and increase productivity.

I will take a moment to contrast this with the Republican view and the Republican treatment of R&D in House Concurrent Resolution 178. That view is pervasive throughout the report accompanying that resolution. R&D, they say, is just another form of corporate welfare, it is just another expenditure that needs to be cut, the Federal Government no longer needs to spend as much money on R&D, they say. For that reason, the Republican budget resolution cuts civilian R&D by 25 percent over the next 6 years.

The coalition budget restores this funding and targets it on some very critical needs:

It maintains a healthy and stable space program and provides NASA the funding it will need to carry out its critical programs.

It increases funding for basic research in agencies such as NSF, real increases, not some distorted arithmetic such as in the Republican resolution.

It provides funding for critical energy programs in solar and renewable research, fossil energy research, and energy conservation. The coalition budget recognizes that these are critical to our energy security and a sustainable future and are not just product improvements, as the Republican budget calls them.

Finally, it provides much needed funding for various environmental research programs that will be critical in basing any future regulations on actual risk data.

Mr. Chairman, the conservative coalition budget makes many good decisions. It holds defense spending to what is actually needed, it avoids a misguided tax cut, and it puts us on the road to a healthier and more productive economic future. Investments in research and development are a major part of this equation.

I do have concerns with the CPI cuts. I will work to see that a final budget package finds another way to reach balance and to promote a healthy, growing economy without the kind of CPI cuts contained in the coalition budget.

But, overall, the coalition budget does make many wise choices. I will vote for it today and ask my colleagues to join me.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to apologize to the

gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. He was right on one and wrong on another. We are paying for our taxes; I disagreed with him there. But he did make the point that we were allowing Medicare and Medicaid to grow, and I misunderstood his comments, and I apologize to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the coalition budget in one decent respect in which we must all agree at one point or another, and that is the increased funding for the health component of Government spending.

As a stalwart supporter of the National Institutes of Health, I consider the work that they do in trying to prevent disease and to cure disease alone merits the full attention of the Congress of the United States because everything that they do is for the individual betterment of the American citizen, and so I commend the coalition on that score, and I hope to be able to convince the Republican Members when we get farther down the budget process that the balancing act that we eventually have to do will take some cognizance of the coalition health funding than is now the case in the budget resolution preferred by the Republicans.

On the other hand, I want to say, in summary, of the gentleman from Maryland, I promise now that I will never say that the Democrats are interested in cutting Social Security if they will consider promising from this floor that they will never say the Republicans are interested in cutting Medicare. If we can make that kind of deal, we have gone a long way in trying to be commonsensical to the American people who, as the gentleman from Maryland says, are not stupid.

We are not cutting Medicare, they are not cutting Social Security. I wish from the President down that the Democratic side of the government will acknowledge that the Republicans at long last are not cutting Medicare.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, in Indiana we are known for our hard work and our common sense. This coalition budget represents hard work because it is not a pie-in-the-sky budget, it cuts spending in Washington first, and it also is known for its common sense because we do not cut a dime from student loans, we do not cut a nickel from hot lunches for poor children in Indiana or Tennessee, and we do not cut a penny from Head Start programs, one of the best investments we make.

Now, if the Republican budget stays with a \$13 billion increase in defense, as that bill passed yesterday, we are

going to see B-2 bombers and a host of other things that are going to require cuts in education that are not going to reflect common sense.

People in Indiana and across the country want and deserve a balanced budget. This coalition budget does it fairly and with common sense, not a pie-in-the-sky budget, but reflects the grass roots, hard work of the Midwest and other States in the Union.

I strongly support a vote for this budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Kolbe].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] said about the Republican budget cutting school lunches and student loans. That just simply is not true.

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

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman for a few seconds here. Go ahead.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman, first of all we have just been working for the last 1½ years, and the gentleman from Arizona will not deny that Head Start was cut under their first budget, student loans were cut under their first budget—

Mr. KOLBE. No, Mr. Chairman, that is simply not true.

Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, student loans are not being cut. First of all, Pell grant will go up, the total dollar volume of student loans will go up under the Republican budget. The only thing that we are talking about cutting is cutting the very wasteful, bureaucratic direct student loan program. We are going to reduce some of the money that goes in subsidies to bankers. But we are not cutting the number of student loans or the amount of student loans. Let us make that very clear.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from the State of New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS].

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity to open this discussion yesterday, and I reflected on the fact that budget proposals are indeed a reflection of our values and our priorities, and in one important respect there is something fundamentally dangerous about the budget resolution that is before us today. It seeks to impose legislatively an arbitrary so-called correction of the Consumer Price Index.

Now there is a body of economists who believe that the CPI currently overstates the impact of inflation, and I think most of us would agree that something should be done about it.

But what the blue dog budget seeks to do would not only, if adopted, reduce Social Security checks next year, but it would set the movement to try to re-

sponsibly reform the CPI back for years. We should only be tinkering with this measure of inflation after a technically competent group can arrive at some scientific measures of the most popular recognition of how we can more accurately assess the impact of inflation. To rely on a budget fix, not of a hundred million or a billion or \$10 billion, but in excess of \$50 billion with the CPI plug when we do not have the final analysis having been completed by either BLS or by the Senate Finance Committee's commission.

We can wait and know that we have got the scientific efficacy, the legitimacy, to make this change. To arbitrarily make it in the form of legislation will, in my judgment, set back the cause of responsibly reforming the CPI.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to respond with regard to the CPI.

Senate Majority Leader BOB DOLE last September, in talking about the CPI, endorsing the reduction in the CPI, said, quote, "It can only happen if we join hands. I think we ought to do it in a bipartisan way without taking political shots." Now that is a quote from the Washington Times, September 27.

Also I would remind my colleagues that 11 Republican Senators have also proposed a CPI increase twice as high as that proposed in the blue dog budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] for yielding this time to me.

I am pleased once again to join in supporting the bipartisan coalition balanced budget proposal. In contrast to both the Gingrich and the President's budget proposals, cuts in this budget are balanced in each year and achieve a zero deficit without resorting to unsustainable program cuts in the out-years and an ill-timed tax cut paid for with borrowed money.

The coalition proposal is a honest compromise between the other two major proposals, and it contains policy recommendations that strengthen and preserve Medicare and Medicaid as well as critical investments in education, technology, and the environment.

I support tax cuts including a capital gains tax cut, but they should be enacted and paid for in the context of overall tax reform when we can also simplify the tax system.

If we are serious about deficit reduction, let us put spending cuts first. Let us put a plan on the table that asks the 104th Congress to make the same kind of hard decisions that we will ask of the 105th and 106th Congresses.

Vote for the coalition budget.

□ 1330

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Louisiana

[Mr. MCCRERY], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to commend the authors of the coalition budget. It is an excellent budget. It is not the best budget on the floor today, but it is an excellent budget. If anyone doubts the positive impact on the budget process that the new Republican majority has had, they need only look at the offerings on the floor of the House of Representatives today and compare them with the offerings of just 3 years ago. There is a marked distinction, a marked distinction in favor of future generations of Americans; in favor of dealing honestly with our Nation's fiscal problems.

I want to commend those who have brought honest budgets to the floor today. I also know, however, that some of these same authors of the coalition budget just 3 years ago voted against a tax increase. They voted against President Clinton's tax increase. Yet, they stand on the floor today, just 3 years later, and say, "Oh, well, we were against them then, but today we think they are okay." That is essentially what they are saying when they refuse to give back to the American people any portion of President Clinton's tax increase of 1993.

The Republican budget gets back for the people less than half of the tax increase that was passed by one vote in this House 3 years ago. I do not think that is too much. I would like to do more. I would like to give more of that money that we took from the American people in 1993 back to them, but at least we get a good start in the Republican budget.

The coalition budget, as good as it is, taxes more and spends more. That is the key difference between their budget and the Republican budget. Please vote no on this coalition budget. Support the Republican budget.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the coalition budget, the fairest, most realistic, most achievable, and most responsible of the balanced budget plans before us.

This plan meets the goals of both the President and the Republican leadership by balancing the budget within 6 years using the conservative economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office. But most importantly, this is a plan that is good for our economy and good for the American people because it preserves vital investments such as health care, medical and scientific research, education, and environmental protection.

The coalition budget is superior to the other plans before us in many ways.

First, it includes \$137 billion more in deficit reduction than the Republican plan, leaving less debt to burden our economy and future generations. And it achieves more deficit reduction faster than the backloaded Republican plan, making it more likely that future Congresses will stick to this plan and actually balance the budget.

Second, the coalition budget extends the solvency of the Medicare trust fund without taking away senior citizens' choice of doctors, as the Republican plan would do. The coalition budget ensures adequate funding for medical education by providing dedicated funding from managed health care plans for this important purpose.

Third, the coalition budget continues the guarantee of health care coverage for all current Medicaid beneficiaries and protects families from the devastating cost of long-term care.

The coalition budget also sets the right investment priorities. It provides \$45 billion more for education programs such as student loans, elementary and secondary education, Head Start, and job training. It provides \$8.7 billion more for medical research at the National Institutes of Health and other agencies. Finally, Mr. Chairman, the coalition budget is the only budget proposal which achieves a balanced budget without shifting the tax burden. The Republican budget would increase taxes for families earning \$28,000 or less and double flood insurance premiums for homeowners.

Mr. Chairman, the coalition budget offers the best opportunity to put aside partisan politics and pass a common-sense balanced budget that is fair to the American people and good for our economy. I urge my colleagues to pass this budget, and I urge the President and the Republican leadership to come to agreement on a plan such as this.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, the reason we are fighting for a balanced budget is that it will allow young working families to save more of the money that they earn. It will boost the economy. It will increase their wages. The problem with the Clinton budget is that it taxes more and it spends more. And the problem with the Clinton budget is that it simply does not balance. It increases the deficit next year, and even more the year after that. That means more money out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Our GOP budget ends three decades of reckless deficit spending and stops forcing our children to pay our bills. Currently, the Federal Government taxes and spends on programs that in many cases simply are not effective, and that is why we provide tax relief. That is why we reform welfare. That is why we are shifting power and money and influence out of Washington and

giving it back to the people whose taxes it was paid with.

For example, in this budget we terminate the Department of Energy and the Department of Commerce, chronically mismanaged agencies. We eliminate or privatize 130 wasteful or unnecessary Federal programs, saving more than \$34 billion over 6 years. The Republican budget cuts corporate welfare, it implements the FAIR Act, taking us away from a command-control Federal farm program, and leading us back toward a more purely based market-based farm system.

Last, Mr. Chairman, President Clinton's budget plan avoids making the hard choices. Of all the spending cuts he recommends, 64 percent take place in the last 2 years, after he is out of office. As has been pointed out, that is like trying to lose 50 pounds over 50 weeks and waiting until the last week to lose 49 pounds. It simply will not happen.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, we are in the strange position of all agreeing that we wish to balance the budget in 7 years, but then quibbling over some of the details, and also over the design. I think it is important to put in bold relief the difference between the coalition plan and the Republican plan and the President's plan.

I think that perhaps nothing speaks more eloquently to this than the comments of the last speaker. That is, how much are we actually making in terms of sacrifices and cuts in these early years, when we are serving in Congress and we are answerable for our actions?

I submit that both under the President's plan and under the Republican plan, we are being asked to postpone the tough decisions until later, when we are perhaps not even in office. It is not responsible. I submit, to take this attitude, but instead, we should ask that realistic cuts and sacrifices be made now, in 1996, 1997, 1998. Under the Republican plan, approximately \$90 billion of deficit reduction has to occur in the last 2 years.

It is unrealistic to think this will happen. We all agree that we ought to be cutting taxes, but tragically, when we attempt to cut taxes, we borrow money to finance that cut. The Republican plan has \$137 billion less deficit reduction than the coalition plan, as a result. I urge support for the coalition plan.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute and 30 seconds, just to point out to the gentleman that, of course, the administration and most of the Members of the majority were supporting a President's budget that would have spent \$7 billion in 1996 more than what the Democrats spent in 1995.

So in other words, the Democrats in the House essentially supported, not

all but the greatest number of them, supported the President's proposal to increase Washington spending by \$7 billion, discretionary spending by \$7 billion over 1995 and 1996. We advocated making a reduction of somewhere over \$23 billion, from 1995 and 1996. We ended up with \$23 billion worth of savings in Washington spending, the single greatest amount of savings in at least the last 50 years.

So to argue that our budget is backloaded is kind of absurd, because we have been able to force the greatest amount of savings in over 50 years. We accomplished that just the opposite of what the administration wanted to do. We did not backload. We got in there in the very first year, I would say to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY], and we made the most significant downsizing of Washington spending and Washington bureaucracy since World War II.

So let us not argue about who is doing the backloading. We are not doing any backloading. We are doing a lot of heavy lifting, and I want to compliment the House. There were only 32 votes against it, so we are in the midst of a real change in this city.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me thank my colleague, the gentleman from Utah, for yielding time to me, and for the good work he has done on the coalition budget.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to point out that the Republican budget that we are dealing with today is the same one that was tried as blackmail to force this President to sign priorities he disagreed with, and the American people disagreed with. It took two shutdowns of this Government to bring the Republican Members of Congress to their senses, so we could proceed with last year's budget.

This budget, again, is a repeat. The poor, the sick, the elderly, our students, the environment, all, once again, face drastic cuts. The elderly and the disabled will no longer be guaranteed a minimum of medical care should they be unable to afford it because Medicaid would be block granted. Rural hospitals and rural medicine would suffer because of the Office of Rural Health is eliminated, on top of many new reductions in the Department of Agriculture's programs, that go well beyond the most recently passed farm bill.

There is no question that the coalition budget is a much better way of balancing the budget. There are no cuts in education or student loans. Medicare and Medicaid growth is controlled, as it must be, but not ruthlessly slashed. The coalition budget not only balances by the year 2002, it creates a surplus. It starts doing out

whatever medicine we must take now, gradually reducing the deficit over the 7-year period, rather than plusing up spending, as the Republican budget does, in a way that makes it questionable as to whether we will ever get to the other end of this road we must travel.

There is no question that the honest and up front approach has been taken by the coalition. It should serve as a basis for agreement, not only in this Congress, before we end our deliberations, but I would hope in the next Congress, when a new majority takes control. Again, I want to thank those who have worked so hard and showed courage in breaking new ground, particularly on the issue of cost-of-living adjustments.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding time to me, and I also want to commend him on his work. I rise not as a member of the Blue Dogs, but I rise as a Member who thinks that the proposal that is authorized by the coalition indeed is a strong proposal, and in fact is the strongest one we have.

I also rise as one who thinks all three alternatives really are better than the Republican party's, because they, indeed, balance the priorities of this Nation. So I am pleased to say I am an advocate and supporter of a balanced budget, but I am even more pleased to say I am supporting a balanced budget that makes tough choices and shared sacrifices across the board, and it does it not at the expense of the poor or the expense of the working American.

Again, all three substitute budgets make clear the programs and policies do support the average American citizen. The coalition budget protects and preserves these fundamental values that make America strong. At the same time, it does not increase the tax burden, as, indeed, the Republican party does, and it does it at the expense of the poor, and the working Americans, when they say cuts, which, indeed, has been the motto for the Republican Party.

I think the coalition budget also has taken a strong position in saying all of us must make sacrifices, those who are senior citizens as well as the rest of America, but it does it in the most appropriate way. There are those who would like to demagog those taking this courageous step. I think they need to be complimented.

Yes; I would emphasize, all three substitutes are better than the Republican party's. I urge my colleague to reject the Republican party's alternative and vote strongly for the resolution that the coalition has put before us.

□ 1345

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN].

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk about welfare spending. Welfare spending is so huge it is tough to comprehend. One way to put it, though, is this.

On average the cost of the welfare system amounted to \$3,300 for each household that paid Federal income tax in the year 1993. That means the first \$3,300 of taxes from that household went into the welfare system black hole. I am sorry, but that is a lot of money for a Federal bureaucracy that has simply failed every American.

Mr. Chairman, some studies show that for every dollar that is spent in the current welfare system, 70 cents of that dollar is wasted on the Federal Government bureaucracy. That is not compassion, I would argue. The money in our Federal welfare system needs to go to those folks who really need it, not a bureaucrat inside the beltway.

Let us talk a moment about compassion, because many of the liberal Members seem to have a distorted sense of what that term means when it comes to our Nation's failed welfare policies. More taxes do not equal more compassion.

Is it compassionate to continue with the status quo that for the last three generations has only served to strip women and children of their dignity? I do not think so. Is it compassionate to prolong a system that encourages destructive behavior and greater illegitimacy plus little incentive to go to work? I do not think so. Is it compassionate to maintain a system that traps so many children in such a poor environment that it exposes them to higher rates of domestic abuse, higher rates of violent crime, and inadequate educational opportunities, so that some children never during the course of their lifetime have within their family a role model who holds a job? I do not think so.

Republicans say no. In fact, our current welfare system is anything but compassionate in reality. It is destructive. Most Americans on welfare want to go to work, but as long as the Government offers them a better deal to stay dependent and makes it tougher to move off welfare, many of them will stay on welfare. That is not compassionate.

Our proposal will bypass this outdated bureaucracy at the Federal level and it will funnel money more directly to the people who so desperately need it. Our proposal will shift the Government's current destructive incentives to incentives that promote marriage and work. And our proposal will remove the Federal Government as a surrogate parent and enable people to take personal responsibility for their lives.

Republicans want to help people break the cycle of poverty that holds down families and children of America. That is compassion. I encourage my

colleagues to vote down the blue dog budget and to vote for the Republican budget that funds \$6 million in child care, that goes after deadbeat parents, and that sends our welfare tax dollars back to the States and to the people who need it.

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the coalition budget, I ask all my colleagues to vote for it, and I commend the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] for the work they have done.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, let me just thank my friend from Utah for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman from Washington tell us what she means about the liberals, the so-called liberals having a distorted sense of compassion? Maybe being from Georgia, I do not quite really understand what "distortion" means.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1¼ minutes to simply say that to try to combine both balancing the budget and tax cuts will guarantee neither and probably prevent either. In an effort to guarantee both, last year the budget contained the provision called "Tax Reduction Contingent on Balanced Budget," but this year they even refuse to include those guarantees. Why? Because they promise tax cuts which the Joint Committee says will cost almost \$216 billion but only provide numbers in the budget for \$122 billion. That is not truth-in-budgeting. The Republican plan is apparently to bring a tax cut package first, an obvious benefit in an election year, and then separately try to change entitlements. This is the same approach used in the 1980's when deficits quadrupled the debt to over \$4 trillion.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the coalition plan which is the only plan which does not borrow money. I would just point out that the \$122 billion of tax cuts is borrowed money. We are going to borrow money from future generations to pay it back to today's generation in a tax cut that people say they would rather use the money to balance the budget.

I urge my colleagues to support the coalition budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the coalition budget, and think it would be helpful if all of

us lowered the tones of our voices and stuck a little bit more to the facts before us.

The coalition budget differs from the majority budget in that we do not borrow \$137 billion in order to grant all of us who need it a tax cut. The chart to my right shows the difference. The orange and the yellow lines are the difference between the majority's views of what the deficit ought to look like in 2002, the White House opinion of what it ought to be, and what the coalition believes that it ought to be.

I for one accept, and I believe I speak for every single Member that supports the coalition budget on both sides of the aisle, with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] that said we should stop talking about cutting, in this case the accusation from a few of the extremists on this side of the aisle that said we are cutting Social Security. We ought not to be saying that because that is not true, and we know it, and the two freshman Members that made that statement know better.

Now the end of that. I commend my colleagues on this side for saying that and helping set the record straight. No one is proposing cutting Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security. But what we are talking about doing, and there are differences of opinion, and members of the coalition, myself in particular, have major differences with the majority and how they choose to adjust Medicare and Medicaid. But we are getting very close on welfare reform, and the beautiful speech we heard a moment ago, we are there, folks, we are there. Why we keep talking about that, I do not know.

But I have to say, and I will be happy to yield at any time to anyone on this side that challenges anything that I am saying in the few seconds I have got remaining, because representing a rural area, I object strenuously to cutting 56 percent of the remaining discretionary spending for agriculture in rural America. That is not the farm program. We took care of that. Fifty-six percent.

The gentleman and the party now that suggest that we ought to eliminate 100 percent of the research on fossil fuels, at a time we are complaining about the price of gasoline, I say makes no sense whatsoever. So I differ with your policies in that regard, and let us debate those policies on the floor. But let us quit making accusations. There is bipartisan support for education, there is bipartisan support for meaningful health care.

What we suggest in the coalition budget is that we ought to be honest going into it and say if we are going to be for it, speak for it, we ought to budget for it, not come on the floor of the House and make some of the speeches that we have heard here today. That is not helpful.

But I want to say, in fairness and in closing, I appreciate the tenor of most

of the debate that has come from this side today. It is helpful. And I appreciate my colleagues on our side for supporting this budget, and I urge its passage. It could be the most positive step forward for this Congress in dealing with the very real problems that both sides say that we need to address.

Ms. FURSE. I rise today during consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 178 to support of the coalition balanced budget plan. As someone who strongly supports balancing the budget, there are aspects to each proposal with which I disagree. After evaluating each approach, I support the coalition budget because it is fiscally conservative and socially responsible. It is a common sense approach that both Democrats and Republicans can support.

We need a balanced budget plan that emphasizes security in our communities and families. I believe the Republican balanced budget plan of last year was rightly rejected by the public and deserved the President's veto. Simply put, it is wrong to ask seniors and students to pay more while giving the Pentagon a \$70 billion boost.

I believe the Black Caucus budget has the best priorities, because it cuts wasteful Pentagon spending by over \$250 billion. Moreover, the Black Caucus budget makes education and our communities a priority. Unfortunately, it goes beyond simply cutting corporate welfare and dramatically increases taxes.

The coalition balanced budget is a common sense budget. It balances the budget through tough spending cuts, without raising taxes, but maintains our priorities. There are no education cuts in the coalition plan. It reforms Medicaid, but does not eliminate health care guarantees for children and pregnant women. It makes important changes in the welfare system, but does not punish children for the actions of their parents. It also emphasizes community health and other protections.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is plain wrong to make seniors and students pay more to hand out tax cuts for the rich. We should make balancing the budget our number one priority—that is what the coalition budget does. This is the second year in a row that I have supported the coalition balanced budget plan, and hope we can pass it before the end of the year.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, no matter how you address the issue, the coalition budget is far and away, more beneficial and less extreme than the bombastic Republican budget. This Republican budget continues the policies of wanton destruction of this Nation's environment, human capital, and technological infrastructure.

May I remind my colleagues that absolutely none of the deficit reduction attempts being attempted would have been possible without the previous efforts of both Presidents Bush and Clinton. Regardless of what my Republican colleagues will tell you, getting toward a balanced budget is neither a new or distinctly Republican idea—it is an American idea. However, it is an idea which must be achieved through thoughtful and careful policies designed to make the taxpayers' money work harder without destroying the social and technological progress that this Nation has built, and the coalition budget does this.

As an example, the members of the Science Committee soundly rejected last year, the privatization of the Department of Energy's National Laboratories. We did so because Republicans and Democrats alike understood how important these precious national resources are. Mr. KASICH and his Republican colleagues obviously do not, since they would carelessly sell off these irreplaceable technological jewels to the highest bidder. It is clear that they were thinking no farther ahead than November 2, and their desire for a political trophy.

Mr. Chairman, I would venture to say that those proposing the coalition budget are even more serious about deficit reduction than the Republican proposal. The coalition budget cuts the deficit without tax cuts. The coalition budget cuts the deficit while spending more on education, economic development, and scientific research. They can do this because this budget postpones tax cuts until after the budget has been balanced.

The world is not the simplistic place that Republicans in this House would have us believe. It is a pool of economic sharks. In the globally competitive environment that American businesses and their employees are in today, the only way to survive and prosper is through investing in the things which drive the engine of economic growth: education, research and development, training and economic development. In our collective haste toward a zero deficit, let us not eat our children's seed-corn. Let us not leave them with a deficiency of educated workers, a paucity of new technology and an abundance of sick elderly and low-income citizens.

Cutting the deficit is not painless, but the coalition budget is far more reasonable and far more careful about how it applies this pain. The coalition budget is far more concerned about changing, but keeping viable, this country's safety net of Medicare, Medicaid and welfare.

Those supporting the Republican budget speak frequently of saving the future for our children and our children's children, but what future will they have living in a polluted environment? Throughout their tenure as the majority, the Republicans have fought an unyielding war against the environment. A leopard cannot change its spots and regardless of how many zoos the Speaker visits and how many nature walks Republican freshmen take, their record and their budget speak for themselves. It is only due to the cries and raised voices of anger against the Republican anti-environment agenda that they seemed to have changed their colors, but we know that the special interests are giving heavily in this campaign season and eventually we will see those environment-destroying policies surface yet again.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this coalition budget and keep intact our children's true future, the one of continued technological advancement, economic leadership, environmental stewardship and a balanced Federal budget.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget resolution introduced by the coalition to balance the budget by the year 2002, and salute my coalition colleagues for presenting a responsible, viable plan that

meets the needs of our Nation today and our collective future.

I oppose provisions of the Republican budget that assume dramatic and detrimental changes in Medicare, Medicaid, welfare, and the earned income tax credit—all in the name of increased defense spending and tax breaks which we cannot afford. Block grants, medical savings accounts, higher Medicare premiums, increasing taxes on the working poor, eliminating guaranteed healthcare for children, women, and seniors, and denying benefits to legal immigrants are not solutions to our country's financial crisis.

This proposal maintains basic human services at adequate levels. The coalition budget does not eliminate bilingual education programs or the direct lending program for student loans. Nor does it privatize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I believe the Republican cuts to these programs would harm children, our future, and I oppose them.

Further, the Republican budget does not adequately protect our natural resources and the environment, reducing funding for these programs by 10 percent. The Department of Energy and its key research programs on alternative fuels, clean coal technology, and renewable energy would be eliminated. The coalition proposal freezes funding for natural resources and the environment at levels that are adequate to maintain the progress we have made in cleaning up our air, water, and land.

Under the Republican budget, the important work of the National Institutes of Health would be endangered. Just recently, scientists have found the gene that causes breast cancer, and they are hopeful that this information will help them develop a cure for the disease. Now is not the time to decrease funds for this type of research. The coalition budget includes an additional \$8.7 billion for this and other health research functions.

Budgets always lack something. Neither includes a targeted capital gains tax cut, which I believe is critical to sustaining and increasing the level of economic growth we have enjoyed in this country. The Republican budget pays lip service to capital gains by indicating that such a tax cut may be possible, but only if offsets can be found in the Tax Code. However, their budget resolution does not assume a capital gains tax cut. And it is clear that under the Republican proposal, there is not enough left over from savings over the 6 years to pay for such a tax cut.

There is a need to permanently extend the research and development tax credit. Our country's leadership in high technology will wither if we do not reward our companies for investment in research and development of new products. These provisions, coupled with the Republicans proposal to eliminate the Department of Commerce, will sound a death-knell for our country's preeminence in the high technology arena.

The coalition's budget is the most viable approach to deficit reduction, toward a balanced budget by 2002, with some tough medicine, and a recognition that we can retain investments in our people, and not abandon our principles to do so.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the coalition budget.

The coalition budget is a fair and steady approach toward a balanced budget in 2002.

It adds \$137 billion less than the Republican plan to the debt because it does not delay the majority of the spending cuts to the last 2 years.

The resolutions before us today are just numbers, but attached to these numbers are fundamental policy assumptions.

While it is encouraging to see the Republicans abandon some of the extreme cuts in last year's budget and bring their numbers closer to the coalition's budget, they retain many of the same dangerous and radical policy assumptions.

The Republicans offer \$168 billion in Medicare savings, while the coalition plan offers \$146 billion in savings.

The differences, however, are more than the \$21 billion would suggest.

The coalition budget achieves greater savings from means-testing the Medicare part B premium for upper income beneficiaries by using existing methods to collect the premiums. The Republican proposal assumes essentially the same provider cuts that were contained in the reconciliation bill that was vetoed last year.

Both proposals provide Medicare beneficiaries with increased choice of private options. The coalition budget, however, protects seniors in rural and other under-served areas and protects seniors from managed care plans charging beneficiaries additional amounts beyond the part B premium.

It also appropriately limits the radical medical savings account proposal to a demonstration program.

The \$2 billion difference between the Republican \$72 billion cut and the coalition's \$70 billion cut from Medicaid masks the fact that the Republican plan permits States to cut their Medicaid funding by an additional \$178 billion, seriously undermining our commitment to the poor, the disabled, and the elderly.

We can cut Medicaid growth without eliminating the guaranteed coverage to the poor, the disabled, and the elderly, and the coalition budget does.

We can balance the budget without eliminating the Departments of Commerce and Energy; and the coalition budget does so.

We can save \$42 billion from welfare programs while at the same time meet the Governors' request for providing adequate funding child care so that the parents can return to work.

We can reduce fraud in the earned income tax credit without imposing a tax increase of \$20 billion on the working poor.

Mr. Speaker for the those and a host of other reasons I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget and support the coalition budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A record vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 295, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

## AYES—130

Andrews  
Baesler  
Baldacci  
Barcia  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Barton  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Bevill  
Bishop  
Blute  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Campbell  
Cardin  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Collins (MI)  
Condit  
Cramer  
Davis  
de la Garza  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Duncan  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Furse

Geren  
Gibbons  
Gordon  
Gunderson  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Holden  
Hoyer  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kennelly  
Klug  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lantos  
Leach  
Cramer  
Lincoln  
Lofgren  
Luther  
Martinez  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McDade  
McDermott  
McHale  
McKinney  
Meehan  
Meek  
Metcalfe  
Millender-  
Wilson  
Minge  
Montgomery  
Moran

Morella  
Murtha  
Oberstar  
Orlitz  
Orton  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Poshard  
Richardson  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rose  
Roukema  
Sabo  
Sawyer  
Schroeder  
Scott  
Siskisky  
Skaggs  
Skelton  
Spratt  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Studds  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson  
Towns  
Vento  
Viscosky  
Volkmer  
Wamp  
Ward  
Watt (NC)  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wynn  
Young (AK)

## NOES—295

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allard  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Bartlett  
Bass  
Bateman  
Becerra  
Berman  
Billbray  
Billirakis  
Bliley  
Boehert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brown (OH)  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bryant (TX)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clinger  
Coble

Coburn  
Coleman  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (IL)  
Combest  
Conyers  
Cooley  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Crane  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cubin  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dixon  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Dunn  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Ensign  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler

Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Frost  
Funderburk  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gillman  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Green (TX)  
Greene (UT)  
Greenwood  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hinchee  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis

Istook  
Jacobs  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Kleczka  
Klink  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBlundo  
Longley  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Maloney  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Martini  
Mascara  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
McNulty  
Menendez  
Meyers  
Mica  
Mink

Moakley  
Mollohan  
Moorhead  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Obey  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Parker  
Pastor  
Pelosi  
Petri  
Pickett  
Pombo  
Portman  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Reed  
Regula  
Riggs  
Roberts  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Salmon  
Sanders  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Schumer  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano

Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Skeean  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stockman  
Stump  
Stupak  
Tate  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Torrice  
Traficant  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Waters  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Williams  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Yates  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—8

Ehlers  
Ford  
Hayes

Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Molinari

Paxon  
Talent

## □ 1415

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Paxon against.

Messrs. EVERETT, MOAKLEY, HORN, and SERRANO, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MATSUI changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## □ 1415

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment designated in paragraph 3 of section 2 of House Resolution 435.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SABO:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

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

## SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,092,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,146,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,195,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,244,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,309,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,389,900,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: —\$7,929,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: —\$2,150,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: —\$2,741,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: —\$7,219,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: —\$1,721,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$16,024,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,325,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,374,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,413,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,454,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,496,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,528,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,321,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,375,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,408,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,447,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,466,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,498,400,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$228,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$229,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$212,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$202,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$156,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$108,500,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$5,441,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$5,713,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$5,964,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$6,204,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$6,395,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$6,542,900,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$45,451,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: \$172,005,000,000.

**SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

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

- (1) National Defense (050):
  - Fiscal year 1997:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$254,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$260,800,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$229,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$258,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$256,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$263,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$257,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$270,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$263,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$279,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$266,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$287,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$278,200,000,000.
- (2) International Affairs (150):
  - Fiscal year 1997:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$15,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$15,700,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,067,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$18,624,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$13,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$13,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$15,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$17,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.
- (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
  - Fiscal year 1997:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$17,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$16,900,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$16,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$16,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$15,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$15,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$15,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$15,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$17,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$16,600,000,000.
- (4) Energy (270):
  - Fiscal year 1997:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$3,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$3,100,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,620,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$3,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$2,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$2,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$2,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$1,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$3,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$2,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$3,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$2,100,000,000.
- (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
  - Fiscal year 1997:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$21,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$22,200,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$36,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$21,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$22,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$21,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$22,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$20,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$21,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$21,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$21,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$23,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$22,600,000,000.
- (6) Agriculture (350):
  - Fiscal year 1997:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$13,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$11,100,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$7,605,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$8,150,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$10,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$10,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$11,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$9,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$10,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$8,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$10,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$8,900,000,000.
- (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
  - Fiscal year 1997:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$8,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$1,900,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$5,536,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$97,707,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$10,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$6,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$11,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$6,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$12,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$8,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$8,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$12,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$8,500,000,000.
- (8) Transportation (400):
  - Fiscal year 1997:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$3,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$2,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$2,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$2,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$1,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$3,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$2,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$3,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$2,100,000,000.

- Fiscal year 1997:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$42,200,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$39,600,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$415,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$571,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$36,200,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$38,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$33,200,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$36,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$30,900,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$34,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$34,200,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$33,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$37,900,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$35,300,000,000.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
  - Fiscal year 1997:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$9,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$10,600,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,952,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,885,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$8,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$10,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$8,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$9,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$7,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$9,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$8,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$9,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$8,300,000,000.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
  - Fiscal year 1997:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$53,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$51,300,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$21,770,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$19,114,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$54,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$53,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$56,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$55,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$58,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$56,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$60,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$58,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$63,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$61,400,000,000.
- (11) Health (550):
  - Fiscal year 1997:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$136,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$136,300,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$140,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$144,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$144,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$151,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$151,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$151,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$151,700,000,000.

- (A) New budget authority, \$158,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$159,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$164,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$163,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$176,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$174,600,000,000.  
(12) Medicare (570):  
Fiscal year 1997:  
(A) New budget authority, \$193,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$191,400,000,000.  
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
Fiscal year 1998:  
(A) New budget authority, \$209,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$207,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999:  
(A) New budget authority, \$222,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$220,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$236,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$234,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$252,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$250,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$272,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$269,900,000,000.  
(13) Income Security (600):  
Fiscal year 1997:  
(A) New budget authority, \$231,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$239,000,000,000.  
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$37,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1998:  
(A) New budget authority, \$244,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$247,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999:  
(A) New budget authority, \$255,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$256,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$271,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$270,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$280,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$277,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$296,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$292,900,000,000.  
(14) Social Security (650):  
Fiscal year 1997:  
(A) New budget authority, \$7,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$10,900,000,000.  
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
Fiscal year 1998:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$11,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999:  
(A) New budget authority, \$9,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$12,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$10,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$10,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$11,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,800,000,000.  
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
Fiscal year 1997:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,600,000,000.  
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,344,000,000.  
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$24,548,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1998:  
(A) New budget authority, \$37,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999:  
(A) New budget authority, \$36,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$37,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$35,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$37,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$37,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$36,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,800,000,000.  
(16) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 1997:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,200,000,000.  
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
Fiscal year 1998:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,000,000,000.  
(17) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 1997:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,800,000,000.  
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
Fiscal year 1998:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$15,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$15,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$16,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.  
(18) Net Interest (900):  
Fiscal year 1997:  
(A) New budget authority, \$282,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$282,300,000,000.  
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
Fiscal year 1998:  
(A) New budget authority, \$289,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$289,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999:  
(A) New budget authority, \$293,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$293,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$296,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$296,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$301,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$301,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$307,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$307,500,000,000.  
(19) Allowances (920):  
Fiscal year 1997:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$500,000,000.  
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$106,000,000.  
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
Fiscal year 1998:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$0.  
(B) Outlays, -\$0.  
Fiscal year 1999:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$0.  
(B) Outlays, -\$0.  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$12,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$16,500,000,000.  
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
Fiscal year 1997:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$43,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$43,300,000,000.  
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.  
Fiscal year 1998:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$35,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$35,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$35,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$35,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$38,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$38,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$41,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$41,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$62,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$62,200,000,000.

#### SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) Not later than June 21, 1996, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b)(1) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$2,062,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$14,816,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$18,457,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(2) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$3,346,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$2,755,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$3,143,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(3) The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$5,717,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$128,862,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$207,698,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(4) The House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$633,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$4,923,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$6,040,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(5) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes

in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$840,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$7,236,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$9,086,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(6) The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays, as follows: \$51,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, and reduce outlays by \$84,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$147,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(7) The House Committee on National Security shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$79,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$472,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$1,753,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(8) The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$112,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$372,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$391,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(9) The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$42,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$255,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$363,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(10) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$148,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997, \$3,870,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and \$5,284,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(11) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the deficit, as follows: by \$1,024,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, and decrease the deficit by \$64,619,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2001, and by \$117,820,000,000 in fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "direct spending" has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

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

Mr. Chairman, one is always faced with choice, and alternatives are never as perfect as one would like them. I was a strong supporter of the coalition budget, which was just, I think unfortunately, defeated on the House floor. That was my preference as the best way to achieve a balanced budget. Now I offer another alternative, the budget as presented by the President of the United States.

As an alternative to the Republican proposal, it is clearly far superior for a

number of reasons. It does balance in 6 years, as scored by CBO; but, more important, it makes very fundamental reforms in how we run numerous governmental programs but is still fair to beneficiaries.

It does make fundamental changes in Medicare but does it in a fashion that does not do long-term damage to the program like those proposed by the Republican majority. It makes fundamental change in reform of Medicaid in a way to save money for both the Federal and State and local governments, but it still continues to assure adequate health care for the vulnerable, elderly, disabled, and children in our society.

It has fiscal restraints as it relates to discretionary spending, but still provides the opportunity to invest in education and training, research and development, and investing in the basic infrastructure of this country.

It reforms welfare in a fashion that is tough on work, not tough on kids.

So, Mr. Chairman, at this point, I strongly urge a "yes" vote for the President's budget as an alternative that is clearly superior for the American public and for the future of our economy to the proposal of the Republican majority.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

I would hope that Members would look very carefully at what they have in the budget that is before them now; that is the President's budget. Because the fact is that this is, indeed, a UFO budget.

Our friend, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, has said on a number of occasions that when they took a poll some time back they found that among young people more of them believed in UFO's than believed they would ever collect Social Security and Medicare because they thought the whole process was breaking down.

Obviously, the administration took that poll to heart and designed a budget around the UFO philosophy, because what they have here is a budget that has unidentified spending cuts in it, that has a family tax increase in it, and it has ominously higher deficits in 1997 and 1998.

Now, think about this for a moment. They come to us today with a budget that, first of all, suggests that it is in balance while at the end of the process, in the year 2002, they have huge, tens of billions of dollars of money they do not identify in terms of spending cuts.

The gentleman from Minnesota just told us that they will protect education and research and training. How do we know? There are massive spending cuts that are not identified in this budget. It is not real.

There is a tax increase in here. If we take the CBO estimates and we take

them out to the year 2002, what we find is it takes \$16 billion of unspecified taxes in order to balance the budget. That is \$16 billion of a middle class tax increase.

So the American families are now being treated to the specter of people saying they are going to cut spending but, in the meantime, what are they doing? They are raising taxes.

And, finally, Mr. Chairman, if we believe they are going to balance the budget, how do we get along with this idea that in the President's budget the deficits go up in 1997 and 1998? That is true. Now, he claims what he is doing is having us on a downward slope toward a balanced budget. But, instead, in 1997 and 1998, where do the deficits go? The deficits go up, not down.

If we were the American people sitting out there, would we believe that the deficits can go up and still balance the budget? I do not think so.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the President says he wants a balanced budget, but in reality he has not produced one. He says he wants to lower the deficit year after year, and as we just heard, he does not do that either. And the President has said that he wants to save Medicare, at least on occasion, and end welfare as we know it, and that does not happen.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the President's budget is a budget of assumptions, it is a budget of hunches, it is a budget of nonspecifics, it is a budget based on if's; what if this happens, what if that happens.

The Republican budget is a concrete budget that returns power, influence and money back to the people of this country. It is a budget that gives a reasonable tax cut to working Americans, and this is in contrast to the President's budget that does none of this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG].

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, there is a stark contrast between the Republican budget and the President's budget on one issue. On the issue of tax cuts there is a clear and flagrant difference.

The Republicans give real, meaningful tax cuts. The President gives essentially no tax cuts and, indeed, in the last year of his budget he raises taxes by \$14 billion just to bring, by smoke and mirrors, his budget into balance at the last minute.

Mr. Chairman, I make no apology for arguing for tax cuts. We Republicans trust Americans to spend their money more wisely than we do. But let us talk about that issue. We are here concerned about the deficit and the debt.

The truth is we have an anemic economy growing at 2 percent a year. Historically our economy has grown over the last 30 years at 3.6 percent. Now it is growing at only 2 percent. If we could enact the tax cuts that President

Clinton vetoed, we could unleash this economy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting a budget that stops the situation where Americans pay more in taxes than they do in food and clothing.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not vote for the President's budget, but I will tell my colleagues one thing: This President has brought the budget deficit down. This President, contrary to Mr. Bush, contrary to Mr. Reagan, who in 1981 said, "If you will only adopt my tax cut, things are going to be rosy." They were rosy, all right, all red. All red. All deficits.

I voted for the coalition budget because I thought it was real. The Republican budget is not real. The President, this President, has already brought the budget deficit down 3 years in the running, the first time that has been done since Harry Truman. It will be a 4th year by my Republican colleagues' figures and our figures, which will be the first time in this century that the budget deficit has come down 4 years running.

President Clinton did it because he had the courage to put forth an economic program in 1993 that was real. It was not easy, but it was real, and none on the Republican side voted for it, so they cannot take credit for bringing the deficit down. All they can take credit for is putting it up \$4 trillion.

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

Mr. Chairman, in 1981 we had similar supply-side economics as the majority is projecting today. In 1981 we were told that by 1984 the budget would be in balance. Instead, we had a deficit of \$175 billion.

When we were told we should cut taxes and something good would happen to the deficit, instead it exploded. Spending exploded under the Reagan program and the deficit went to \$175 billion, under the same theory that the majority leadership has today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I have heard many times here today and on television in the last few days that the President raised taxes, the biggest taxes raised in history. That is not true, but we will not debate that at this time.

Every Member in this body had more people getting a tax cut under the President's 1993 package than had an increase. In the 8th District of North Carolina, 1,100 people had a tax increase and 54,000 people had a tax cut because of the EITC, the Earned In-

come Tax Credit, which the majority is going to do away with in this budget. They are going to practically do away with that. If a taxpayer makes \$20,000 a year and does not have any children, they will not get any tax relief. So much for the middle income folks.

Let me tell Members this. Here is what we have done, and I am speaking about "we" because we are all Americans. Since President Clinton has been President, we have created 8 million new jobs. People say the President created those jobs, but they were created in the United States of America. We have lowered interest rates and produced the lowest combined rate of unemployment since 1968.

I was at a reception last night for a group of people that are not Democratic supporters, and one of the gentlemen was in the furniture business. I said, "How has business been in the past 3½ years?" He said, "It has been the best it has ever been since I have been in business." And this is a family business. "I have made more money in the last 3½ years than I have ever made in business."

Now, the same people that are coming here today to tell us how great this Republican package is and how bad the 1993 package was, let me just read some of the statements that were being made when we were considering the President's package back in 1993.

□ 1430

In 1993, the Speaker of the House said: The tax increase will kill jobs and lead to a recession, and the recession will force people off of work and on to unemployment and will actually increase the deficit.

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

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. What, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HEFNER. That was the Speaker of the House, distinguished Representative NEWT GINGRICH. The President, the chairman of the Budget Committee in the other body, said April fool, America. This Clinton budget plan will not create jobs, will not grow the economy, and will not reduce the deficit. These are not my words. It was said in the Dallas Morning News.

Our distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, who is a very dear friend of mine, made these statements: We are going to find out whether we have higher deficits. We are going to find out whether we have a slower economy. We are going to find out what is going to happen to interest rates, and it is our opinion that this budget is a killer.

He goes on to say the Democrats have a job-killer program. It is like a snake bite. The venom is going to be injected into the body of this economy in our judgment, and it is going to spread throughout the body and is

going to begin to kill the jobs that Americans now have.

And it goes on and on. I could give other names: DICK ARMEY, CONNIE MACK, Congressman DORNAN, WALLY HERGER, JOEL HEFLEY, CHARLES GRASSLEY, JIM BUNNING, JOHN CHAFEE, JOSEPH KNOLLENBERG, JIM RAMSTAD, and it goes on and on and on.

Mr. SABO. If the gentleman would continue to yield, has the deficit not gone down?

Mr. HEFNER. Yes.

We have created 8 million new jobs. The deficit is down. They have continued to go down for 3 years, on the 4th year of a downward trend on the deficit. It will go down even more this year than it would if we pass this Republican so-called family friendly budget that is going to help the middle class.

This budget was a sham when it was projected a few months ago. It is a sham today and I do not blame BOB DOLE from disengaging from this process that the Republicans are putting forward.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds only to say that the reason the deficit went down is that the President of the United States and the Democrats in Congress enacted the largest tax increase in American history.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to two of the points made by the previous speaker. First of all, he said that not only was the earned income tax credit being cut. We have heard that one before. He said it was practically being dismantled.

Now, I know the gentleman from North Carolina has been around Washington a lot longer than I have. Maybe that is part of the problem here. This is how much has been spent in the last 6 years on the earned income tax credit. This is how much, \$109 billion; \$155 billion would be spent in the next 6 years.

Mr. Chairman, that is dismantling the EITC? I do not think so. But only in Washington-speak, only those people that have been around here all the time and only think of everything when it doubles every year think that we are actually cutting or dismantling the earned income tax credit.

On the second point, as far as the deficit is concerned, I would point out that President Bush, the Congressional Budget Office under a Democratic Congress, a Democratic administration, proposed in a Republican administration, said that the deficit was going to go down each of the succeeding years after 1992. The President's budget starting in 1993 showed deficits that stretched into infinity.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK].

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, our budget shows our trust in the American people to make their own decisions. We want to let them control their money and design programs that will solve the problems at home. I know firsthand that the local people can be trusted to do this. You know, when I was Mayor, we did not hold our hand out to the Federal Government. We simply went ahead, worked together to move people off of the Federal dependency and into self-sufficiency.

We got a lot of ideas for others to follow, like a public housing venture that literally moves people out of public housing and into home ownership. We have a housing partnership that last year built 119 homes, sold those homes, and 65 of those homes were sold to people who had previously been in public housing.

We started a homeless shelter with private community support that in the last 2 years has put over 500 men back into the workplace. We have coordinated job training program that actually does help young people, not only with training but puts them into their first job. We are turning lives around one at a time and it works. It works because we work together to help people achieve self-sufficiency and because we can tailor the program to fit the need.

Our budget allows communities all over America to use their ingenuity and help to do their own programs to solve their own problems, and it works so much better than a bureaucrat in Washington, DC, trying to tell them how to do it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I have been here for 20 years, and I have seen a lot of budgets. Each year that I vote on budgets, I have not found one yet that I can agree with 100 percent. But this time, and basically that is why I voted for the coalition budget, because there was only one item in there that I disagreed with. Now I am faced, like every Member of this House is faced, with a prospect that if we do not pass the President's budget, which I do not agree with on certain things, all I have got left is this monstrosity that the majority has presented to us that will ruin rural America.

I have no choice. I do not think anybody in this House has any choice. The only alternative I have is the President's budget, and it is a whole lot better than what I see coming from them. What does it do? Well, it protects and provides funds for education, which is big for my district and the United States of America. It provides for medicare. It does not make those reductions that they make in medicare and medicaid, which will devastate my rural hospitals.

I am from a rural district, yes, this is going to mean closings. My hospital association says it means closing within 5 years of some of my rural hospitals. What does that do? I guess they can go out and find the money and provide for the hospitals. Sorry, folks, it is not going to work that way. The President's budget provides for environment, rural development, and it is balanced, yes, in the same period of time, it is a balanced budget.

Although I do not believe we should do tax cuts until we have a balanced budget, and I firmly believe that, that is one of the areas I disagree with the President's budget, but I can vote on that as a later issue.

So I am asking the Members of this House, if they do not want to take the radical approach, you know, I heard two Members of that opposite party last month when I was talking federalism with them, said the Federal Government should do two things: Defend our shores and deliver the mail. They were not so sure about delivering the mail. Think about that. That is radical, just defend our shores and do nothing else.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM].

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

If there is a young person who, for whatever reason, missed school today and is sitting, listening to this debate, let me tell them why I think their country is in such debt and why I think the President's budget does not help a whole lot. The deficit is about \$150 billion. There is a thing called the national debt that, as I speak, is \$5,098,866,418,898. It is worth \$19,250 for every man, woman, child in America.

The reason that we got a \$5 trillion debt is because entitlement spending in this country has gone through the roof, and both parties are sitting here yelling at each other about who caused the problem. In my opinion, both parties have let the entitlements grow to the point that they are 50 percent of the budget. When we add the interest element to the equation, 67 percent of the Federal budget is on auto pilot. If you want us to balance the budget, please make us change the reason Medicare has grown 2,200 percent since 1980. If you want to free America up, balance the budget and help people, please change welfare so the average person does not stay on it 10 years. If you want us to do something about education in your State, please make us change Medicaid so it does not grow at 19 percent a year and takes money away from the State to run its education program just to get health care dollars.

President Clinton's budget has no entitlement reforms. It does not address why we are in debt. It does not change

any of the reasons that led to every man, woman, and child owing \$19,000 today. If you want us to change America, let us give choices and get government back home.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We are still talking here today about the need to balance the budget, to reduce the burden on future generations. That is important, and I certainly concur with that belief. But I think it is very important too that we protect future generations and ensure that a good quality of life is going to be available to our grandchildren as was available to us.

The Republican budget resolution does not adhere to this principle. The amendment before us now, which incorporates President Clinton's 6-year balanced budget plan, will continue to invest in our children. It will provide quality, affordable health care to our senior citizens and the disabled, provide tax incentives targeted to the middle class and stimulate further economic growth and development.

The choice before us is simple: We either invest now in critical programs aimed at improving the quality and standard of living in the United States, programs like education, community development, biomedical research, national assistance, public safety, small business development, trade promotion, clean air and clean water, and so forth. Or we can refuse to meet the basic responsibilities of the Federal Government and turn our backs on the most vulnerable, the senior citizen, the children, the disabled, and the poor.

I support investing in the future, and I will support the Sabo amendment. I urge my colleagues too, as well. I hope you would carefully review this proposal because many of the policy assumptions that were included in the budget have always enjoyed bipartisan support. The budget, as I stated before, it balanced. It includes real middle-class tax cuts without adding to the deficit or without using Medicare cuts to pay for tax cuts for the rich.

It includes a proposal to give premium subsidies to individuals who lose their health insurance when they lose their jobs. It also assumes real increases in biomedical research, maintains a strong commitment to civilian research and development, increases our investment again in our children in education. It also calls for the restoration of tax fairness by targeting tax relief to the real middle class, and the amendment assumes the deduction for qualifying. This is most important. The deduction of \$5,000 a year to education and training expenses in 1996, 1997, and 1998 and in 1999 raises it to \$10,000.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

At times I am asked, "What's the hardest part of being a Congressman?" I could easily talk about the grueling schedule or the complexity of legislation or the fact that we live in glass houses—or maybe the answer for many of us has to do with how hard it is to be missing in action from our families so much of the time.

But one of the toughest things I grapple with on days like today is determining when something is good enough to support as "moving the mark forward" and when it just doesn't quite pass muster.

I refuse to be part of the mentality so prevalent these days that claims compromise is a dirty word. Working things out, finding a middle ground—that's part of the life blood of a Democratic legislative body.

But I also know the danger of wink-and-nod acquiescence to inferior agreements crafted too much for political expediency and not enough in honest confrontation of difficult problems—problems like the deficit.

I sincerely praise both the President and the Republicans for promoting specific and legitimate balanced budgets this year. I am proud as a Democrat to note that, with one exception, this is the first time since the last Democratic President that, the House has voted on a Presidential budget scored as being in balance by the Congressional Budget Office.

Just as the majority has moved toward the coalition budget by moderating many of their savings, the President has moved toward the coalition budget by tackling some of the tough choices necessary to reach balance. While more movement from both sides is necessary, the fact that each has come toward the coalition's numbers in the center gives me some hope we still can seal a balanced budget agreement.

But in the final analysis today, I think both the President's and the majority's budgets have done too much winking and nodding when it comes to deficit reduction. Republicans want too much to raid my grandson's pockets to pay for today's tax cuts. Having lived through the failed promises of the 1980's tax cuts, I won't walk down that path again.

Likewise, the President wants to dip into my grandson's pockets to pay for grandpa's Social Security and Medicare. Having watched the uncontrolled ballooning of those programs in the early 1990's, I won't follow that path either.

President Clinton, and Chairman KASICH both deserve recognition for heightening the debate on balancing the budget. But both proposals fall short when measured on the deficit reduction yardstick. I will oppose both, having just supported the only obvious compromise and the plan most dedicated to deficit reduction, the coalition budget. Our substitute postponed tax cuts until the budget is balanced, provided a steady deficit reduction glide path, and has less total debt than any of the other options before us. It also avoided unlikely off-triggers on taxes and other questionable budget devices found in both of the other budgets.

Americans are asking for bipartisanship, for honesty, integrity, and responsibility, and for

constructive solutions. It's time to respond to those demands.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS.]

Mr. STEARNS. I thank my colleague. Let me give an analogy on this debate. Let us say you are overweight by 100 pounds. You are trying to lose weight over a 7-year period. Would you take a plan where in the first 2 years you gain 100 pounds and then in the next 2 years you try to lose it, then in the final year you really make an effort to reduce that 100 pounds? Of course not, it will not work.

This same principle is applying to the Clinton budget. The President's budget is such that the largest spending reductions are in the 7th year. Also under the President's budget, deficits go up in the early years. We certainly do not need that, either.

How many of this floor remember what the President said in 1993 about his tax increase? He said, "You might think I raised your taxes too much. Well, it might surprise you to know that I think I raised your taxes too much too." And in fact his tax increase was the largest of the 19 increases we have had on this floor since 1981.

□ 1445

Mr. Chairman, I ask, "Isn't it time that after 15 years we should have one single tax cut?" We should not have to wait another 17 years.

Also, my colleagues, Prof. Thomas Hopkins of the University of Rochester indicated that the annual cost of Federal regulation has risen since 1981 over the equivalent of \$6,000 for every single American while the party of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has been in control for the last 40 years.

Come on, Mr. President. It is time for a new direction. Even the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. HOYER, came on this House floor and said he is not going to vote for the Clinton budget, so why should Mr. SABO?

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], because it is so much better than the Republican alternative.

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

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, why does not the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and many of the gentleman's other colleagues come on the House floor and say they do not support the Clinton budget?

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I cannot respond for other people. I can only say the President's record on deficit reduction, on rational discipline of the Government is so much superior to previous Republican administrations. His proposal today is so far superior to the majority proposal that it is a simple

and easy vote for me to vote "yes" despite the fact I would have preferred some other alternative.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North California [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I might have an answer.

Might be the reason the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is not going to vote for it might be the reason that 20-some of the Republicans voted for the coalition budget because they think it is so much better than the Republican budget.

I say about the Republican budget it is like the one we had many years ago. This budget is like an ugly child. We have to tie a pork chop around its neck to get the dogs to play with it.

So this is a terrible budget.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds only to say that the members of their party will flee from their budget like scalded dogs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Clinton budget and in support of the House Republican budget proposal.

I also want to express my appreciation to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee.

He and his staff worked closely with the committee on Veterans' Affairs on the Republican budget, and it shows in the favorable provisions for veterans.

The President's plan would balance the budget on the backs of our Nation's veterans, drastically cutting VA medical care spending.

The House Republican budget plan provides \$100 million more next year and \$5 billion more over the next 6 years than the Clinton plan for veterans' medical care spending.

The President's plan takes more cuts out of veterans programs for deficit reduction but still falls short of balancing the budget, denying all veterans the economic advantages of a balanced Federal budget.

Our plan balances the budget while providing nearly \$230 million for increases to veterans' earned benefit programs, which are not in the President's budget.

In the words of President Clinton's Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Jesse Brown, and I quote, "The President's budget would devastate VA."

In a letter dated May 14, 1996, to Secretary Brown, the national commanders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, and the Paralyzed Veterans of America stated and I quote:

Our Nation's sick and disabled veterans deserve a viable health care system devoted to

them and their special health care needs. . . . President Clinton's seven year balanced budget proposal does not provide the funding necessary to meet these needs.

I urge my colleagues to join the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs and the major veterans service organizations in denouncing the Clinton budget proposals for veterans by voting "no" and defeating the Presidents' plan.

For over a year, Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Jesse Brown has bashed Republicans in Congress with a barrage of fraudulent and deceptive attacks about the Republican budget's impact on veterans' programs.

Secretary Brown has misled veterans to believe that the Republican budget would impose a means test on service-connected benefits, tax veterans' benefits, remove disabled veterans from compensation rolls, and cut compensation for other disabled veterans. The Balanced Budget Act contained none of those proposals, and Secretary Brown knows it did not. He has also widely claimed that he would be forced to close numerous VA hospitals because of the budget.

With the apparent approval of the President and clear knowledge of the facts, Secretary Brown continues spreading misinformation. He goes so far as to suggest in battlefield metaphor that "veterans are under attack by hostile forces within this nation. Those forces are Members of Congress. . . . We must stay alert because we have hypocrites in the land."

Yes, there are hypocrites in Washington. They are creating a pattern of deception, purposely telling half-truths to scare veterans for political advantage. But, they are not the Republican Members of Congress.

Let's take a look at the pattern of deception. In the 1994 budget, President Clinton's Office of Management and Budget planned to cut 27,000 VA employees as part of the Clinton administration's heralded reinventing Government effort to reduce the Federal work force by 252,000 positions by the year 2000. Congress, at that time controlled by the Democrats, blocked the proposal and worked out a compromise limiting the VA cuts to 10,051 employees. In the 1995 budget, President Clinton proposed the first installment of these VA personnel reductions. Secretary Brown presented it to Congress and defended the President's budget, which included cutting VA medical care staffing by 3,400. Congress refused to accept the budget, allocating \$100 million more than Secretary Brown had requested for VA medical care. Despite this increase, VA eliminated 3,436 medical care positions and closed 2,300 hospital beds. Clearly, these medical staff reductions and bed closures were not budget driven. They were part of an overall plan to move VA's health care system in line with private sector models, emphasizing outpatient and primary care.

For 1996, after prolonged budget debates, Congress increased VA medical care spending by \$400 million above the prior year. Secretary Brown shrieked for months that veterans would suffer due to lost hospital beds and medical staff cuts. He forecast catastrophe and called Congress mean spirited wherever he traveled. Throughout the year, Republican leaders assured veterans that medical care funding would remain sufficient to provide well managed, quality care.

In recent testimony before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Secretary Brown stated that his dire predictions did not happen because of increased efficiencies and consolidations of service. He did not explain why his predictions failed to reflect VA's already planned efficiencies and consolidations. This raises the question of whether he was out of the loop or just scaring veterans for political purposes.

Testimony of the Under Secretary of Health, Dr. Kenneth Kizer, confirmed the previous reductions of work force and hospital beds did not result from budget cuts but were part of VA's initial efforts to reform the way it provides care. Dr. Kizer said, "We are fundamentally reengineering and reinventing the health care system so that it goes from a hospital based system to an ambulatory care-based system that is rooted in primary care." He added, that VA would "continue to emphasize improved and increased accessibility and quality of VA health care."

Having admitted that his dire predictions did not come true, one might expect Secretary Brown to cool his rhetoric, correct the record, and reassure veterans that quality health care delivery is being maintained.

But on a recent trip to Colorado, Secretary Brown blamed Congress again for cuts, implying that staffing reductions are purely budget driven and are having a negative impact on the delivery of care.

The Secretary has a responsibility to tell veterans the truth about what is really going on within VA health care and the President's budget.

Secretary Brown should tell veterans that the President's budget requests a further medical care work force reduction of 5,000 in 1997. He should also tell veterans that he has sought and received authority from the President to reduce VA's medical work force by 10,000 persons over the next 2 years. And, he should tell veterans that these additional proposed reductions are a continuation of VA's reorganization efforts, can be achieved without negatively impacting health care delivery, and are not simply budget driven reductions.

When on the road, at taxpayer expense, the Secretary says nothing about President Clinton's budget for VA health care in future years. He should be honest with veterans and tell them that the President's budget takes VA medical care from a high of \$17 billion in fiscal year 1997 down to a low of \$13 billion in fiscal year 2000 without one word of explanation about how this would be accomplished. When asked about this at a hearing, Secretary Brown told the obvious truth saying, "The President's outyear numbers would devastate VA."

As a self-proclaimed advocate for veterans, Secretary Brown should have the courage to tell the truth—to tell veterans and their families that the House Republican budget is better for veterans than the President's budget. The House budget proposes to spend

nearly \$100 million more on VA health care in 1997 than President Clinton, and \$5.1 billion more on VA health care than the President over the next 6 years. Additionally, the House budget requires less in savings from veterans' programs to balance the budget and provides for nearly \$230 million in benefit improvements that are not contained in the Clinton budget plan. Those are the facts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to the President's budget. I agree with the Secretary of the VA that the President's budget will, in fact, be devastating to the VA. The President slashes VA medical care spending by \$4 billion while at the same time raiding \$18 million from the National Cemetery Service at the same time as more veterans, in fact, are dying. It bothers me tremendously.

One point I would like to make is, I have to ask where is the President's commitment? I ask that because the President, first he said he would balance the budget in 5 years, then he said we can do it in 7 years, then he said I think we can do it in 9 years, then he said I think we will balance the budget in 10 years, then he said I think we can reach it in 8 years, then he said somewhere between 7 and 9, and today he sent to the floor a budget for 6 years.

Where is the commitment? This is a President that opposed the balanced budget amendment. Bill Clinton has the commitment of a Kamikaze pilot on his 37th mission.

Where is your commitment, Mr. President?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair would caution Members their remarks should be addressed to the Chair.

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

I want to only say it is the President's program that reduced the Federal deficit by more than 50 percent over all the "no" votes of the Republican, now majority, when they were in the minority. It is the President's program that has brought record growth of over 8½ million new jobs since 1993. The President does not have to listen to lectures from people who voted "no" on real deficit reduction in 1993. He has not just talked about it, he has done it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the President's budget is not perfect, but the President's budget does prove that we can balance the budget in 6 years without extreme cuts in health care and education and housing and law enforcement and environmental protection. But while those extreme proposals get most of the attention, I would like to point out to other areas of the

extremist Republican budget that have at least as many bad implications for our future, and those areas are scientific research and development and our public transportation.

The Committee on the Budget plan cuts civilian science by \$15 billion over 6 years. It phases research and solar and renewable energy way down and wipes out energy conservation and research in fossil energy efficiencies. It eliminates technology partnerships with businesses, including advanced technology development and manufacturing extension.

Now, these are the very investments that create high-paying jobs to grow our economy while protecting our environment and quality of life.

Now, public transportation gets people to jobs and to their medical appointments while conserving energy and protecting the environment. Completely missing the interconnection between public transportation and our energy and environmental security needs, the Republican budget slashes support for transportation systems that are used in every urban community, large and small, all over America.

What kind of future will those policies leave us? Well, a bleak future at best.

So we should reject the Committee on the Budget's renewal of extremist proposals and adopt instead the President's budget as a far better investment in our future, and I urge all my colleagues to support the President's sensible priorities.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I find the use of the term "extremist" in reference to the Republican budget rather ironic when looking at the section dealing with veterans' health care spending. The veterans in this country want a balanced budget. They know what it is to sacrifice for our country, and they want a balanced budget, but they want a balanced budget that is fair, in which we do not attempt to balance the budget of this country on the backs of our Nation's veterans. The President's budget seeks to balance the budget on their backs at their expense.

That is why the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs rightly said that the President's budget would be devastating to the veterans' health care spending in this country, and that is why the national commanders of four of our major veteran service organizations wrote the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs this week saying that in fact there was not adequate funding for a viable health care system in the President's budget and urging that it not be supported and saying that they would oppose it and all other budgets that fail to provide for our veterans.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] earlier called the Presi-

dent's budget the UFO budget. I rather like that and think that is rather accurate. But if we look at the veteran section, we can call it the big dipper budget because in the next 4 years in the area of VA medical spending there is a 20-percent cut in veteran spending for health care in the President's budget. That is devastating. It would reduce from \$17 to \$13 billion over the next 4 years. It is over a 20-percent cut in medical care. We cannot tolerate that.

The President's budget would spend \$5 billion less on veterans' medical care over the next 6 years than the Republican House budget. The House budget even next year spends \$100 million more on VA health care than does the President.

There is nothing extreme about that, but there is fairness to our Nation's veterans.

Again I say, Mr. Chairman the veterans of this country want a balanced budget, but they want a balanced budget that is fair. They do not want, as this chart indicates, a 20-percent cut in medical care spending with no explanation of how those cuts will be achieved, simply putting them at the expense of our Nation's veterans. That is not right, it is not fair. The President's budget fails the fairness test for our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Chairman, that is why we need to oppose this Clinton budget.

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

Veterans funding is the gentleman's top priority. He should have voted for the coalition budget because that budget had less cuts in veterans' care than the majority proposal. But, in reality, what will govern the funds available for VA funding in the next several years is a total level of discretionary funding. That is what is going to give appropriations the flexibility for funding VA. Cuts in discretionary funding are much deeper, much more severe, than those projected in the President's budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE) assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1997

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the President's 6-year balanced budget.

This debate is about much more than dollars and cents—it is about our Nation's fundamental priorities and values. The differences between the Gingrich budget and the President's budget are very clear. These plans offer competing visions for America's future, and they present all Americans with a stark choice.

The President's plan balances the budget and provides tax relief for the middle class while protecting key priorities like Medicare, Medicaid, education and the environment.

President Clinton's budget will guarantee Medicare's solvency through 2005, while giving our seniors greater choice and flexibility. It cuts down on fraud and abuse in Medicaid, shakes up the welfare system, and provides hard working families with tax credits to pay for college or to start a business.

The Gingrich budget hits the elderly and our children the hardest. New York alone will lose \$14 billion in Medicare funding and \$10 billion from Medicaid under NEWT GINGRICH's budget. Seniors will lose long-term care and children will be denied health care. Financially strapped school systems—like the one in Yonkers, NY, will lose millions in Federal aid.

The choice is clear—the President's balanced budget provides tax relief for hard working Americans while protecting the priorities of the American people. NEWT GINGRICH's budget increases spending at the Pentagon while slashing Medicare, Medicaid, education and the environment.

Let's listen to what a very senior Republican from my State of New York recently had to say about the Gingrich revolution:

Americans did not vote to cut funding for education and cut funding for the environment and cut funding for programs they care about it.

Those were AL D'AMATO's words—let's take his advice, reject the Gingrich budget and support the President's plan.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would caution that Members should avoid references to individual Senators.

□ 1500

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the latest round of Republican Medicare cuts. The American people rejected this extreme agenda last year, and I call on my colleagues to reject it today. The Medicare cuts contained in the Republican

budget are designed to create a second-class health care system for America's seniors. Their drastic cuts are compounded by dangerous policy proposals which will truly force Medicare to "wither on the vine," as the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia, NEWT GINGRICH, called for last year. Under the Gingrich budget seniors will pay more and they will get less health care.

The medical savings accounts in the Republican plan will skim off the healthiest and the wealthiest individuals and threaten to leave the remaining millions of seniors vulnerable to a weakened Medicare system, while increasing their costs. The Republican plan to cut \$168 billion from Medicare and \$72 billion from Medicaid is far more than is necessary to ensure the solvency of the trust fund.

The President's budget proves that. The President's budget makes Medicare solvent for the same number of years as the Republican budget, but does so without making such deep cuts. So why would the Republicans cut so deeply? The answer is \$176 billion in tax breaks for the wealthiest in our country.

Mr. Chairman, the American people rejected, out of hand, the extreme agenda of the Republican resolution when Speaker GINGRICH tried to take the country hostage by shutting down the Government and then going home for the Christmas vacation. Congress should not slash Medicare and Medicaid for millions of America's seniors in order to pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest few. It was wrong last year, and it is wrong today. I call on my colleagues to reject the Republicans' failed agenda.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

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

Mr. Chairman, listening again to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, I think back again to the Washington Post editorial that talked about Medicare. Here they go again. Mr. Chairman, the fact is this: that spending per patient will increase from \$5,200 to \$7,000 under our plan. That is no cut. There is no increase in deductibles, copayments, or premiums. And the gentlewoman neglected to admit that the Medicare trust fund is \$4 billion in arrears. That is unconscionable. That is why we must have this budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona can continue to try to fool the American public, when in fact if you add more seniors to the program, if you allow for inflation, the Republican budget in fact does cut

Medicare for seniors. It allows them to have to pay increased deductibles and increases their medical bills, and no matter how they want to tell us that they are slowing the rate of growth, they really, truly want to see this program changed and it wither on the vine, as their leader, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], has talked about.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] to respond.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I would simply remind my friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, that again she misquotes people, not only an interesting use of numbers, but with reference to withering on the vine. The full record indicates, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut knows, the Speaker was referring to the Health Care Financing Administration and some of the problems with socialized medicine that existed in the former Soviet Union. That quote has been culled incorrectly.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut knows this, as she also knows the fact that we are increasing expenditures per beneficiary. There is no dispute with that, nor is there a dispute, Mr. Chairman, with this cold, hard fact of reality: The Medicare trust fund is already \$4 billion in arrears.

I ask my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, at long last, have they no sense of decency left? Let us save Medicare for seniors, quit worrying about the next election, enact this budget, and save the program.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the very decent gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, talk about decency; BOB DOLE: "I was there fighting the fight, voting against Medicare in 1965 because we knew it would not work."

"Now, we didn't get rid of it in round 1, because we didn't think that was politically smart, and we don't think that is the right way to go through a transition. But we believe it is going to wither on the vine." The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. NEWT GINGRICH, speaking to the Blue Cross-Blue Shield conference on October 24, 1995.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend and member of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

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

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Arizona is going to take exception to

quotes, let us talk facts. In fact, the Republican budget proposes the deepest cuts in Medicare, future Medicare spending: once again, \$161 billion over 6 years, compared to \$117 billion in the President's budget before us.

Let us look behind these numbers, however, so we understand exactly where those cuts fall. One hundred and twenty three billion dollars comes from part A, the reimbursements to hospitals and home nursing care. There is no way we can take these cuts out of future spending and hospitals without devastating the network of essential care provided by hospitals all across this country. This cut is deeper than their cut last year.

As regards hospital reimbursement, home health care services so vital to seniors, they cut more than they cut last year. I think the American people know full well that their budget last year on Medicare cuts was reckless, was dangerous, and threatened the care of our elderly.

As regards the part B premium, for those who might elect the managed care option under their Medicare revisions, the GOP budget would leave unlimited exposure to physician charges. Medicare would cover a portion of the physician charges, but whatever the physician wanted to bill in addition to that, the senior would be responsible for.

The bottom line on their budget: Closed hospitals in many parts of the country, and higher doctor bills payable out of the pockets of the senior citizens of this country.

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

Mr. POMEROY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman voting for the budget?

Mr. POMEROY. I am going to vote for the President's budget. I will oppose the GOP budget, for the reasons that I am saying.

Mr. Chairman, another area of important contrast involves the Medicaid Program. The Medicaid Program is a major source of reimbursement, as members know, for those senior citizens in nursing homes without resources. They will, combined with the reductions in State funding, devastate reimbursement in the Medicaid Program, and the President's budget compares very favorably in this area as well.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the minority on their tactics, because we have been studying them and learning from them. It is interesting that in the hour that they came to the floor to support the President's budget, they do not have anything good to say about it. So what

they do is come to the floor and try to attack our budget.

Every one of them are smart, good, decent people who know that Medicare is going bankrupt. They furthermore know that we are increasing the number of dollars behind the senior citizen from \$4,800 per senior citizen to \$7,000 for each senior citizen.

But what is curious about this debate is that the plan basically has all its savings at the end. Take a typical American diet, I would say to the gentleman from Illinois, HENRY HYDE; that you are going to lose 50 pounds this year; you are going to lose 1 pound in the first week and 49 in the last week.

So first of all, it is backloaded. In other words, we put all the heavy lifting off for the children of the next century. We have children that visit this Capitol every day, and we are asking them to do all the heavy lifting, while we kind of get away scot-free. We do not want to do that.

Second, we do not believe in tax increases.

Third, if the economy has improved so much, why is it the President keeps running around talking about wage stagnation and job insecurity? It is because it is real. It is because they have not been able to grow this economy, to provide job security, permanent jobs, high-paying jobs, because the American people do not have the money to save and invest and risk-take, and give our workers the tools they need to compete and win.

Finally, everyone on this floor knows that at the end of the day, we are going to have to come to grips with entitlement programs. Our philosophy is we can manage them better by designing local solutions to local problems for less cost.

But I wish we could spend this hour having you defend or support the President's budget, rather than attacking ours. It is a curious way to operate, but I think I understand it, when you have so much difficulty finding the good reasons to support the President in his very feeble efforts.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I have no problem defending the President's budget versus that of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH]. The gentleman from Ohio worked hard, but the President's is much better, much better for education and training, much better potentially for reforming Medicare in a fashion that will work.

The reality is your changes, you add some money up early, your provider Medicare cuts are going to have to be deeper in the final year, 2002, than they were in your original plan. Why? to accommodate your tax cuts. You talk about front end and back end loading. Somehow, there is enough money for your tax cut in 1997, for you show a deficit increase then, too. Miraculously,

your tax cut costs less in 2002 than it does in 2001. There is some end loading in the President's, but you have the same problem. If you did not want that, if you wanted a nice, steady flow, you would have voted for the coalition budget.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that it is really dubious to make the claim that the President is spending more on any program that is in the discretionary accounts, because you have \$67 billion in unspecified cuts. If we wanted to do a really good job, an effort at this in the style of the gentleman from Massachusetts, ED MARKEY, we would take the \$67 billion in cuts and we would hold charts up of the children who we think you will hurt, or we will hold up charts of any number of discretionary programs and say you are going to cut those.

The simple fact of the matter is that we have done the most, we have been able to accomplish the most amount of change, and you all endorsed it. About 2 weeks ago the President of the United States had a budget that said we would have spent \$7 billion more in 1996 than we spent in 1995. We said, no, no, we want \$23 billion less. And guess what, the revolution has come, and guess what, it is winning. And do you know why? You all voted for it. You voted for the most massive amount of downsizing of Washington spending since World War II. I think it is fantastic that you did it.

Now, for the period of the next 6 years, there is not fundamentally that much difference between you and us on Washington spending, because you have already endorsed our program. Now what we are asking you to do is to endorse the rest of our program that takes entitlement programs that are going through the roof, that are threatening to sink the young people's future, that are destroying job security and creating wage stagnation, and we are saying, look, take the program out of Washington, send it home, design a local solution for a local problem. And we do not want to have higher taxes on the American people. People pay too much in taxes.

Mr. Chairman, the choices are pretty clear between these two alternatives, but I am glad that the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. SABO, is now defending or supporting the President's budget rather than focusing on the shortfalls in ours, because we believe strongly in ours and we are glad that the gentleman at least believes in his.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that we impose discipline on discretionary spending. We did it in 1993. I just have to say to my friend, the chairman of

the committee, I am curious that if it was his program that finally passed, why he had to shut the Government for Christmas.

There were some issues at odds: Funding for education, for environmental protection, for inspection of safety, very important priorities. That is the difference. Frankly, there are very important differences over the future: Over educational funding, training, research and development; significant differences between the President's budget and its potential for doing good things for the future of our economy, things that are left out of your budget.

□ 1515

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the point that the President was asking and many of you were asking to spend \$7 billion more in 1996 than in 1995. We were saying, No, no, we don't want to do that. We want to downsize Washington programs and spend less. At the end of the day, we ended up spending \$23 billion less. You wanted \$7 billion more, we spent \$23 billion less. That is a \$30 billion difference.

The thing that is so amazing is that we frankly have already won that debate, because you all voted for this. There were only 32 votes against this appropriation bill that lowers the whole base of spending in Washington. It is a terrific accomplishment by this Congress. I want to congratulate you for being part of it.

But when you start this big argument about the difference in Washington spending, frankly, folks, that debate is done. You already conceded our point. We are going to have the most massive amount of downsizing of Washington and the most amount of hope for the American people we have had in terms of controlling this Government in 50 years. I think it is reason to celebrate, not fight. We appreciate your support of that.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the Budget chairman, on his disingenuousness.

All the budgets have agreed that we would balance in 7 years. All the budgets have agreed that we would downsize. So what else is new? The question is, inside of that, what is going to be cut?

What is not going to be cut inside of yours, ladies and gentlemen, is Star Wars, a \$13 billion increase in the Pentagon, and all the taxes for the wealthy, and in the meantime the people on Medicare pay higher doctor bills, more seniors will be in the system, there will be more inflation. You

have got a lot of backloading. Then Mr. DOLE has already said, "I tried to get Medicare once but it was not politically timely, but I think we can do better this time."

But what is disturbing is how come I cannot get more votes for the Congressional Black Caucus budget because we are Democrats, too, with one of the better programs that have been on the floor. I ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] to consider that.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the reason that I think in our Committee on the Budget there was not much talk about the positive notes on the President's budget is because the President's budget is full of tricks. It takes taxes and says we are going to have tax cuts, but then it restores all those tax cuts and ends up actually with a tax increase of \$16 billion after the year 2002.

It does not have many spending cuts so nobody is particularly offended. Technically it balances because of a gimmick. The President says, "Look, if we're not on track by the year 2000, then I want you to take another \$67 billion out of discretionary spending." That is more discretionary cuts than even the Republicans have suggested in that length of time. It is going to be impossible. It is pretending that it balances when it does not. I bet there are a lot of Democrats that are going to be unwilling to vote for the President's budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that our Federal budget should be a statement of our national values. President Clinton's budget is. It protects and invests in the health, education, and well-being of the American people, protects the environment, as well as protecting Medicare and Medicaid.

I have many problems with the Republican budget. However, the most extreme and shortsighted part of the GOP budget plan is the severe cuts to education and job training. Essentially these vital programs to prepare the American people for the challenge of a new global economy are cut by 25 percent from this year's funding and then frozen for 6 years. Many scholarship and student loan programs are eliminated. This renewed attack on education places the Republican budget on a collision course with the Clinton administration, which has proposed \$61 billion more in investments for education and job training.

For health programs, the Republican plan calls for drastic cuts in programs like community health centers, family planning and biomedical research. Is

this a statement of our national values? The plan to cut purchasing power for the National Institutes of Health by 16 percent is extreme and is lacking in an understanding of the importance of investment in biomedical research.

Over and over again the Republican budget makes cuts where we should be making investments. I do not believe it is a statement of our national values. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the GOP plan and be proud to vote "aye" on the Clinton proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the 1997 Republican budget resolution. Like last year's budget, the plan is out-of-touch with the American people and should be rejected by the House.

In 1993, President Clinton working with Congress began a process of deficit reduction that has produced Federal deficits which have gone down for 4 years in a row. In fact, the Federal budget deficit has been cut in half since the beginning of the Clinton Presidency. We need a continuation of the moderate proposals which have been working. We do not need another extreme budget plan to foster bitter confrontation between the Republican Congress and the administration. The American people reject this tactic; they want bipartisan cooperation in solving problems.

The Republican plan proposes to cut Medicare by \$168 billion over the next 6 years. Even worse, the plan proposes to end 30 years of universal coverage for senior citizens and allow the healthy and wealthy to opt out of the program causing disruption and placing the entire Medicare Program at risk.

The Republican plan for Medicaid is even more extreme. A cut of \$72 billion over 6 years and allowing the States to cut even more in State payments would be severely destructive to the program. The plan also would eliminate the current guarantees of health coverage for low-income children, pregnant women, disabled people, and senior citizens. Thankfully, the President has already rejected the drastic approach and proposed a reasonable plan to cap individual benefits resulting in comparable savings without millions of Americans losing health coverage.

Likewise, the Republican budget includes much of the Republican welfare plan which was vetoed by the President because it was too extreme and did little to move people from welfare to work. There appears to be little to recommend proceeding with the same plan encouraging a race to the bottom for State welfare programs.

With regard to discretionary spending, the Republican plan is once again extreme. Funding for defense programs is increased greatly over the Pentagon's request. On the other hand, nondefense spending falls dramatically; a 25-percent reduction in purchasing power for domestic programs.

For health programs, the Republican plan calls for drastic cuts to programs like community health centers, family planning and biomedical research. The plan to cut purchasing power for the National Institutes of Health [NIH] by 16 percent is extreme and lacking in an understanding of the important of investment in biomedical research.

Again this year, the Republican budget plan proposes to cut important worker protection programs, including the Occupational Health and Safety Administration [OSHA] by more than 20 percent while terminating important research on workplace safety. The budget plan also calls for the repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act and the Service Contract Act thus threatening other important worker income security protections.

Nonetheless, the most extreme and short-sighted part of the GOP budget plan is the severe cuts to education and job training programs. Essentially, these vital programs to prepare the American people for the challenges of a new global economy are cut by 25 percent from this year's funding and then frozen for 6 years. Important education reforms are terminated and funding for bilingual education is eliminated. Many scholarship and student loan programs are eliminated. The successful direct Student Loan Program is also eliminated. This renewed attack on education places the Republican budget on a collision course with the Clinton administration which has proposed \$61 billion more in investments for education and job training.

Meanwhile, this plan would phase-out funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities as well as eliminate Federal funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Again, these proposals are short-sighted and extreme.

Again, the Republican plan fails to adequately protect the environment. The plan would cut purchasing power for natural resources and environmental protection by 26 percent. It also focuses cuts at the Environmental Protection Agency based on flawed risk-based regulation reforms. The American people want the environment protected. They want clean water, clean air, and access to well-kept national parks.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget resolution is *deja vu* from last year's Gingrich budget. This budget sets in motion the same failed tactic of confrontation that resulted in the longest and most destructive Government shutdowns in our Nation's history. I fear that not enough was learned by the Republican leadership from last year's failures.

I urge my colleagues to reject this fundamentally flawed Republican budget and insist that a bipartisan budget proposal be adopted to move us on an orderly course to complete the important budget work of this Congress.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank my good friend and ranking member from Minnesota, Mr. SABO, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to acknowledge that I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is right. We do need to be discussing the Clinton budget, and we do need to be doing it in contrast to the Republican budget so the American people can fully understand. I do think that we have a sense of responsibility here and we are right, or he is right, we did collectively come together to vote on that last bill, appropriations bill, to ensure that the Government remained open, which is what the Democrats were trying to do all year long.

But one thing we did stand up and say is that we did not like those priorities because it did not ensure the protection of Medicare, it relinquished the responsibility for young children to have good health by cutting Medicaid so drastically, and then it gave short shrift to research and development. And here we are again now, looking at this new budget with the same kinds of poison-pen activities.

I support the Clinton budget because it recognizes that we as Americans must be embracing of all of us. It supports research and development, it includes a very vital program that I have heard my colleagues make jokes about, and that is the Summer Youth Jobs Program that puts young people back to work, and then I think we should refresh our memories about what happens when we recklessly cut taxes.

I believe in cutting taxes, and I think we need to be fair to the American people. If we cut taxes, we need to ensure the least of those who are working and not engaged in receiving welfare and respecting the earned income tax credit. But with this new budget, we are seeing the Republicans cutting \$200 billion of revenue. Where does it go? It does not go to the average working American. It goes to those who are already well-endowed.

We realize that under a Republican President when that same philosophy and budgeting process was implemented, we for the first time in this Nation began to define the deficit in one word, trillions.

Now we are coming to this Congress and asking for a fair budgeting process, one that emphasizes the environment, one that emphasizes education, one that emphasizes working America, and one that recognizes that this country would not be where it is today if we had not supported research and development. We would not be where we are today in terms of health care nor would we be where we are today in terms of the kinds of technology and jobs that are created. I think research and development is the work of the 21st century. That creates the work opportunities for the 21st century. It would be shameful to cut so drastically, what

we have done in this Republican budget.

So I would simply say that we are talking about a budget that has priorities, priorities of balance and a priority that balances what this budget should be about and, yes, does not take away \$200 billion of revenue that American people will need to ensure a better quality of life.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the distinguished majority whip.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate this very vigorous debate. It has been very encouraging and very stimulating. I hope the American people are watching, because there are two very clear differences held here on the floor as to where this country ought to be going.

My good friend from Houston, TX, my neighbor who just spoke, was very clear about where the Democrats are, where the liberals are. They want priorities and they want to maintain the Washington spending that they have been so proud of for all these 40 years. They want to continue these programs. They do not want to change them, and they are hanging on by their fingernails every chance that they can to continue taking money from the American families and paying for their priorities. That is what this is all about. That is why I rise in opposition to the President's budget substitute and I urge my colleagues to support the Dole budget.

Mr. Chairman, today's debate mirrors the greater debate going on in this country. On the one hand we have the President's budget which is much like the present administration. Rhetorically the President's budget looks great. It seemingly balances the budget. It seemingly gives tax relief to American families. It seemingly urges welfare reform. But if we look at the numbing details, a very different picture emerges. It is the picture of a President who promised a middle-class tax cut and then socked a gas tax on middle-class families and a Social Security tax on America's seniors.

It is the picture of a President who promised to end welfare as we know it and then vetoed commonsense welfare reform twice.

It is the picture of a President who promised to balance the budget in 5 years, then in 10 years, and then every year in between.

And it is the picture of a President that says one thing and does another.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy to see why this President is so strongly supported by Hollywood. His budget is kind of like a Hollywood set. It is a sturdy-looking facade backed by nothing more than a vivid imagination.

The contrast with the Dole budget is very striking. The Dole budget is the real thing, much like the man himself. It cuts taxes for American families, not as much as I would like, but certainly more than the President even pretends to cut; it saves Medicare for the next generation, and it balances in 6 years using real numbers, real assumptions, and real cuts in wasteful Washington spending.

So, Mr. Chairman, the American people yearn for the real thing. They do not want any more empty promises. They do not want any more phony numbers, and they do not want bigger government cloaked in Clinton rhetoric. They want a smaller, more effective Federal Government. They want lower taxes. They want real welfare reform. And they want a balanced budget.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject the Clinton budget and vote for the real thing, the Dole budget.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, a few short weeks ago the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] estimated the budget deficit for the current fiscal year, 1996, to be \$145 billion. At that time CBO also estimated that the deficit, without some intervening action by the Congress, will top \$200 billion in fiscal 1999, reach \$311 billion in 2003, and explode to \$403 billion in 2006.

And the national debt continues its climb too and today is hovering near \$5.1 trillion. Without significant deficit reduction, the national debt of the United States will exceed \$7 trillion in 2006, a level of future debt the nation clearly cannot afford.

As a member of the coalition, I am proud of the work our group has done this year in developing and presenting an alternative resolution that balances the Federal budget, with significant deficit reduction and program reforms that stem the hemorrhaging national debt. The coalition budget alternative is comprehensive and fair, and I am pleased to vote to support it today. In doing so, I applaud the work of BILL ORTON and CHARLIE STENHOLM and the other coalition members for their hard work.

Let me also congratulate Chairman JOHN KASICH, Ranking Member MARTIN SABO, and all the members of the Budget Committee for the work they have done this year. Chairman KASICH and Mr. SABO are both dedicated to balancing the budget, and one of my regrets is that we are not here today with a budget resolution that both of our Budget Committee leaders can support.

Mr. Chairman, I am also supporting President Clinton's budget proposal presented by the gentleman from Minnesota, [Mr. SABO], as well as the Republican resolution presented by Chairman KASICH because both of these budget resolutions are comprehensive and will set in motion the needed policy and spending changes necessary to reach a balanced budget.

Balancing the budget should be the top priority of the Congress; there can be no other. As we in the Congress proceed to implement the fiscal year 1997 Budget Resolution, let us keep the goal of reducing spending and balancing the budget central to all of our efforts.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Sabo substitute, the President's balanced budget. This plan brings the budget into balance by the year 2002 by providing \$523.4 billion in total deficit reduction over the next 6 years, including cuts of \$265 billion from entitlement spending alone.

The President's plan—like the Republican budget—brings us to balance by 2002, but unlike the GOP plan, it does not require that our seniors, education, and environmental protection bear a disproportionate share of the burden for deficit reduction.

For instance, while the President's plan would maintain direct student loans, as used by 2.5 million students in 1,400 schools nationwide, the Republican plan would eliminate them altogether. The Republican plan also eliminates the AmeriCorps national and community service program. Overall, the GOP plan would provide \$60.6 billion less for elementary, secondary, and higher education and training than the President's plan. Likewise, the President's plan demonstrates a commitment to clean air and water while the Republican plan provides \$13 billion less on protection and cleanup of our environment. And, the Republican Medicare reductions mirror those proposed in last year's budget while the President proposes real reform that protects seniors and the solvency of the Medicare trust fund.

However, I want to express my serious reservations over the fact that this budget resolution, as well as the Republican plan, assumes a reduction in the Consumer Price Index [CPI], the standard used to calculate the cost-of-living adjustments for various programs including Social Security.

The alternatives before us today assume that the Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS] will reduce the CPI by 0.2 percent in 1998 and 0.4 percent in 2000. There is no requirement that Congress review or approve this change. Although last year I successfully amended legislation to require that Congress must review and vote on such changes, my amendment to the Labor appropriations bill was dropped in the final product.

Additionally, I want to express my reservations about the tax cuts contained in the President's budget. With our Nation facing a debt of over \$5 trillion, I do not support tax cuts at this time. Any savings should be applied to deficit reduction.

Despite these concerns, which will be addressed in more detail in later bills, the President's budget plan is sound deficit reduction. It brings our budget into balance while maintaining our commitment to education, environmental protection, seniors, and our communities.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sabo amendment, which forwards President Clinton's budget proposal. The President's budget is balanced in 6 years as scored by the CBO. It continues the fundamental reforms begun by this administration while not doing long-term damage to programs as does the budget presented by the Republicans. It funds education in a way that continues progress toward our children's futures. It funds health care for the poor, the young, the disabled and the old. It funds programs to train the underemployed so that we can re-

duce dependence on welfare programs for the able bodies. It's family- and taxpayer-friendly.

This body has rejected two alternative budgets today. The American public rejects the Republican budget, because it is almost the same as the one we saw last year. I urge my colleagues to act with reason and not drag the country through the same mess we went through last year when there was no rhyme nor reason to the fiscal crisis that the Republican majority brought to us by trying to pressure the American people to accept less than they want and deserve.

The President's budget saves money for local and state government and still reserves funds for valuable programs to support the children, families and vulnerable among our population. It reforms our welfare programs in a fashion that is not tough on kids.

I appeal to my colleagues, especially those on the other side of the aisle. Don't callously harm the well-being of our seniors, our children, our working poor, and our homeless. Vote for the Sabo amendment so that we can move forward to develop a reasonable Federal budget that will work for all the American people.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of President Clinton's proposal to balance the budget. While it is not the budget that I would write, this budget does eliminate the deficit by the year 2002 while protecting the elderly from higher Medicare premiums, preserving Medicaid for the poor and those in nursing homes, protecting the environment, and providing adequate funds for education.

If I were drafting this budget, I would have cut an additional \$25 billion from defense and added that back to the Medicare trust fund for hospital and physician reimbursements. In my view, these Medicare cuts are too large for our hospitals, particularly teaching hospitals and those which treat many poor patients.

We can lessen the impact of the Medicare reductions if we treat the defense budget under the same standard as every other part of the budget. Instead defense cuts are left off the table. That is not right.

The reality is that every Member of Congress could come up with their own plan to balance the budget. There are other changes that I would make as well, but the Clinton budget is the closest to my values. That is why it has my support. It is not perfect, but it gets the job done.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 117, noes 304, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 178]

AYES—117

|             |              |           |
|-------------|--------------|-----------|
| Abercrombie | Baldacci     | Becerra   |
| Ackerman    | Barcia       | Beilenson |
| Andrews     | Barrett (WI) | Berman    |

|              |                |               |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Bevill       | Hall (TX)      | Mink          |
| Bonior       | Hastings (FL)  | Moakley       |
| Borski       | Hefner         | Murtha        |
| Brown (CA)   | Hilliard       | Neal          |
| Brown (FL)   | Hinchee        | Oberstar      |
| Bryant (TX)  | Jackson (IL)   | Obey          |
| Bunn         | Jackson-Lee    | Oliver        |
| Clayton      | (TX)           | Owens         |
| Clement      | Jefferson      | Pallone       |
| Clyburn      | Johnson (SD)   | Pastor        |
| Collins (IL) | Johnson, E. B. | Payne (NJ)    |
| Collins (MI) | Johnston       | Pelosi        |
| Condit       | Kanjorski      | Pomeroy       |
| Coyne        | Kaptur         | Richardson    |
| de la Garza  | Kennedy (MA)   | Rose          |
| DeLauro      | Kennelly       | Roybal-Allard |
| Deutsch      | Klecza         | Sabo          |
| Dicks        | LaFalce        | Sawyer        |
| Dingell      | Lantos         | Schroeder     |
| Dixon        | Lantos         | Schumer       |
| Durbin       | Levin          | Slaughter     |
| Eshoo        | Lewis (GA)     | Spratt        |
| Farr         | Lofgren        | Studds        |
| Fattah       | Lowey          | Thompson      |
| Fazio        | Maloney        | Thornton      |
| Fields (LA)  | Manton         | Torres        |
| Fliner       | Markley        | Torricelli    |
| Flake        | Martinez       | Vento         |
| Foglietta    | Mascara        | Volkmer       |
| Ford         | Matsui         | Watt (NC)     |
| Frost        | McDermott      | Waxman        |
| Gejdenson    | McKinney       | Williams      |
| Gephardt     | McNulty        | Wilson        |
| Geren        | Meek           | Wise          |
| Gordon       | Menendez       | Woolsey       |
| Green (TX)   | Millender-     | Yates         |
| Hall (OH)    | McDonald       |               |
|              | Miller (CA)    |               |

NOES—304

|              |               |               |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Allard       | Costello      | Goodling      |
| Archer       | Cox           | Goss          |
| Arney        | Cramer        | Graham        |
| Bachus       | Crane         | Greene (UT)   |
| Baessler     | Crapo         | Greenwood     |
| Baker (CA)   | Creameans     | Gunderson     |
| Baker (LA)   | Cubin         | Gutierrez     |
| Ballenger    | Cummings      | Gutknecht     |
| Barr         | Cunningham    | Hamilton      |
| Barrett (NE) | Danner        | Hancock       |
| Bartlett     | Davis         | Hansen        |
| Barton       | Deal          | Harman        |
| Bass         | DeFazio       | Hastert       |
| Bateman      | DeLay         | Hastings (WA) |
| Bentsen      | Dellums       | Hayworth      |
| Bereuter     | Diaz-Balart   | Hefley        |
| Bilbray      | Dickey        | Heineman      |
| Bilirakis    | Doggett       | Herger        |
| Bishop       | Dooley        | Hilleary      |
| Bliley       | Doolittle     | Hobson        |
| Blute        | Dorman        | Hoekstra      |
| Boehmert     | Doyle         | Hoke          |
| Boehner      | Dreier        | Holden        |
| Bonilla      | Duncan        | Horn          |
| Bono         | Dunn          | Hostettler    |
| Boucher      | Edwards       | Houghton      |
| Brewster     | Ehrlich       | Hoyer         |
| Browder      | Emerson       | Hunter        |
| Brown (OH)   | Engel         | Hutchinson    |
| Brownback    | English       | Hyde          |
| Bryant (TN)  | Ensign        | Inglis        |
| Bunning      | Evans         | Istook        |
| Burr         | Everett       | Johnson (CT)  |
| Burton       | Ewing         | Johnson, Sam  |
| Buyer        | Fawell        | Jones         |
| Callahan     | Fields (TX)   | Kasich        |
| Calvert      | Flanagan      | Kelly         |
| Camp         | Foley         | Kennedy (RI)  |
| Campbell     | Forbes        | Kildee        |
| Canady       | Fowler        | Kim           |
| Cardin       | Fox           | King          |
| Castle       | Frank (MA)    | Kingston      |
| Chabot       | Franks (CT)   | Klink         |
| Chambliss    | Franks (NJ)   | Klug          |
| Chapman      | Frelinghuysen | Knollenberg   |
| Chenoweth    | Frisa         | Kolbe         |
| Christensen  | Funderburk    | LaHood        |
| Chrysler     | Furse         | Largent       |
| Clay         | Gallegly      | Latham        |
| Clinger      | Ganske        | LaTourette    |
| Coble        | Gekas         | Laughlin      |
| Coburn       | Gilchrist     | Lazio         |
| Collins (GA) | Gillmor       | Leach         |
| Combest      | Gilman        | Lewis (KY)    |
| Conyers      | Gonzalez      | Lightfoot     |
| Cooley       | Goodlatte     | Lincoln       |

|               |               |             |
|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| Linder        | Porter        | Souder      |
| Lipinski      | Portman       | Spence      |
| Livingston    | Poshard       | Stark       |
| LoBlundo      | Pryce         | Stearns     |
| Longley       | Quinn         | Stenholm    |
| Lucas         | Radanovich    | Stockman    |
| Luther        | Rahall        | Stokes      |
| Martini       | Ramstad       | Stump       |
| McCarthy      | Rangel        | Stupak      |
| McColum       | Reed          | Tanner      |
| McCrery       | Regula        | Tate        |
| McDade        | Riggs         | Tauzin      |
| McHale        | Rivers        | Taylor (MS) |
| McHugh        | Roberts       | Taylor (NC) |
| McInnis       | Roemer        | Tejeda      |
| McIntosh      | Rogers        | Thomas      |
| McKeon        | Rohrabacher   | Thornberry  |
| Meehan        | Ros-Lehtinen  | Thurman     |
| Metcalfe      | Roth          | Tiahrt      |
| Meyers        | Roukema       | Torkildsen  |
| Mica          | Royce         | Towns       |
| Minge         | Rush          | Traffant    |
| Mollohan      | Salmon        | Upton       |
| Montgomery    | Sanders       | Velazquez   |
| Moorhead      | Sanford       | Vislosky    |
| Moran         | Saxton        | Vucanovich  |
| Morella       | Scarborough   | Walker      |
| Myers         | Schaefer      | Walsh       |
| Myrick        | Schiff        | Wamp        |
| Nadler        | Scott         | Ward        |
| Nethercutt    | Seastrand     | Waters      |
| Neumann       | Sensenbrenner | Watts (OK)  |
| Ney           | Serrano       | Weldon (FL) |
| Norwood       | Shadegg       | Weldon (PA) |
| Nussle        | Shaw          | Weller      |
| Ortiz         | Shays         | White       |
| Orton         | Shuster       | Whitfield   |
| Oxley         | Sisisky       | Wicker      |
| Packard       | Skaggs        | Wolf        |
| Parker        | Skeen         | Wynn        |
| Payne (VA)    | Skelton       | Young (AK)  |
| Peterson (FL) | Smith (MI)    | Young (FL)  |
| Peterson (MN) | Smith (NJ)    | Zeliff      |
| Petri         | Smith (TX)    | Zimmer      |
| Pickett       | Smith (WA)    |             |
| Pombo         | Solomon       |             |

## NOT VOTING—12

|         |             |         |
|---------|-------------|---------|
| Coleman | Jacobs      | Molinar |
| Ehlers  | Lewis (CA)  | Paxon   |
| Gibbons | Manzullo    | Quillen |
| Hayes   | Miller (FL) | Talent  |

□ 1549

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gibbons for, with Mr. Paxon against.

Mr. Coleman for, with Mr. Miller against.

Messrs. HYDE, HORN, POSHARD, NETHERCUTT, and SERRANO changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DICKS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, before we begin, I ask that my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] be permitted to speak out of order on a matter unrelated to the budget that should come to the attention of the House.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MURTHA was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENT PRAYER FOR CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, ADM. JEREMY M. BOORDA

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the House to rise and join me in a moment of silent prayer for Admiral Boorda, who apparently either shot himself accidentally or intentionally.

Admiral Boorda was one of the finest naval officers that I have ever known;

a person who came up through the ranks, and all of us had so much admiration for, and who has done so much for this great country over the years. The Navy and the country is a better place because of his fine service, and I would ask that we would bow our heads for a moment of prayer.

Amen.

The CHAIRMAN. A final period of general debate is now in order. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of budget resolution House Concurrent Resolution 178.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 178. It keeps us going in the right direction to make sure that we do indeed balance the budget by the year 2002.

It is truly gratifying to see the change that has taken place in Washington since the Republican majority was elected. The entire debate has shifted from one of simply not letting the deficit get any bigger to really balancing the budget. That is a fundamental change in the culture of the Federal Government.

It is good to take stock of these things from time to time because people forget very quickly how things used to be. They forget that under the previous leadership of the other party, spending spiraled out of control and it was common to refer to spending as being "uncontrollable."

We have proved that it was a lack of will to control spending that lay at the heart of our deficits. And, it was the Orwellian use of language in which spending increases were called cuts that aided the ballooning of Federal spending. The deficits ballooned because Congress could not control itself, not because spending could not be controlled.

Under Republican leadership, domestic discretionary spending actually decreased for the first time in more than two decades. While we did not reduce it as much as many of us would have liked, it was a major accomplishment to completely change the direction of government from growing ever larger to actually shrinking it.

Those of us who promised to work for a smaller, less intrusive government can be very proud of what we have been able to do in such a short time.

The budget before us today keeps us on track to getting our financial house in order. Again, it does not go nearly as far as I would like; but, it maintains our momentum toward the goal of a balanced budget and the economic rewards that go with it.

The budget should be balanced as a matter of principle, but, just as important as the principle is the economic benefits that go with it. A 2-percent drop in interest rates, which nearly all economists agree would result from a balanced budget, means lower costs for buying a home, a car, or a college education.

Because of that kind of economic change, individuals will be able to do the things that they need to do to improve their lives and take care of their families.

Our budget will make sure that the Government programs that we depend upon will be there when we need them. Medicare is going bankrupt even faster than we originally thought and we absolutely cannot allow that to happen.

Our budget will allow Medicare to continue to grow; in fact, it will be one of the fastest growing programs in the budget. But the rate of growth will be slowed through sound policy changes that ultimately give senior citizens greater choice and control over their own health care.

I suppose that budgets reflect the priorities that we place on things and they say a great deal about who you trust. Our budget says that we have heard the call of the American people for a smaller and more responsive Government.

This budget reflects our belief that individuals can and will make the best choices about how to run their own lives. It is a far cry from the Washington-knows-best, one-size-fits-all, bigger-is-better, "spending can't be controlled" budgets of years past.

I encourage my colleagues to support the budget resolution and keep America on the path to a balanced budget, more freedom and individual responsibility.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS].

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, recently I was in Dallas, TX, and I bought a little plaque for my office that talked about priorities. I know it is very difficult to see this plague because I tried to photocopy it and it is pretty difficult to see it, but here is the message. It says: "One hundred years from now it will not matter what my bank account was, the sort of house I lived in, or the kind of car I drove, but the world may be different because I was important in the life of a child."

I bought that plaque because it reminds me of why I am here in Congress. We all need to be reminded to keep our priorities in line. Today's vote is about priorities. It is about the priority of our Nation to live the way we expect every citizen to live, within his or her means. This debate today is about truth, it is about honesty, it is about our children and our grandchildren. It is about getting rid of a \$200-plus billion deficit and a \$5 trillion national debt.

Over the last 30 years this city has had one heck of a party, and we continue sending the bill to our kids and our grandkids. Mr. Chairman, every night I pray that the Lord will bless and keep my children, and I have a picture of my family here, and every time we have this budget debate I am reminded of my responsibility in that prayer. I have five personal reasons why I want to balance the budget. They are Kesha, Jerrell, Jennifer, Julie and Trey Watts.

I urge Members all to look around next Sunday when they go to their church or they go to their synagogue or parish, and I challenge them to go to the nursery and take a look at those nursery kids, those 2 years old and 3 years old, and understand this as they look at them: Each of them, each one of them, they are responsible for \$18,000 of the national debt, each of them, and they never held a job.

I urge Members to do that, and if they vote no today they have to tell every one of those precious children they just saddled them with an ever-deepening debt. Their life will never be as good as ours, and in essence we have lost our priorities. I urge a "yes" vote for this budget. I urge a vote for the right priorities I urge my colleagues to remember their own reasons, their own children, and continue our country on the path to a balanced budget.

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

Let me just make a couple of comments and then I will yield to others. I will try to be shorter than I was planning on.

I hear all this discussion about children. I happen to have a new grandchild. I am a grandfather for the first time, a little over a month ago.

□ 1600

It is a new experience. It is nice. But I look outside today, and I hope for the sake of my granddaughter the future is not as dreary and bleak as the weather outside today. I tell my friends on the Republican side that I see their budget, and I worry about it. I hope she grows up in a world where she knows she has to pay her bills, but I also hope she grows up with a sense of obligation and a sense of community that is larger than simply herself or her community or her State, but it also includes a view of the country as a whole in the world.

We have important obligations as we move forward to balance the budget, which we should do. But we made important commitments to our seniors in Medicare, and as we reform it and change it, as we must, we must make certain that we do it in a rational way that is sustainable and continues quality health care for all in this country. I fear the Republican proposal, as in so many cases, goes too far. In Medicaid where we deal with health care for the most vulnerable in our society, the numbers are not that far off, but the policy is. My colleagues let the States put billions of dollars out of the program.

I could go on in program after program where that is the case. We are going to pass it today. I hope that we only recognize that somehow it is a bargaining position for your side of the aisle. Ultimately I still hope that we can come to some agreement in this session between the Congress and the President and find a solution that is

pragmatic rather than ideologically driven so that we can move this whole country forward. Your proposal today is not that solution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], who served as a very distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means and, unfortunately, is leaving us at the end of this session of Congress.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, this issue today is not about balancing the budget. In fact, this issue that we are talking about really is a wish list. It is not a law. It never will become law. It is just a wish list that we put together to say that we are fulfilling our responsibilities. But there is something wrong with this wish list. Seventy-five percent of all the savings in this wish list come out of children, aged, sick people's benefits. Seventy-five percent of all the money that is saved in this wish list comes out of Medicare and Medicaid.

In addition to that in this wish list, a horrible damage is done to the programs that have worked successfully. All of the seniors will be herded into managed care where they do not choose to go, have not chosen to go, and do not need to go. Who will profit by all that? The insurance companies, the medical doctors, and all the people who are making such a killing out of managed care.

Second, the States will not be required to continue their efforts for their children and their old people under Medicaid. Another horrible cut from the welfare of those who are dependent upon us who are healthy and well off. Then, Mr. Chairman, there is a tax cut in here, just like there was last year, and it is here for the wealthy friends of our Republicans.

America does not need a tax cut. The United States of America has today the lowest tax burden of any of the 25 industrialized nations on earth. We do need to balance our budget, but we do not need to balance our budget at the expense of the dependent people in this society. And we do not need to balance it for the benefit of those who can more than pay their own way.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 178, the House budget resolution, but want to comment on the President's budget and the other budget alternatives.

While I am pleased that the President has finally agreed on the need to balance the budget, his plan falls short on a number of the critical reforms that are necessary to achieve this goal. It promises a lot, but delivers little.

In 1994, I had the opportunity to serve on the President's bipartisan Commission on Entitlement Reform, the Kerry-Danforth Commis-

sion. For a year the Commission heard testimony from a parade of experts on the need to reform Medicare and Medicaid and other entitlements or they would ultimately either become insolvent or eat up virtually all our tax dollars.

What troubles me most about the President's budget is that it does not face up to the pressing need to address the entitlement issue. Instead, the administration has played politics by portraying the sound reforms to Medicare contained in the Republican budget as a threat to seniors.

Reforms to Medicare, Medicaid and welfare are not needed simply to balance the budget, they are needed to protect these programs for those they serve.

I am one Member who believes that we can still achieve some major progress toward balancing the budget this year.

While the President's budget falls short in key areas, I believe that the coalition budget presented earlier shows that Republicans and Democrats do not have far to go to achieve fair compromises on the most important budget issues.

The coalition budget plan and the Republican budget are the two most credible plans for achieving a balanced budget in 6 years. The President's plan does not meet the critical tests necessary to achieve a balanced budget. The President's plan is based on overly optimistic economic assumptions and avoids most of the tough choices necessary to balance the budget.

Mr. Chairman, today we should pass this budget resolution and then get down to the task of producing welfare, Medicaid, and Medicare reforms that will save these programs and save tax dollars.

These are the areas we must concentrate on in the next few months to really make a difference in the lives of our constituents.

Members of the Blue Dog Coalition and a number of Republicans have already demonstrated that we can work together to reform programs which will help people and balance the budget.

Congressman JOHN TANNER and I have introduced a bipartisan welfare reform bill which would save \$50 billion over 7 years and contains all the key reforms necessary to move people from welfare to work.

This compromise is based on H.R. 4 conference report and the bipartisan Governor's proposal.

It contains all the essential elements of the conference report—work requirements; family cap; time limits; limits on benefits to teenage mothers; paternity establishment; illegitimacy reduction; and child support enforcement.

It builds on the Governor's plan by providing additional funding for child care and the contingency fund to protect States from economic downturns, but requires more State accountability.

This is the type of bipartisan effort that will lead to a balanced budget. We need to pursue similar agreements to reform Medicaid, Medicare and hopefully provide tax relief to the American people.

I support passage of the budget resolution and then immediate action to pass legislation to reform the key programs that will balance the budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have to rise in opposition today to the final budget resolution before us. Setting budget priorities is one of the most challenging things that we have as Members of Congress to come before us. In agreeing to a budget resolution, we are making a series of choices, choices about the goals that Government makes, choices about the services that citizens receive, choice about commitments that are kept.

The good thing about today is we come to this floor together, and we are all looking at balanced budgets. But the whole point is, how do we get there? There is no single right way to get there. There is no one answer. What we are talking about today are choices. I would argue that some of the choices in the majority's budget resolution are very much the wrong ones.

Quickly, let me just mention the choices on Medicare. We all fully agree that we have to keep the Medicare program solvent. We have done it before. We will do it again. But there are several policies in the majority's budget resolution today that would, it really would make it more difficult for seniors and at the same time does not improve the Medicare solvency situation. Two examples: Medical savings accounts. We could debate medical savings accounts for younger, healthier people and probably have a very healthy good debate. We have one universal health system in this country. Those over 65 get Medicare. If you give them a medical savings account to choose, who is going to choose it? Of course if you are younger, if you were healthier, you will choose it. And in some choosing, we lose \$4.6 billion in that whole choice.

More damaging still is those that are frailer and sicker stay in our traditional Medicare which has worked, is there for over 65 and as a result of the healthier, stronger ones going out of it, the premiums go up for the sicker. It is what we call adverse selection. In plain English, what it means is the premiums are going to go up.

Also, something that some of us on both sides of the aisles have worked for for years, and that is to see that when you have Medicare and you go to the doctor, you have a protection against increased costs over and above Medicare. For years we fought that. I can remember going to meetings when I was on the city council; assignment: Let us have assignment for doctors who work their way through it so it was fair for those on Medicare and fair for the doctors.

What is happening in the new budget resolution that we are about to vote on? Balanced billing, they call it. It is not balanced, let me tell you. It means

the doctor can add on and you will not have a choice.

My final thing, let me say why in heaven's name when we are all talking about welfare reform that we are going and attacking the earned income tax credit? Make work pay. Do not take money out of people's pockets.

These things make it impossible to vote for this majority budget. We really should not do what we are doing today.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the House resolution, as a grandfather, and urge passage.

My third grandchild—and second grandson—will be born soon, and as I think of welcoming this new Hobson into the world, I can't help but wonder what kind of future he will face. How much will prices rise during his lifetime? Will the country still be a place of opportunity? Will there still be a thriving economy to support his generation? When I think about the answers to these questions, it becomes increasingly clear to me that the best thing I can do for my new grandson is to vote "yes" for this budget package.

When they look back on this Congress, our own children and grandchildren will judge us harshly if we pass up this chance, and we continue to rob them because we do not have the backbone to control our spending in this Chamber. Every time we deficit spend we are refusing to take responsibility for our actions.

Many constituents I've talked to have had concerns about specific programs they benefit from, but without fail, they also remind me to follow through with the promise to balance the budget. People are willing to accept the changes necessary to preserve our country's fiscal security, but they want us to make sure that what we do is fair, and that we follow through on our commitment to balance the budget.

We're a year into the balanced budget mission, and the sky has not fallen like some said it would. In fact, we all know that the sky will continue to brighten the closer we get to 2002 and to balance.

I know there are many here today whose parochial interests lead them to declare this plan unfair. To those people I ask them to consider this: is it fair to take the money and future and opportunity from generations of Americans who aren't even born yet? That's what we do when we deficit spend and run up the debt. Someone pays and it isn't those of us in this room, it is our children and grandchildren who trust us to look out for them.

Protect our children's and grandchildren's future and shift power, money and influence out of Washington and back to Americans: pass the 1997 budget resolution.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, as I ask for opposition to the majority budget proposal, it is with the understanding and the true belief that all of us in this House are really looking for a better America, a more prosperous America,

an improvement in the quality of life for all of our citizens.

Not too long ago when President Clinton spoke to both Houses, there were a lot of people that reported that he sounded so Republican, that he had stolen every idea that only the genius of the party labeled The Grand Old Party could have. I rather thought that that was a message in saying that we all have the same objectives.

We truly would like to have a smaller Government, that we would want to reduce taxes on our constituents and even our own, for that matter; that we are concerned with being able to say that during the time that we were in the Congress, we indeed improved the quality of life. That happened whether we were Republican or whether we were Democrats.

I think that next to feeling good about being American, the next good feeling that we have in our country is the dignity and the pride of having a job. You have had to know unemployment, you have had to know the pain of looking at your family in the face, looking at your kids and somehow explaining why that American dream is not yours to share in. You have to understand, even if you had a good job and for some reason you lost a job, they downsized, they merged, how do you explain to your kids and to your family that America is doing much better, trade is expanding, but somehow you got caught in the cracks?

I suggest when Members look at this budget, instead of the rhetoric about wiping out the Department of Education and wiping out the Department of Commerce, we should say we are going to increase education. If they are not doing the job, we have got to restructure it. Instead of talking about wiping out the Department of Commerce, we are going to say we are going to expand world trade, we have exhausted European and domestic markets.

While we are talking about this and while we are willing to make available moneys for research and development, when do we start talking about training people, giving them access to education, not cutting student loans, not cutting back on education and job training? Saying everybody in this country is going to be able to work, is going to be able to stand up and say that they are going to take care of their family and they will never allow welfare to compete for the hearts of their children and the mother of those children because they have the dignity to work.

That is what the earned income tax credit was all about. It was saying if you are working every day, black or white, Jew or gentile, and at the end of the year you end up below the poverty level, that we are not going to advocate that you make the salary of a Member of Congress, but we will give

you something to bring you to the dignity of working and being above poverty.

So we cut out education, we cut out the job training, and we have the audacity to cut out giving a hand to people who refuse to be on welfare but want to work each and every day with just a little help. When we start thinking about what we are not doing to put people to work in terms of education and job training, when last have we ever heard on this floor that we are spending too much money on our jails? When have we ever heard that mandatory sentences mean more taxpayers' money spent?

Why in the city of New York, we have a detention center that costs \$60,000 a year to keep a bum kid in, and that is before he is convicted. Yet the fight is between the mayor and the Governor and this Congress as to whether \$6,000 a year is enough. So you kick them out of school, you put them in the streets and we end up with drugs, with violence, and with jail.

A greater America is a working America, a stronger educated America, and we just made the wrong cuts for this great Republic.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, this Republican budget reminds me of a movie I saw a few years ago called "Groundhog Day." In the movie, Bill Murray, who is the star, keeps reliving the same day over and over again. Everything happens to him the same way.

This budget, which has been advertised as a real change, when you examine it, when you open the package that has been repackaged, is really the same thing. It is said to be a moderate budget. It is not a moderate budget. It is warmed over tax cuts for the wealthy, rehashed cuts in Medicare, in Medicaid, reconstituted cuts in education and the environment.

For 17 months, the President, the Democrats have been waiting for the Republicans to come to the sensible center so that we could get a budget done. The Republicans have been offered a balanced budget plan made up entirely of cuts that the Republicans support, but it is never good enough. We cannot seem to get the compromise, the consensus that we need to get this done.

□ 1615

This budget still raises taxes.

Now listen to this. I said it in the last budget debate:

This budget raises taxes on working people who are at the bottom, trying to get in the middle class, while it cuts dramatically taxes on capital gains, most of which goes to the wealthiest Americans. How can anyone argue that this is fair, that this is sensible, that

this is pragmatic, that this is what we ought to be doing in this country?

It still cuts Medicare and Medicaid way too much. That would not have to be done if we simply gave up the tax break for the wealthiest Americans, if we just focus the tax break on middle-income people and people trying to get in the middle class. We would not need as deep a cut in Medicare and Medicaid and in education.

And then if we look at the list that comes out of discretionary spending, it is too long for me to read this afternoon. Job training in vocational education, cut by more than \$1 billion; national direct student loans, eliminated entirely; libraries across the country cut by one-fifth; 24 education programs eliminated entirely; Institutes for Occupational Safety and Health, gone; rural housing eliminated; rural health, gone; agricultural extension and research, gone.

The list goes on. I could read it all afternoon.

These are efforts that everybody could agree are good for the future of this country that only, only the government will perform if this country is to move forward.

Now let me end with this:

This budget for the second year in a row is not going to happen. The President will veto the implementation of this budget, and what I cannot understand, my friends in the Republican Party, we now have 2 years of no progress.

I know my colleagues did not like the President's budget in 1993, but it cut the deficit in half, and most importantly, it got done.

This country is not a parliamentary system. Our colleagues cannot do it their way alone. They have to come to the middle, and we have to find a compromise to move this country forward, if our colleagues continue being obstinate and resolute in wanting to do it their way or no way, we get nothing done for the American people.

Let us vote this budget down, let us get a budget back on this floor that is somewhere out here in the middle that everybody in this body can support, and let us get this deficit down and balance this budget as we should have done a long time ago.

This budget will not live. Let us find a budget that will.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that we have had enormous progress. The simple fact of the matter is that in the area of Washington spending the spending that we are responsible for year to year, that if we do not even come to work, of course, entitlements keep going up, but on that spending that the President was forced to deal with, we had the most massive amount of change in 50 years. We saved a net amount of dollars of 30 billion, the

most amount of savings, the most amount of shrinking of Government in 50 years.

As George Will told me, "Historians were wrong, JOHN. Historians were wrong. They said government never shrunk. You proved that it can, in fact, shrink." And the savings of that \$23 billion came, it came because we had principle. We did not cave, We stood up for what we believed in. We are standing up for this country. We are standing up for the power of the individual and a smaller Federal Government into the next century.

But let me tell you about the three reasons why we do this budget. One is the children. Everyone in this Chamber cares about the kids. That is why we all talk about them. We are about preserving America's greatest legacy. It is simple: "Your children will be better off than you were." It is the legacy that we got from our parents.

I look across this Chamber, and I look at a great man, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], a hero of the Korean war. Never in his wildest dreams did he ever think that he would get to be a very senior and respected spokesman on the Committee of Ways and Means. And I look across the aisle here. We got a professional football player who struggled his way up and made the big time and then came to Congress because he had a vision.

I mean, all we are saying is that every child, and everybody agrees with this, every child deserves a legacy and an opportunity for them to be able to live their dreams, and we cannot give them that if we keep spending money we do not have. We know it. We do not want to send them to work where the message is that they are going to work longer and harder for somebody else to pay somebody else's bills. We do not want to strangle them with a big government that can choke them off in overregulation and things that do not make common sense.

So, No. 1, our principles are driven by children, the next generation. As my colleagues know, it is right out of the Bible. One of the most important principles is the other person is more important than we are. Well, we think that this country is more important than us; and, second, we believe our children and the next generation, frankly, are more important than we are. So we do it for the children.

But as Eunice Kennedy said to me one night, she said, "You know I understand your love for the children. That's about what you're going to do tomorrow. What about today?" She said, "You have to explain what you're going to do today," and she made a fair point, and I want to say to my friend from New York, when we talk about jobs, when we talk about job insecurity, when we talk about wages, let us just look at the facts. We got a candidate in our party, we had an independent candidate, and we are going to

hear about job insecurity and wage stagnation until we solve it, and we should, because mothers and fathers are working longer and harder and they are getting stuck. Too many families are stuck. They are not getting ahead.

I understand it. I come from a family where we had to work like crazy to get ahead. I understand the problem.

Where does it come from? The simple fact of the matter is, if a country does not save, it cannot invest. If a family does not save, it cannot invest, it cannot invest in its children, it cannot invest in its home, it cannot invest in transportation. If a nation does not save, it cannot invest, and America has the lowest savings rate of any modern industrialized nation on the face of the Earth. We punish people for saving, and not only do we punish them for saving, but we make it difficult for them to have anything left after they get their wages because government at all levels has taken too much from them. So, first of all, they do not have anything left, and the few crumbs they have left, they cannot save because if they save, they get penalized on their income tax statement because they saved. It is crazy.

This Nation needs to save. We need to provide reasons to save for our future because, if we save, we can invest, and if we can invest, we can improve productivity. That is an economic term. But what does it really mean? It means putting tools in the hands of American workers that allow them to compete and win with workers all around the world.

Intel in New Mexico, I believe, is the highest-paying job one can get in New Mexico. I say to my colleagues you do not work for Intel; you know why? Because the whole world wants the magic of the computer. And so their workers are paid a premium wage, their jobs are secure.

America needs to pursue a policy that saves and invests and takes risks and rewards risks and helps our people win. That is what our budget does by rewarding risk-taking and savings and investment and opportunity.

And third, the point maybe on which we most disagree because I am not so sure we disagree on the first two, how do we make this transformation? My colleagues, what we are about over here is we are about the power of the individual and we are not about the power of Washington bureaucracy. We are for systematically taking power, money and influence from this city and sending it home, and that does not mean that what we have done for the last 30 years or 40 years had not been good. It has been good. Thank God we created Medicare, thank God the Federal Government got involved in many of the issues they got involved with. But, frankly, we are not getting the results from here any more. We will not

solve the problems on crime on the streets of Los Angeles from Washington. The only people that can solve the problems of crime in Los Angeles are people who live in the neighborhoods of Los Angeles. They need to be empowered.

Children are not going to learn because we are calling a bureaucrat in Washington to figure out whether our kids are getting educated. Mothers and fathers across this great country of ours, they are the ones that can make the assessment, they are the ones that have to work with the teachers in the school houses to determine whether their children are winning or not. We do not believe that the answer lies here.

Job training; oh, come on, 120 Federal job training programs. I do not advise anybody to leave their job and think that Washington is going to retrain them. How are we going to do it? We are going to put an incentive in the hands of a business. The business is going to call somebody who does not have a skill. The business is going to train that person for an incentive, and then they are going to hire them for a real, permanent, high-paying job. That is how we do job training.

So I say our vision is get the pendulum, move the pendulum back, get the power and the money and the influence out of this city, back home where we can have local solutions for local problems at less cost because I will just suggest to my colleagues, in closing, the 21st century is about the century of the power of the individual, not the century of the power of government. It is about giving individuals the tools that we have created in this economy that can make us the most powerful people in the history of the world, and we mean to take the first big step toward guaranteeing a bright and beautiful and opportunistic, an opportunity society, for everyone into the 21st century.

Pass the resolution. It is a giant first step toward saving our children, toward providing for better jobs and empowering individuals as we fly into the 21st century.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, while I am in support of the budget resolution before the House today I do want to alert Members to a serious issue. I believe that this is no time to back away from aggressive trade policies. We need all the tools available in a post-NAFTA and post-GATT world to ensure that our farmers can fairly compete in world agriculture trade. There are programs that help American farmers and one of them is Public Law 480. This program helps countries become our trading partners of the future.

We need to strengthen Public Law 480 and integrate it into an aggressive trade strategy to make us more competitive. The 1996 farm bill made significant changes to Public Law 480 to improve the program.

For example, South Korea was a former Public Law 480 recipient. Now South Korea is

the fifth largest market for United States agriculture goods. We sell over \$2 billion in agriculture products to South Korea each year.

Countries now receiving title I assistance include Lithuania and Ukraine, countries that will be our future cash trading partners.

I do not believe we should turn our backs on the farmers and ranchers of America. We need all the trading partners we can get—or the European union will take over all agriculture exports in the world.

Title I, the concessional agriculture sales program and title III, food grants to promote economic development, of Public Law 480 are important programs and it is my intention during the appropriations process to work to make sure funding is provided for the Food for Peace Program.

The Subcommittee on Department Operations, Nutrition, and Foreign Agriculture, of which I am the chairman, worked very hard to improve this program and will continue its work to ensure adequate funding for the Food for Peace Program.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, the budget resolution for the fiscal year 1997, brought to the floor under the leadership of Chairman KASICH and the Budget Committee, continues our payments on a balanced budget by the year 2002. It is an important step forward for the Congress and for the American people, and one I wholeheartedly support.

In the report to accompany the budget resolution, the Budget Committee makes a number of specific suggestions on cuts in both discretionary and mandatory spending. Their suggestions look both at the fundamental purpose of American Government, and to areas where—when there is a legitimate governmental function—we can eliminate waste, bureaucracy, and duplication.

While I generally agree with most of the suggestions made by the Budget Committee in its report, as the chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over the Federal Trade Commission, I was disappointed to see that they targeted this agency for elimination. My subcommittee will be taking up reauthorizing legislation for the agency within the next month or two, and while the subcommittee will continue to review the FTC's operations with a critical eye, I believe that this is an important agency and one which should continue to be funded.

The FTC has often demonstrated its commitment and competence in protecting American consumers. Both in its recent rejection of the Rite-Aid/Revco merger and the "Senior Sentinel" sweep designed to root out telemarketing fraud, the agency has acquitted itself admirably in meeting its mission. While we realize that this agency had a number of problems in the 1970's and early 1980's, it has put many of those problems behind it and manages to accomplish its goals with a minimum of public resources.

Further, the FTC provides a good return on the public's investment. The agency is nearly 70 percent funded by fees generated from corporate mergers. It regularly reviews old rules and discards those that are obsolete or no longer necessary to prevent fraud or unfair trade practices. When I look at the FTC, I believe that it is the model of what a regulatory agency should be, efficient, fair, and flexible.

My subcommittee will be looking closely at the FTC over the next few months and we will look for areas where the agency can be even more efficient and meet its statutory duties at a lower cost. However, eliminating the FTC would, in the end, wind up costing Americans far more in increased commercial fraud and bureaucratic waste than would be saved. I believe that this agency should continue to perform its mission and I will support efforts to see that it is able to do so.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, once again, the House will pass a balanced budget resolution and will continue to keep its promises to all Americans. I am proud to say my colleagues on the Budget Committee and I have been able to continue our commitment to saving our children's future and providing for our seniors. This budget plan—the only plan to balance the Federal budget while providing much needed tax relief, promotes growth, strengthens the Nation's defense, and ends the practice of runaway spending.

But above all, the Republican budget shifts money and power from Washington bureaucrats and back into the hands of people. Under our plan, Americans will earn more and keep more of their money, as we release our Nation's children from the burden of our debt.

This budget addresses Medicare's impending bankruptcy by strengthening and improving the program. It expands benefits for senior citizens by extending the Hospital Insurance Program through the year 2008, 3 years beyond the President's plan. We also recommend increasing Medicare spending for each beneficiary from an average of \$5,200 in 1996 to \$7,000 in 2002. And, contrary to the demagoguery by many willing to accept the status quo and stand idly by while Medicare burns its last flames, overall spending increases by 59 percent between now and 2002.

With this budget, my colleagues and I have ended the old Washington formula that measures compassion by the number of bureaucrats on the government payroll. We maintain the current level of funding for LIHEAP, Education for the Disadvantaged, the Drug Free Schools Program. In addition, student loan volume will increase from \$26.6 to \$37.4 billion.

While the President talked about reforming welfare, and indeed campaigned on this very pledge, the only thing he has done on the issue is veto real reform, reform which he once championed. So once again, we help the President keep his promise to the American people by reforming the ineffective aspects, while maintaining the safety net for underprivileged Americans. Over the next 6 years, welfare spending will increase from \$83.2 billion in 1996 to \$105.5 billion in 2002.

And we do all this while rolling back the Clinton tax increase of 1993. We balance the budget, insure our national defense and protect our children's future. It's what the American people asked for in 1994, it's what Republicans said they would do and it's the right way to restore prosperity for all Americans.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 178, the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution, clearly the best and most responsible of the proposals we consider here today.

First and foremost, it draws a philosophical difference that fundamentally sets it apart from

any of the alternatives—the Black Caucus and coalition budgets as well as the President's proposal: It seeks to shift power, money and influence out of Washington and back into the hands of the American people where it belongs. None of the other proposals can say that—each of them raises more revenue and keeps more of it at the Federal level.

It also includes responsible tax cuts, and I emphasize the word "responsible." I categorically reject the claim that this budget resolution cuts taxes at the expense of the poor and elderly. First, the tax cuts are needed to balance the budget. Let me say that again—the tax cuts are needed to balance the budget. Why is this? Because whenever we have decreased tax rates in the past, receipts have gone up. Cutting rates means less tax sheltering and this means more revenue. By also controlling spending—and this legislation includes 130 Federal program terminations—we can live within our means.

Furthermore, the social safety net programs in the Federal budget will be increased under this budget resolution. Medicare, Medicaid, education spending—all go up. These programs are not being cut to provide tax cuts for the wealthy—it just isn't true. Reforms that are included are necessary to save the programs.

The President's own advisors have told the Congress that some of these programs are in very real danger of going bankrupt unless reforms are made now. We simply must face this very real problem now, or very quickly it will grow beyond our ability to control it.

We can debate the size and shape of these reforms—I myself have questions about this—and as chairman of the Health Subcommittee, I will be active in this debate, but this budget resolution is simply a blueprint. It is a general guideline to set the tone for the budget debate to come. It is the beginning of the process, not the end.

This guideline sets a responsible tone, it provides tax relief for America's families without endangering support programs for our Nation's elderly and veterans, it puts more money into the hands of the people and cuts the size of the Federal Government.

I urge support for the resolution.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 178 and to express my particular support for the veterans provisions in the bill. As chairman of the Veterans Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension, Insurance and Memorial Affairs. I am very pleased that the Budget Committee has been able to craft a bill that will allow us to make improvements in several areas of veterans benefits, while at the same time moving us further toward a balanced budget.

During a recent hearing, several veterans groups expressed their support for using the savings from legislation overturning the Court of Veterans Appeals decision, Davenport versus Brown to improve veterans benefits. The benefits improvements contained in House Concurrent Resolution 178 do just that, and I thank the committee for their foresight and patriotism.

This is a good bill for veterans. First it will increase total VA outlays from \$37.8 billion in fiscal year 1996 to \$39.9 billion in fiscal year 2002. Over the next 6 years, VA spending would total \$233.3 billion which is \$18.7 billion

more than over the previous 6 years. This year, our budget provides \$100 million more for VA medical care than requested by the President, and \$5 billion more than the President over the next 6 years.

For our older veterans, it strengthens the solvency of the Medicare Program and provides a 45-percent increase in spending for Medicare. Our middle-aged veterans will benefit through lower taxes and increased buying power. Their families will see increased education and entrepreneurial opportunities, and less government. Younger veterans will see a permanent \$500 per child tax credit, an adoption tax credit, a repeal of the 1993 gasoline tax and improvements in health insurance and medical savings accounts.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to note that in testimony before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, VA Secretary Jesse Brown stated, "the President's budget would be devastating for the VA." The Secretary also said that the President's budget would close the equivalent of 41 hospitals, fire 60,000 employees, and deny care to as many as 1 million veterans.

Further, when confronted with the facts regarding the President's budget for the VA, the Secretary likes to make a point that the President has agreed to negotiate the VA budget every year. Well, that's not good enough for me. If the President is such a strong supporter of veterans, let him put the money up front. Veterans benefits should not be negotiated.

As I mentioned earlier, our bill improves several areas of veterans benefits. First, to help our severely disabled veterans, we are proposing to raise the one time automobile allowance from the current \$5,500 to \$10,000. That will make it easier for veterans who have lost the use of their limbs or sight to more easily afford transportation.

Second, we have included legislation to extend compensation benefits to the day of death of a veteran. This may seem a small matter, but it is significant to bereaved spouses of veterans.

Third, we are going to extend the period for which a surviving spouse can receive back benefits from the current 1 to a maximum of 2 years. This will partly make up for increased adjudication time at the VA which is now running about 3 years for a claim to be decided at the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

We want to reward our veteran college students with an increase in their GI bill benefits by giving those who have a "B" average going into their senior year a scholarship. We also intend to provide an opportunity for those still on active duty to transfer from the less generous Post Vietnam Education Assistance Program [VEAP] to the current Montgomery GI bill. We'll also make it easier for veterans to become teachers by making permanent the ability to use their GI bill education benefits to pay for teaching certification.

Finally, we are going to continue funding for the veterans pro bono legal representation program at the Court of Veterans Appeals. This program ensures that needy veterans with good cases are represented before the court. The program also assists the court by reducing the number of pro se cases before the court thereby reducing the time it takes the court to process claims.

Mr. Chairman, it is important for veterans to compare the budgets before us today and decide for themselves whose budget is best for veterans and the Nation. I urge them to contact their elected officials and express their support for the bill.

To my colleagues I say support House Concurrent Resolution 178 because by doing so, you support America's veterans and ensure the economic security of the Nation.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget resolution for fiscal year 1997. The new Republican budget is nothing more than a rehash of the same extremist priorities from last year—including large tax breaks for the wealthy paid for by deep cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. House Concurrent Resolution 178 also includes misguided cuts in education funding, unneeded boosts in defense spending and tax increases on 6 million hard working American families. There is no doubt that spending in certain areas can be reduced and programs can be reformed, particularly in the area of health care, but this budget goes too far.

Mr. Speaker, the majority refuses to abandon the most outrageous part of their budget—unnecessary cuts in Medicare to finance tax breaks for the wealthy. This budget cuts \$168 billion from the Medicare Program—\$124 billion from part A and \$44 billion from part B. This plan sacrifices the quality and availability of senior's health care for a tax giveaway, which primarily benefits people making over \$100,000 a year. The impact on senior citizens and hospitals is even more devastating than the cuts proposed last year.

House Concurrent Resolution 178 puts the squeeze on hospitals, through deep cuts in the part of Medicare that pays hospital bills. These cuts could force many hospitals to close or reduce the services they now offer to their communities. Regardless of inflation, hospitals would get less than they do today in nominal dollars under this budget. In Philadelphia, our health care system and entire economy will be endangered by these insidious cuts. Many hospitals in my district, whose beneficiaries are predominantly Medicare and Medicaid patients, may have no alternative but to shut their doors.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 178 contains the same damaging structural changes to Medicare and Medicaid the President vetoed last year. It continues to rely on the untested and dangerous medical savings accounts as its centerpiece. The majority proposal would segment the Medicare population, leaving the traditional program with fewer dollars and a sicker pool of beneficiaries. It would drive up premiums and causing Medicare to wither on the vine. This proposal is of extreme significance to my district, the 20th oldest in the Nation. More than 100,000 senior citizens in my district rely on Medicare and they live on fixed incomes. This proposal could truly end universal health coverage for elderly, effectively reversing 30 years of progress.

Mr. Speaker, the majority tries to hide its true intentions behind lofty rhetoric about saving Medicare for the future. House Concurrent Resolution 178 extends Medicare's solvency for the same number of years as the President's plan—yet the GOP plan takes \$44 billion more from Medicare. It is obvious, Mr.

Speaker, that the majority is using funds cut from Medicare to pay for their crown jewel—a \$176 billion tax cut for wealthy Americans.

In addition, the majority is still insisting on ending the Medicaid guarantee for 36 million Americans, including millions of senior citizens and children. Mr. Speaker, approximately 400,000 people in Philadelphia rely on Medicaid as their only source of health care. Without that guarantee, families will be forced to sell their homes to pay for nursing homes for their elderly parents. This budget cuts Federal medical spending by \$72 billion, but the total cuts could still reach \$250 billion over 7 years if States spend only the minimum required to receive their full block grant allocation. This potential \$250 billion cut reduces spending growth per person below the general rate of inflation. Deep total cuts in Medicaid could place older Americans and people with disabilities at risk of losing optional Medicaid benefits. These cuts would place an additional financial burden on families caring for their parents and others with long-term care needs. In addition, the majority still insists on repealing Federal enforcement of nursing home quality standards that have dramatically improved the quality of nursing home care.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 178 also would raise taxes on between 6 and 10 million hard working American families by cutting the earned income tax credit program. The earned income tax credit benefited 40 million Americans in working families and has been proven to help people move off welfare. In addition, this budget continues the assault on educational opportunities for our Nation's young people by cutting more than \$4.5 billion in educational assistance over the next 6 years. The Republican majority has proposed to eliminate the direct student lending program, which provides educational assistance to over 2.5 million students nationwide, as well as the Goals 2000 Program, and the State Incentive Grants Program.

We cannot afford to slam the door of educational assistance on our young people nor rob our senior citizens of their right to adequate health care. Instead, Mr. Speaker, we should continue on the path to balance with a bipartisan budget that rejects the radical policies contained in this budget and moves forward with a plan that truly reflects the values of mainstream America.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 178, the fiscal year 1997 House budget resolution. Like the Republican Majority's budget proposals of last year, this measure sets the course for a balanced Federal budget for the first time in a generation. For nearly three decades, the Federal Government has recklessly overspent, accumulating a national debt of \$5 trillion. This year, the interest on that debt will reach \$344 billion. A child born today inherits a tax bill of \$187,746 just to pay for their share of that interest. At this point, it does not matter who is to blame. What does matter is that we reverse this dangerous course before it is too late.

House Concurrent Resolution 178 is a budget plan which will give our children a future that promises economic opportunity and prosperity. This 6-year budget plan envisions a smaller, less intrusive Federal Government. Downsizing will be accomplished by eliminat-

ing wasteful or duplicative programs, sharing more power with States and local communities, and lessening the burden of taxation and regulation which has a stranglehold on our Nation's families and businesses. While House Concurrent Resolution 178 would reduce Federal spending by approximately \$700 billion over the next 6 years, overall Federal spending would still increase 3 percent annually during this period, rather than near 5 percent annual spending growth under current law.

House Concurrent Resolution 178 is not a perfect resolution. The House Budget Committee has presented recommendations of programmatic changes which can be implemented to achieve a balanced budget. The Budget Committee's illustrative cuts and reforms, however, include some suggestions which I find objectionable. Specifically, these include the elimination of the Department of Energy [DOE] and the corporatization of its national laboratories. I have written the chairman of the Budget Committee regarding these provisions, where savings yielded are questionable at best. Furthermore, I plan to be very active in the debate should the House consider related legislation.

Mr. Chairman, although I have these concerns about the budget plan's energy-related provisions, House Concurrent Resolution 178 has many more positives than negatives. I would also note that the recommendations in this plan are nonbinding; to be implemented, each recommendation must be considered through the Committee process, adopted by both Houses of Congress, and signed into law by the President.

Time and time again, the President and the Democrats in Congress have disregarded the call from around the country for fiscal responsibility; instead, they seem intent on being dragged kicking and screaming into the 21st century. The Republican budget plan is a credible approach toward eliminating the budget deficit and revitalizing our economic and budget outlook today and in years to come. Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this most important measure and its underlying goal of a balanced Federal budget.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget proposal we have before us today. This is a proposal which shows that the Republicans have not learned from last year's budget debate. Last year, when the Republican proposals came to light, the American people overwhelmingly voiced opposition to the extreme policies of cutting health care for the elderly, gutting environmental protection, and cutting such crucial investments as education, in order to provide massive tax breaks and increase defense spending. It was not just the dollars cut from the programs, the Gingrich/Dole budget also fundamentally changed these programs, renegeing on the basic assurances of health care, education and work opportunities, and devastating the environment.

I support responsible spending reductions and statistics show that the budget downpayment accomplished during 1993 and 1994 by Congress and the President has paid off in terms of really reducing the deficit. That downpayment has led to the lowest deficit level

since the Carter administration. The Congressional Budget Office [CBO] reports that the deficit for fiscal year 1996, when measured against the size of the economy, will be 1.9 percent of the GDP, the lowest level since 1979! The numbers also show that it is the first time the deficit will have dropped 4 years in a row since President Truman was in office.

The deficit is too high, but we have made progress. Now the congressional Republicans want to waste that hard work with tax breaks for short term political gain and platitudes of spending cuts way down the road. It is largely because of improved economic figures and the fact that their budget window is now 6 years instead of 7, that the Republicans come to us today with cuts which they claim are more moderate than last year's budget proposal. But although their numbers appear more moderate, the GOP/Gingrich core policy proposals are still drastic, with skewed priorities for our Nation's future.

The Gingrich budget plan once again relies on massive cuts in Medicare and Medicaid programs which help over 70 million Americans gain access to health insurance. It is clear that there are serious problems with our current health care system. Congress should be acting to expand health care coverage and rein in escalating health care costs, but instead, Republicans are focused on tearing our Nation's health safety net, potentially adding millions more to the ranks of the uninsured. The plan puts Federal health care on a defined contribution basis, not the existing assurance of health care to those who need it.

The Republican Medicare plan continues to include the same policy proposals as last year's plan, drastically cutting payments to providers, restructuring the current program and heavily relying on untested medical savings accounts. Once again, although changes are needed in the Medicare Part A Program to extend solvency, the Republican plan goes too far, changing Medicare from reliable health insurance for our seniors to a second-class health care system. The claim of solvency is only a pretext for the out-of-context policy the GOP pursues.

Perhaps even more damaging than the Medicare cuts are the cuts and program changes planned for Medicaid. Medicaid provides health benefits to 36 million Americans, including 443,000 Minnesotans. Under the Republican plan, the seniors, people with disabilities, and low-income families who receive help from Medicaid, will be at risk of losing their coverage. In addition, States will be allowed to reduce their own share of funding for Medicaid, making the actual cuts much more severe than they appear in the resolution. Again, it is important to note that Federal defined contribution plans will not provide the defined benefits that many rely upon each and every day.

As we head into the 21st century, one of the most important investments our Nation should make is in education. Republicans once again want to make the same extreme cuts as in last year's resolution. The budget hits students who need help with higher education costs by eliminating the Direct Loan Program, and eliminating new funding for Perkins loans and State student incentive grants. The budget makes a host of other education cuts, such as

eliminating Goals 2000, bilingual education, and immigrant education programs. Further, the proposal slashes funding for job training, such as the programs consolidated in the CAREERS bill. This budget resolution goes too far by cutting these programs 28 percent below the levels in the CAREERS bill, which already cut the programs by 20 percent. Alas, it becomes clear that the goal of consolidation is the justification to shrink the block grant programs. Pretending that efficiency will make up 45-percent cuts in programs doesn't hold up to commonsense evaluation.

On the environmental front, the budget resolution calls for a 26-percent cut in natural resources programs by 2002. Even as we see more and more visitors to national parks and more public interest in protecting and enjoying our national heritage, the Republicans want to slash Federal protection of these resources. We all know that effectively protecting resources is expensive and that if we want to truly protect our environment, we have to allocate sufficient funding. The funding level in this budget resolution simply will not adequately protect our environment for future generations. In addition, the Republican budget blueprint once again advocates destroying forever the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge [ANWR] by permitting oil and gas exploration and drilling. ANWR is the last great piece of American wilderness, and opening the refuge area to drilling will assure destruction of this priceless and irreplaceable treasure.

The budget blueprint contains negative policies which harm long-standing labor laws that protect American men and women, such as repealing the Davis-Bacon Act and the Service Contract Act, and gutting OSHA. Under Republican policies, fair treatment for working families would be jettisoned and corporate management would set the rules without adequate safeguards or monitoring.

Another area which merits concern are the cuts in housing and community and regional development. Continuing to cut housing when it has already been targeted for cuts in the past is pouring salt on the wounds of those most in need. In addition, the community development programs of CDBG and CDFI have their administration merged with the HOME program and transferred to States and local governments, accompanied by severe budget cuts. Again the block grants are given short shrift. How can this majority Republican Congress advance more block grants when it reneges on the basic tenet?

In fact, the treatment of community development in this budget resolution shows the danger of turning programs into block grants—underfunding. Block grants and ceding control of programs to the States have been the mantra of this new Republican majority. However, as the budget belt tightens, Republicans seek cuts to the block grants, leaving State and local governments with all the flexibility, but with no funding to administer the programs or provide the services. This should serve as a warning to all those who advocate block grants as the answer for every problem.

This GOP budget recommends a 50-percent cut in the Federal Flood Insurance Program. Areas that are cut from funding no doubt will not find affordable insurance and when the damage occurs the Congress will reply with

100 percent Federal assistance. This is the final analysis: It will not save money, it will cost Federal taxpayers, and create political gamesmanship and more uncertainty. The GOP budget calls for \$312 billion in unspecified domestic discretionary spending in the next 6 years, meaning that the cuts already illustrated would be eclipsed by yet more savage slashes in future years. However, some sacrosanct pet programs are spared. Even while funding cuts and negative policy changes are proposed for health care, education, infrastructure, the environment, and community development, the Republican's plan proposes an increase in 1997 defense spending of \$12 billion over the Pentagon's budget request. Most of this new spending goes to unrequested weapons systems, including a host of new planes, helicopters, submarines, and ships, above what is necessary for our national defense. The irony of these budget priorities is that the United States will enter the next century with more smart weapons systems, but fewer smart soldiers to operate these sophisticated weapons systems.

We can continue to responsibly reduce the deficit, and proposals have been put forth to show that we can do it in a fair manner. The Republicans make the task of deficit reduction a political sham by insisting on including tax breaks of \$124 to \$175 billion in their budget plans. The amount that the Republicans project for the cost of the one tax item is \$124 billion and is not sufficient to pay for their additional proposed tax break policies, meaning that the cost of the tax changes will be much higher when the entire policies are in place.

The tax policies in the resolution do not reflect fairness, as the measure greatly reduces the earned income tax credit for the working poor while making low-income families ineligible for the new children's tax credit. The children's tax credit will not benefit 34 percent of the Nation's children because their parents' income is so low that the nonreimbursement tax credit policy denies the child credit for low income families. In addition, the Gingrich/GOP plan leaves the option open for a capital gains tax break, a proven budget buster. Instead of including these unfair tax policies in their plan, Republicans should use these funds to moderate the cuts in other programs.

During the past year, the Republican majority has consistently shown that they do not value programs or protections for American working families and seniors, ranging from affordable health care and a clean environment, to quality education and a livable wage. Unfortunately, as this fiscal year 1997 budget proposal shows, they have not been listening to the consistent and concerned response of the American people, which has been opposition to the Republicans' extreme actions. The American people understand that in pursuit of fiscal and deficit balance, we should not accept human deficit and social imbalance. The people expect shared sacrifice, not the Gingrich cuts for people programs and tax breaks for the rich, the policy that the GOP is intent on advancing. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican budget resolution.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chairman, here we are again. It was just about a year ago that we stood here on the House floor, debating the Republican plan to balance the Federal budget.

By now, we are all familiar with what happened in that debate. In response to our attempt to balance the budget, Republicans were confronted with one of the most savage political attacks in the history of this country.

We were called "mean-spirited", "uncaring", and "extremist". The American people were told that we didn't care about old people and that we wanted to starve innocent children. All of this despite the fact that our budget actually increased spending on Medicaid, Medicare, school lunches, student loans, and other programs that help the most vulnerable in our society.

Fortunately, the Republican Congress weathered these desperate attacks and fulfilled its promise to pass a balanced budget bill. Unfortunately, President Clinton's veto made all of our efforts go for naught.

But, as they say, "if you don't succeed, try, try again"—and that is exactly what we are doing. Today, we are considering another bill that lays out a concrete plan to balance the Federal budget by 2002.

Before I talk about some of the specifics of our proposal, I would like to say a few words about why we will not give up on our efforts to balance the Federal budget.

The reason we are back on the floor today, trying to balance the budget, is simple. If we do not get Federal spending under control, we risk leaving our children and grandchildren with a mountain of Federal debt that will never be able to be repaid.

If we do nothing, our children will face a country with higher interest rates, lower economic growth, and fewer jobs than there would be under a balanced budget.

If we do nothing, the safety net that supports the poor, the elderly, and the disadvantaged will collapse under the sheer weight of Government debt.

My Democratic colleagues accuse us of lacking compassion, but I say to them: How compassionate is it to borrow from our children and leave them to pay the bills?

How compassionate is it to allow the Federal safety net to collapse because of our unwillingness to do what needs to be done?

How compassionate is it to duck the hard choices, just to make things more difficult for those who come after us?

The answer is obvious: It is not compassionate at all. It is time for us to take responsibility for ourselves and put our Nation's finances in order. And that is exactly what the Republican budget does.

The bottom line of our budget proposal is simple. Under our bill, the Federal Government would experience steadily declining deficits between now and 2002—when we would actually have a \$3.2 billion surplus. For the record, that would be the first time in nearly 30 years that the Federal Government runs a surplus—truly a historic accomplishment.

But deficit numbers alone don't tell the whole story of the Republican balanced budget. Our budget proposes much more. A comprehensive overhaul of how our Government does business.

The bill starts by proposing fundamental reform of entitlements. It would probably surprise most folks to learn that the largest portion of the Federal budget, by far, is entitlement spending. In fact, spending on entitle-

ment programs such as Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security currently consumes about two-thirds of the Federal budget. And, if we do nothing, spending on these programs will eventually consume the entire Federal budget, leaving nothing for education, defense, or any other Federal program.

Accordingly, one of the top priorities in the Republican budget is to get entitlement spending under control. Our budget starts by reforming Medicare.

As most of my colleagues are aware, the Medicare trustees warned last year that the Medicare trust fund would be bankrupt by 2002 if Congress did not act. Since then, things have only gotten worse. Medicare was \$4.2 billion in the red this year and is now projected to go broke even sooner than expected, possibly as soon as the year 2000. If we allow that to happen, we will be putting the health care of millions of seniors at risk.

Obviously, we can't let that happen. That's why our budget includes Medicare reforms that would slow the explosive growth of this vital program. Note that I did not say cut. That's because the Republican budget does not cut Medicare. Our plan merely slows the rate of growth of Medicare from the current rate of 10 percent per year to about 7 percent a year. In doing so, our plan would save Medicare from bankruptcy, while still expanding the ability of seniors to make choices about their own health care.

But let me repeat. Our plan does not cut Medicare. In fact, Medicare spending under the Republican budget will increase from \$196 billion this year to \$284 billion in 2002.

In addition to Medicare reforms, our budget makes needed reforms to a number of other entitlements program.

For example, our proposal incorporates much of a Medicaid reform plan proposed earlier this year by a bipartisan group of our Nation's Governors. Currently, Medicaid spending is growing by an unsustainable 19 percent a year. By giving States more flexibility in how they administer Medicaid, this proposal would reduce this rate to 6.6 percent growth per year, twice the rate of inflation. In doing so, the Republican budget would save \$77 billion over the next 6 years while preserving the health safety net for the poor.

The budget resolution also calls for reform of our Nation's ailing welfare system. As my colleagues are aware, earlier this year President Clinton vetoed a Republican welfare reform bill that would have fulfilled his own promise to "end welfare as we know it." Our bill calls for Congress and the President to give welfare reform one more try, and save \$53 billion in taxpayer dollars over the next 6 years.

Let me say one last thing about the entitlement reforms proposed in our budget. We have left Social Security alone. Republicans made that promise in the 1994 elections, and we plan to stick by it.

Besides entitlement reforms, the Republican budget also proposes an overhaul of the Byzantine government bureaucracy that has grown up over the past few decades. Our budget starts by eliminating 130 wasteful and unnecessary Federal programs, including Goals 2000, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the President's AmeriCorps Program

which, according to the Government Accounting Office, costs taxpayers over \$25,000 per volunteer. The bill also proposes deep reductions in our foreign aid spending—\$14.2 billion over the next 6 years.

Most importantly, however, our budget calls for the elimination of two Cabinet Departments, Energy and Commerce, that duplicate the missions of other departments and which have clearly outlived their usefulness. In doing so, this bill would save over \$10 billion per year. I am especially proud of this element of our budget—I believe that nothing demonstrates our commitment to dramatic change than our willingness to take on special interests and eliminate these wasteful Cabinet agencies.

Finally, I want to address one of the most important aspects of the Republican budget resolution: Tax relief for working Americans.

As many of my colleagues are aware, Americans spend a great deal of time working for the Government instead of for themselves. This year, the average American worked until May 7—longer than ever before—to pay their taxes.

Another astonishing statistic. According to a recent report by the Tax Foundation, the top 50 percent of all taxpayers pay 95 percent of all taxes. That means that if you are in the top 50 percent of taxpayers, you are not only working to support your own family, but you are probably working to support someone else's as well.

To me, this doesn't make any sense. We should be doing everything possible to help workers in this country make ends meet, not weighing them down with a crushing tax burden. But that is exactly what we are doing.

For this reason, I am pleased that our budget contains meaningful tax relief for working Americans. The centerpiece of our plan is a \$500-per-child tax credit for middle-class families that will help those families make ends meet. Our budget also contains a repeal of President Clinton's 1993 gas tax hike, expansion of tax credits for adoption, enhanced health insurance deductions for the self-employed, and raising the Social Security earnings limit. Finally, the bill contains a reduction in job-killing capital gains taxes.

I strongly support these tax reductions. They are fair, reasonable, and targeted toward working individuals and families who are most in need of tax relief. I also believe that the tax relief contained in the Republican budget is a dividend to American taxpayers for our efforts to reduce wasteful Federal spending.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, the budget we are considering today represents the Republican vision for the future. Smaller, more cost-effective Government, a balanced Federal budget, and lower taxes. I don't think that there is much doubt that these priorities are the priorities of the American people. The question is: Are we going to look past partisan political rhetoric and do the right thing, or are we going to succumb to the temptation of business as usual?

For our sake, and the sake of our children, who will have to pay the bills that we leave behind, I hope that we will choose to take the former approach. It is time to do the right thing for the economic future of this country. I urge my colleagues to support the Republican balanced budget resolution.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this ridiculous, radical, and revolting Republican resolution to cram a devastating budget down the throats of the American people. When I first read the Gingrich-Army Republican budget proposal, I recalled hearing that it was *deja vu* all over again. As I studied the Republican budget more, I realized that the Republicans must have really enjoyed shutting down the Federal Government so much last year that they want to do it all over again.

Then I thought about how the drastic cuts to so many Federal programs would effect so many people—not just the hard working Federal worker who experienced so much frustration about wanting to do their jobs and not being able to—but also the many senior citizens who rely on the Medicare system to pay for their medical care. The Republicans want to cut Medicare by over \$167 billion over 6 years. These cuts are as deep as the ones the Republicans tried to get away with last year. Not only deep cuts to fund Medicare—when Medicare isn't there to pay the medical and hospital bills for seniors, they will have to pay more out of their own pocket or not receive the needed health care. The restructuring of the Medicare program proposed by the Republicans could threaten the very existence of Medicare.

All over again, just like they tried to get away with last year, the Republicans propose to cut Medicaid funds to States to provide health coverage to the poor, the disabled, and pregnant women. If the Republicans would have their way in this budget, Medicaid would be cut by \$72 billion over the next 6 years, and the total reduction in funding could be as high as \$250 billion. The Republican budget proposes to tear down the existing Medicaid Program in which the Federal Government and the American people have already invested literally billions of dollars, and replace it with a patchwork system of block grants to States. This combination would jeopardize health care for millions of low-income children and pregnant women, seniors in nursing homes, and the disabled, as well as low-income seniors who depend on Medicaid to pay their Medicare part B premiums.

All over again, the Republicans want to cut funds for the education of America's children. How many times do the American people have to tell the Republicans that education is a high priority and that the best education cannot be provided on a shoestring. The Republicans are trying to hide the fact that they are again trying to cut education programs, claiming that funding would be frozen at 1996 levels. In discretionary programs, that would mean real cuts of about 22 percent below the already reduced 1996 level in the 6 years through the year 2002 that this resolution covers.

Now, let's talk about tax breaks. I have a quiz for you: Do you think the Republican budget attempts again to provide capital gains tax breaks for the wealthy, or, do you think the Republicans are proposing to sneak in a \$20 billion tax increase on low-income working families to pay for the rich to get a tax break? Too hard? Not if you've been awake for that last 2 years and watched the Gingrich-Army Republicans try over and over again to pay

back their wealthy supporters by trying to give the rich every tax break and funding advantage they could.

Let's get serious, Republicans. Do you think the American people are really going to lay down and let you shove this ridiculous budget down their throats? Not if I can help it, and thank goodness, not if President Clinton can help it—and he can. He has the guts and the pen to stop these radical Republican proposals. Let's defeat this Republican budget proposal now, so we can really get down to business before we have a repeat of last year's Government shutdowns and threats of tax increases and teacher layoffs. I urge a "no" vote on this Republican budget proposal.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Chairman, as sponsor of the balanced budget amendment which passed this House last year, my concern for the financial future of our country is well known. I support a balanced Federal budget because we owe it to our children and grandchildren. It would be unconscionable to saddle them with the accumulated debts that we ourselves failed to pay. In this regard, I am very pleased that all the budget plans we are considering here today also envision a balanced budget by the year 2002, as well.

However, I am concerned about the treatment of solar and renewable energy programs and the complete elimination of wind energy research and development in House Concurrent Resolution 178. These large funding cuts will greatly harm American research efforts in these important technologies and give our foreign competitors an unparalleled opportunity to take the world lead from the United States in this high-growth field.

We have seen other kinds of new technologies invented and developed by Americans, only to be successfully deployed by foreign countries. This is the so-called VCR syndrome. We are now in danger of letting our technological leadership in another important field slip away once again.

Proponents of cutting the budget for renewables point out that they are merely eliminating corporate welfare. To this I must note that the great majority of companies involved in the research, manufacture, distribution, and supply of renewable energy technologies are classified as small businesses by the U.S. Small Business Administration. Rather than eliminating handouts to corporate giants, these funding cuts are pulling the rug from under the thousands of small businesses which employ tens of thousands of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, through careful allocation of available funding resources, we can fully support renewable energy technologies and still have a balanced Federal budget. This is a combination that will benefit present and future generations of Americans. I will continue to work throughout the budget process this year to ensure that renewables get fair funding treatment.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution offered today. The fiscal year 1997 budget resolution represents a continued attack on the health, safety and well-being of the majority of the American people. While not as drastic as the budget proposed by the Republican majority last year, this budget also is too extreme. By cutting Medicare and Medicaid, the

safety net for vulnerable populations—the elderly, disabled, and poor children and families—will be in jeopardy, I cannot support a budget that includes massive Federal spending for new tax breaks while other critical programs, including Medicare, Medicaid, and earned income tax credit—are greatly weakened. This is not a realistic budget. We cannot, and should not, enact a budget such as this that promises to cut spending and cut taxes. If we are serious about reducing the deficit—as I am—we should make the hard choices to being our Federal spending in line. This budget, however, promises to make life easier for the affluent, while balancing the budget on the backs of the poor and disadvantaged.

I support a balanced budget. In fact, I have cosponsored and voted in favor of amending the U.S. Constitution to mandate a balanced Federal budget. However, while the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution passed by this committee achieves balance on paper, I cannot support the callous and irresponsible policy assumptions it uses to achieve these savings. The policy implications have very real consequences to the citizens of this Nation.

I am especially concerned about the deep cuts in discretionary spending included in this budget. Certainly, we must take serious steps to carefully scrutinize every portion of our Federal budget in order to control Federal spending and bring our deficit under control. However, the cuts in discretionary spending included here are too harsh and will have a serious impact on millions of Americans, most notably the vulnerable populations that continue to be left behind as we change our Federal priorities.

For example, the cuts in education leave me very concerned about the future of this Nation. The education of our children must be a top priority. The education our children receive should be adequate in keeping the U.S. economy competitive as we move into the next century. American children rank dismally in math and science achievement compared with students from other nations. The proportion of young people completing high school has remained stagnant for a decade, despite the ever-increasing demands for education in the job market. National education reforms under President George Bush's Goals 2000 program pointed our Nation in the right direction. This budget, however, eliminates Goals 2000. Having all our students starting school ready to learn, increasing the high school graduation rate, teaching every adult to read and keeping drugs and violence out of schools are not goals we should abandon. While our deficit needs to be eliminated, we must not decimate the education of future generations.

Under this budget, the Legal Services Corporation is cut drastically in fiscal year 1997—a large step toward the total elimination of the program by 1999. The Legal Services Corporation is a good example of a Federal program that is effectively being administered at the local level. The leadership of this House claims to want to expand the role of state and local authority while shrinking the size of the Federal Government. The Legal Services Corporation is a prime example of how local control of a Federal program is working. The creators of the LSC recognized that decisions

about how legal services should be allocated are best made not by officials in Washington, but at a local level, by the people who understand the problems that face their communities. The LSC provides funds to 323 programs operating over 1,200 neighborhood law offices. Together they serve every county in the Nation. LSC programs provide services to more than 1.7 million clients a year, benefiting approximately 5 million individuals, the majority of them children living in poverty. The phase-out of the LSC represented in this budget eliminates a much-needed program and threatens the life and well-being of every poor or near-poor person in this country.

A well-maintained transportation network is essential for economic development. If highways cannot be maintained, our goods cannot move in commerce. Similarly, without continued attention to our Nation's airports, delays and other difficulties will slow our economy's growth. In addition, transit funding provides immediate benefits for economic development, carrying low-income people to their place of work and reducing congestion in metropolitan areas.

Transportation should not bear higher cuts than other programs. This budget phases out Federal assistance the operation of mass transit systems. Operating assistance is essential to transit systems across the Nation. Transit systems are already taking serious steps to cope with federal operating cuts of nearly 50 percent in fiscal year 1996 and 12 percent in fiscal year 1995. Transit systems, by necessity, are operating more efficiently yet still must cut services and increase fares. The complete elimination of operating assistance would have a drastic impact and could eliminate necessary public transportation in communities across our nation.

The elimination of funding for mass transit is just one example of the hypocrisy of this budget. As this budget pushes people into the workforce it takes away their means of getting to work. This budget is unfair and should not be passed by this House.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 178, the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution. I have numerous reservations with the funding priorities and assumptions contained in this resolution. However, I will take this opportunity to highlight three important issues—the deep cuts proposed in discretionary agriculture spending, the ill-advised Medicaid proposal, and the proposed elimination of Federal involvement in fossil energy research.

The budget resolution for fiscal year 1997 again makes a deep cut in agriculture spending. This Congress passed, earlier this year, an extreme overhaul of farm programs, setting them on the road to eventual elimination. Now in this budget resolution, this committee has decided to make an extreme reduction in the amount of discretionary spending for agriculture.

The resolution makes the recommendation to cut total agricultural discretionary spending from \$3.9 billion in fiscal year 1997 to \$2.1 billion in 2002, a staggering reduction in budget authority. This discretionary cut mostly takes the form of unspecified reductions in U.S. Department of Agriculture overhead costs. The members of the committee and rural America

are left to wonder if these cuts will be in the delivery of farm programs, the delivery of conservation programs, or the quality of nutrition and food safety programs. Clearly each and every function of the Department of Agriculture will be impacted by these assumptions. This committee should question if this is the appropriate time to be making these cuts when commodity stocks are at their lowest point in a generation, the livestock industry remains in extreme distress and new plant diseases continue to spread across the nation's heartland.

The budget resolution does specify some specific cuts. These cuts are mainly in USDA research programs. With commodity support already cut by the new farm bill, our producers need quality agricultural research more than ever to protect themselves against diseases, insects and changing environmental conditions. The new farm bill addresses many of the concerns related to competitive research projects and facilities buildings projects. The Agriculture Committee currently is undertaking a comprehensive review of agriculture research programs and will be writing specific legislation to address the needs of agricultural research in the future. The Agriculture Committee should be allowed to do its work without being locked into an extremely restrictive budget scenario before it is finished.

Finally the budget resolution phases out both title I and title III of the Public Law 480 Food for Peace Program. Again, the new farm bill promised American farmers that their future profitability would be derived from the world market. Now we are witnessing the elimination of one of the most successful export enhancement programs ever.

In this budget resolution we see the broken promises of the freedom to farm bill. As the freedom to farm bill was being passed, sponsors hailed a new era in farm policy, promised strengthened research programs and dangled the riches of the world market in front of American farmers. Now we can see that those promises are broken barely 2 months after the bill was signed. We are willing to do our share to balance the budget, but rural Americans cannot continue to take these extreme and unfair budgetary hits.

With regard to Medicaid, I have deep concern about the provisions of the majority's proposed budget for Medicaid. I do recognize that, at least with respect to the commitment of Federal Medicaid funding, this budget makes significant progress over the majority's effort last year—from the proposed reduction of \$182 billion over 7 years last year to \$72 billion over 7 years this year. It thus appears that after a year of rigorous analysis and intense debate, the members of the majority have been persuaded that the Federal Government simply cannot make cuts on the order of those proposed last year without jeopardizing the health of some of our Nation's most vulnerable populations.

Despite the progress this budget represents, however, I remain deeply concerned that it will undermine the central mission of the Medicaid Program, which is to provide a minimum level of health care to the children, the elderly, and the disabled of this Nation. During committee markup, I offered a sense-of-the-House amendment to preserve the basic program elements critical to the performance of Medic-

aid's mission. The committee rejected this amendment, indicating that the level of progress represented by this budget is not as substantial as the reduced Federal cuts suggest. Unfortunately, the improved Federal funding level in this budget masks a series of policy proposals that will jeopardize the health of children, seniors, and the disabled.

Mr. Chairman, let me be clear that my concerns about this budget stem not from any hesitation about whether to reform Medicaid. Medicaid must be reformed through such measures as utilization of managed care, enhanced State flexibility, and the streamlining of regulations. Yet the goal of reform is to improve the program's effectiveness, not to undermine it.

Perhaps the greatest threat to Medicaid's mission contained in this budget is the dramatic reduction in State contributions it allows. In addition to limiting Federal contributions, the budget caps State contributions to Medicaid at 40 percent, allowing the many States with match rates between 41 and 50 percent to lower their required contributions. Thus, although the Federal cut has been reduced to \$72 billion, the total potential reduction in Medicaid spending after accounting for reduced State contributions is \$265 billion. It is simply not possible to withdraw these vast sums from the system without endangering the health safety net that Medicaid has historically provided to North Dakotans and others around this Nation.

This budget would also permit States to use discredited—and currently illegal—funding mechanisms to further limit State contributions to Medicaid. Once again, States could establish schemes to tax providers or collect inter-governmental transfers from State entities, later rebating these funds to the payors, labeling the rebates as Medicaid expenditures, and claiming Federal matching funds for them. Given that the payment of such rebates involves no genuine State outlays for health services, legalizing these sham financing systems make State matching requirements meaningless.

The majority points with pride to the list of groups and services covered under the Medicaid proposal contained in this budget. Upon review, however, several important groups have been excluded and the list of covered services is revealed as a largely empty promise. With respect to covered services, this budget merely requires states to offer some of the various health services listed, while repealing all of the Federal standards that speak to the amount, duration, and scope of these services. Thus, a State could cover only a few days of hospital care even in the event of a serious illness such as a heart attack. Without the minimal Federal standards, people guaranteed coverage under the majority's plan may find the guarantee to be a hollow one.

One of the groups excluded by this budget is poor children. This budget repeals the guarantee of health care coverage for children over the age of 12 living in low-income families, more than half of whom have parents who work. For low-income parents in North Dakota, knowing that the basic health care of their children will still be covered if they leave

the welfare rolls has been an important element in encouraging the transition from government dependence to productive employment. Thus, not only will this repeal endanger the health of these vulnerable children, it will provide a strong disincentive for parents to move from welfare to work. With respect to the disabled, this budget repeals the federal definition of disability, allowing states to narrow this definition as they see fit and thereby exclude many disabled Americans from coverage.

Mr. Chairman, this budget also threatens senior citizens. While under the majority's plan States are supposed to abide by federal nursing home quality standards, Federal monitoring of quality is terminated and States will have nearly unfettered discretion with regard to monitoring and enforcement. We must not forget that it was precisely because many States proved incapable of ensuring quality nursing home care that Congress was prompted to enact basic quality standards in 1987. In another strike against seniors, one that will have particular impact in North Dakota, this budget substantially reduces payment by Medicaid of copayments, premiums, and deductibles for those Medicare beneficiaries whose income is below the poverty line. Given that many low-income seniors already devote large portions of their monthly budgets to health care costs, this cutback will force seniors into a cruel choice between staying healthy and meeting life's other basic expenses.

Mr. Chairman, I will work diligently to address the flaws outlined above and I am hopeful that the majority will join in this effort. As we move forward to balance the Federal budget, we must not abandon the long-standing Federal commitment to the basic health of the children, seniors and disabled of our Nation.

Finally, I have serious concerns about the provisions in this resolution which would eliminate the Federal Government's involvement in fossil energy research and development. This is very short-sighted policy. Research may not immediately improve profitability, but the long-term benefits are immeasurable. With respect to fossil energy, development of new energy processes to the point of commercially acceptable financial and technical risk is a long road that regulated industries have not been willing to go alone. Those joint private-federal ventures which have been undertaken, like the numerous projects underway at the Energy and Environmental Research Center in Grand Forks, ND, have brought a wealth of information to the energy industry.

The Federal Government has a stake in research and development of fossil fuels. For example, utilities are not going to initiate their own research on emission controls. If they did, it would be an open invitation to regulators to impose new or stricter standards and bigger costs under the doctrine of best available control technology. What's more, energy markets are specialized and highly competitive and would be unlikely to consider complementary solutions.

Without the Federal Government's involvement in fossil energy research and development, it is unlikely this important work would be done. In fact, many companies have eliminated their alternative fuels programs, leaving

only a tiny contingent of researcher. It is in the national interest to preserve this infrastructure with limited Federal funding.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican budget resolution.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, as we all know, the Budget Resolution does not have the force of law, but is a working document Congress uses to set the spending limits and broad priorities for the appropriations process through which the spending plan for the coming fiscal year is put in place.

Our action today is just the first step in that process, and, if last year is any indication, we have a lot of work ahead of us after today's votes.

Each of the four alternatives considered today is itself the product of compromise and accommodation. I would venture to guess that no Member of this body will agree with every provision in any of them.

While I disagree with certain of its techniques to achieve budget saving, I voted for the so-called coalition budget in frank protest to several aspects of the Republican proposal, particularly its elimination of direct student lending. In addition, the coalition budget best reflects my concerns that reforms in the areas of health care and welfare remain prudent and fair and that the Federal commitment to education in general is honored.

The committee resolution may be an acceptable starting point for budget discussions, but I would place my party on notice that I can be expected in the authorization and appropriations process to object to elimination of the direct student loan program and any cuts in education. I also have doubts about the case for elimination of the Department of Commerce, although reform of its functions and merger with the Special Trade Representatives', Office may be in order.

While the hard work remains ahead, it is crucial that the goal of a balanced budget be advanced, but in such a way as to ensure fairness for all.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to the pending resolution. In an echo of last year's dysfunctional priorities, the majority has once again chosen to balance the budget on the backs of the poor, children, and the elderly.

The Republicans refer to this as an honest budget. But I do not believe they are being honest with the American people. They claim to be helping working families by reducing their tax burden. Instead, their budget cuts the earned income tax credit by \$20 billion. This action would raise taxes on more than 6 million working families. The resolution also cuts capital gains taxes for the wealthy by \$176 billion. It seems clear to me that this resolution is not a family tax relief as the Republicans refer to it, but a family tax burden.

They claim to shift power out of Washington back to neighborhoods, communities, and people. But their resolution cuts welfare spending by \$12 billion over President Clinton's balanced budget and gives no details of how neighborhoods, communities, and people are supposed to deal with poor children who are lacking the basic necessities of life.

The Republicans claim to give States authority to improve Medicaid and save Medicare from bankruptcy. However the truth is that this

authority to improve comes in the form of a repeal of Federal enforcement of nursing home quality standards which have, by the way, dramatically improved the quality of nursing home care. Elderly would no longer be safeguarded from the use of restraints, drugs, or other poor quality care.

There are about 166,000 of my constituents in El Paso who are eligible for Medicaid. Of those eligible, approximately 22,000 aged and disabled use Medicaid for nursing home and in-house care or community based care. There are 826 nursing home recipients in El Paso as well.

The Republican savior of Medicare takes the form of more cuts to the program. The budget resolution cuts Medicare spending by \$167 billion. They have achieved this reduction with deep cuts in payments to the hospitals and home health providers that serve beneficiaries. This jeopardizes both quality of care and access to health services. Their \$167 billion cut would result in insufficient funded hospitals that are unable to keep up with cost. There are approximately 60,000 Medicare beneficiaries in El Paso. El Paso hospitals would have to drastically cut services and staffing. For example, El Paso's Thomason General Hospital predicts the effects of the cuts to be: reduction of staff by as much as 992 positions; clinics would be open only 2.5 days a week it would eliminate Level One Trauma services; and it would reduce all of the outpatient services.

The Republicans also claim to shift control of education out of Washington. In reality, education is once again under the budgetary ax. This proposal seeks to eliminate the direct student loan program, affecting over 2.5 million students and cutting nearly \$4.5 billion over 6 years. There are also a number of substantial cuts and terminations in discretionary education spending, including an elimination of the Goals 2000 and bilingual and immigrant education.

The termination of the bilingual education program will be devastating to El Paso. In fiscal year 1996 El Paso received \$661,246 in bilingual education grants. Losing this source of funding would put an enormous burden on our schools.

Our immigrant population is growing, and the vast majority of these immigrants are from Asia and Latin America. If we capitalize upon their linguistic abilities, we can ensure that young immigrants and the children of immigrants will be a valuable asset to our national competitiveness in the global economy. If we fail to adequately fund bilingual and immigrant education, we will set up many children for failure and lose the benefits of their valuable linguistic skills.

In the long run, the result will be that many of our young immigrants and their children will be able to contribute fully to the future stability of our economy. I do not believe that neglecting the needs of a portion of our population that speaks English as a second language is sound policy. If we do not provide adequate funding for this program now, we will pay heavily in the future.

Terminating funds for the Goals 2000 program would interrupt statewide school reform plans which set higher academic standards for all students. The elimination of almost \$400

million in resources for schools will end ongoing state and local education reform efforts affecting 9 million students and terminate 40 percent resource centers. This termination would effectively cut 351 students and 14 teachers in the El Paso area from this program.

For the preceding reasons, I do not support this resolution. It continues the Republican policy of catering to the wealthy and neglecting working families, the elderly, and the poor. It will be devastating to El Paso and our Nation as a whole.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the budget resolution offered by the Republican majority. The Republican majority has once again done a bad job of putting together this most basic budget blueprint. Like last year, this resolution is a product of closed-door meetings with party leaders, pollsters, and lobbyists for multinational corporations, instead of a meaningful accounting of the needs of average working Americans and senior citizens.

This resolution is particularly deceptive and disingenuous because if the Congress follows this budget resolution, the American people will feel its harsh effects only after the November elections. The proposal will needlessly put us on another collision course with the President that could lead to new Government shutdowns and numerous stopgap spending measures. I have no doubt that the resolution's proposals will hurt seniors living on fixed incomes, middle-class and low-income families, and make it more difficult to ever balance the Federal budget. Indeed, while the bill is supposed to help the Republican party appear kinder and gentler to the American people as November draws near, there is little that is kind or gentle about this bill.

We must do better. Congress needs to put forth in this budget resolution a clear and honest vision of the future—one that says the Federal Government can work more efficiently and effectively, while also helping to empower individuals and working families to succeed. The Republican resolution offers no such hope.

I am fully prepared to support a budget plan which is balanced in 7 years using Congressional Budget Office numbers, as required by the bipartisan balanced budget agreement. Unfortunately, this legislation is neither bipartisan nor balanced. A better balanced budget plan would integrate the following principles into a new budget blueprint for the future.

#### RESPECT PAST SUCCESS

Not surprisingly, the Republican majority in Congress is doing everything it can to ignore the tremendous deficit reduction success of President Clinton and the previous Democratic Congress. The Federal budget deficit has been cut in half since 1992, the last year of the Bush administration. Having fallen 4 years in a row, the deficit is now at its lowest level as a percentage of the economy since 1979.

To help achieve this deficit reduction success, hundreds of Federal programs have been cut or eliminated, the Federal work force has been reduced by 200,000 workers, and 16,000 pages of Federal rules and regulations have been eliminated. All of this was accomplished as a result of President Clinton's 1993 deficit reduction plan enacted into law without

a single Republican vote in either the House or Senate.

Still we are only way to a balanced budget. More can and must be done to continue to improve our fiscal condition and economy overall. The Republican majority needs to be reminded that we are not starting from scratch. Democrats have already proved that the budget deficit can be substantially reduced on a careful, considerate, and orderly basis. A radical transformation of the budget is unwarranted and unnecessary.

Unlike this budget resolution, therefore, we do not need to endanger critical programs which promote the well-being of the neediest Americans—such as children and the elderly. Nor, do we need to eliminate programs which promote economic growth, job creation, and the competitiveness of the United States. We certainly do not need to weaken programs which help middle-class Americans retrain after losing jobs to unfair international competition and which educate their children to prepare for a rapidly changing economy.

#### FORGET TAX CUTS UNTIL THE BUDGET IS BALANCED

Balancing the budget is difficult enough without tax cuts siphoning off desperately needed revenue. Both the \$176 billion tax cut called for in this budget resolution and the \$117 billion cut proposed in the President's budget will make it more difficult to balance the budget. If we would forget tax cuts, we could balance the budget sooner and in a less disruptive way. That would be better in the long run for our economy and average working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, nobody likes taxes. We all believe we would be happier with a little more of our own money in our pockets. But at what cost? Should we risk not balancing the budget because some want to provide a short-sighted, election-year gift to taxpayers instead of waiting to provide tax cuts after the budget is balanced. My parents raised me to believe that you couldn't have dessert until you have eaten your vegetables. Republicans want to eat dessert first in return for a promise to eat their vegetables later. Common sense tells us that is a bad idea.

I truly believe that average working Americans are more than willing to forgo a Federal tax cut today if it means the Federal Government will be able to get its act together and balance the budget without hurting them in the long term.

Both the Republican majority and the President are wrong on tax cuts. If balancing the budget is our primary goal, tax cuts should be made contingent on balancing the budget first.

#### ATTACK CORPORATE WELFARE

The Republican budget resolution proposes to cut only \$26 billion in corporate subsidies and tax breaks. This is a step in the right direction, and the Republican majority should be applauded for putting forward proposals in this area. But the cuts represent only the tip of the iceberg.

President Clinton has proposed significantly more in corporate welfare savings—some \$54 billion. And, independent groups across the ideological spectrum have proposed tens of billions of dollars more. The conservative CATO Institute found \$85 billion in corporate welfare encompassed in 125 programs. The Progressive Policy Institute identified \$265 bil-

lion in potential savings spread across 120 programs. Clearly, a much greater level of savings in corporate welfare subsidies and tax breaks can be found for this budget resolution.

For example, I have been fighting for many years to eliminate what I believe to be a huge tax loophole in the federal tax system favoring foreign corporations operating in our country. The tax system permits foreign companies to overcharge for goods they provide to subsidiaries in the United States, which effectively reduces the subsidiary's tax liability. This activity, commonly referred to as "transfer pricing," may result in annual lost revenue to the Federal Government of as much as \$33 billion, according to at least one estimate. I have introduced legislation to help address this problem and I would again urge the Republican majority to integrate my proposal into this budget resolution.

Corporations should shoulder a greater portion of the funding burden of our Government. In 1945, corporations contributed 35 percent of budget revenues. That share is down to 11 percent today, more than a two-thirds reduction. Instead of cutting taxes for wealthy stockholders and profitable corporations under this budget resolution, we should do more to reduce inefficient and unfair subsidies and tax breaks which place greater burdens on average working taxpayers.

#### DON'T WEAKEN GOOD PROGRAMS

Medicare has clearly been one of the most successful programs of the Federal Government. In tandem with Social Security, Medicare has dramatically reduced the poverty rate among elderly Americans and increased overall quality of life. This is no time to be making unwarranted and damaging changes to the program.

Though the budget resolution represents an improvement from the Republican budget proposals on Medicare last year, the cuts are still excessive. We can certainly find limited savings from hospitals and medical equipment suppliers, as has been done in the past and proposed by the President this year. However, if we go too far with such cuts, small hospitals will close and the quality of health care will drop, especially in areas like mine which are outside major metropolitan centers. The Republican proposals on Medicare must still be moderated significantly.

Many seniors want to see a greater emphasis on reducing waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare program. I agree. The President has just completed the first year of a major new effort to crack down on waste, fraud, and abuse which has netted \$43 million from Medicare programs so far this year. We need to build on this effort.

The budget proposals for Medicaid are also cause for great concern. While Medicaid is commonly known as the medical program for low-income families, few realize how important the program is for senior citizens. In Pennsylvania, the care of 64 percent of nursing home patients is Medicaid funded. I am worried that the excessive cuts for Medicaid proposed under the Republican budget resolution will increase the cost of nursing home and medical care to seniors and their families.

Programs to protect the environment and our natural resources have also had tremendous success over the past 25 years. Our air

and water has gotten cleaner, and our national parks have been protected from adverse development and exploitation. Unfortunately, this budget resolution proposes a 26-percent cut on spending for natural resource and environmental programs. Given the urgent need to address environmental problems in north-eastern Pennsylvania, such as numerous Superfund sites and coal-damaged lands spread across this region, I am greatly concerned about such cuts.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the meager amounts of money our country spends on economic development each year has brought great hope to so many smaller communities in our country, including those in my region. The Economic Development Administration [EDA], for example, has provided money to build new buildings and create hundreds of new jobs in Nanticoke, Wilkes-Barre, and Hazleton, PA. These buildings now serve as essential anchors for local economic revival and bring in local, State, and Federal tax dollars far in excess of the original Federal investment. However, this budget resolution proposes to eliminate the EDA and its successful programs over the next 4 years. Eliminating this agency will leave small communities with few places to turn to for economic development assistance. Certainly, eliminating this agency and cutting other similar economic development programs are among the worst ideas in this budget resolution.

Another excellent program which deserves mention is the earned-income tax credit [EITC] program. Changes to the EITC proposed by President Clinton in 1993, and enacted by Congress, provided needed tax relief for working Americans. In Pennsylvania, the expanded credit for 1996 will give low-income, working families an average additional tax break of \$940 per year, and working individuals \$240 per year. This budget resolution rejects the EITC as an effective tax relief and work-promotion program, by cutting it \$26 billion. If the proposal is enacted, low-income working individuals and families who choose work over welfare will see their taxes increase. If anything, the EITC should be expanded, not cut.

#### ELIMINATE WASTEFUL SPENDING

Although the need to eliminate wasteful spending seems clear, the Republican majority has actually promoted new wasteful spending in this budget resolution while forgetting about obvious spending cut targets. For example, the resolution proposes serious cuts in education, including spending on libraries and job training programs, but expands unnecessary programs for the Defense Department. In fact, the budget resolution provides \$12.8 billion more than the Department of Defense [DOD] asked for in its request to the Congress, even after DOD was given an additional \$7 billion more than requested last year.

Mr. Speaker, I find it amazing that the Republican majority is perfectly willing to cut deeply into so many good federal programs, but greatly increase spending on additional weapons. Our country is no longer faced with the possibility of a major nuclear attack, yet Republicans want to spend 30 percent, or \$860 million, more than requested on national missile defense programs. The budget also proposes to spend \$504 million in excess of DOD's request for another nuclear submarine

and \$305 million more for fighter aircraft. We simply do not need, and cannot afford, such unnecessary excess in the defense budget.

In 1993, I proposed to the Congress a list of proposed spending cuts totaling \$213 billion over 5 years. Many of the cuts have been enacted, and a number of the programs I proposed for elimination are no longer in place. Indeed, we have made much progress on eliminating wasteful spending.

But many large and small wasteful programs continue to be funded in the proposed Republican budget. One good example of a wasteful small program is the National Endowment for Democracy [NED]. NED will spend \$32 million on taxpayer supported projects to supposedly foster democracy around the world. NED, however, is run by U.S. political parties, business interest groups, and labor unions. As a result, the participants have promoted not only the worthy goal of democratic participation, but also taxpayer funded training in American-style lobbying for business and labor interests, as well as the training of foreign media. We simply should not dedicate scarce resources through private organizations for such purposes.

The budget resolution also does nothing to cut wasteful subsidy programs to timber and mining companies. Our country will forgo \$700 million over the next 5 years providing below-cost timber sales and constructing logging road networks. We will receive virtually nothing for mining of public lands, even though mining companies will earn billions of dollars on mineral sales. Such subsidies are wasteful, and are unfair to hard-working taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the House to reject this budget resolution and to work to enact a genuinely bipartisan plan which incorporates the fundamental principles I have discussed. We need a budget plan which is fair and equitable, which attacks irresponsible spending and embraces good programs, and which drops reckless tax cuts. The American people need and deserve much better from this Congress.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 178, the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution.

Over a year ago, I stood on the floor in support of this essential effort to balance the Federal budget. Since then, doing so has been my No. 1 priority as a Member of Congress.

I am pleased to be able to say that over the past year we have taken the first step toward a balanced budget. We have reduced the deficit and cut Government spending by \$43 billion.

Today, I stand in support of taking the next step forward toward securing a better future for our children and for our country. This budget sets reasonable priorities for Federal Government spending, returns money to the pockets of hardworking American citizens and returns important decisionmaking power where it belongs—out of the hands of the Washington bureaucracy and into the hands of States, municipalities, and families. This resolution balances our country's economic needs with our commitment to our veterans, seniors, students, and hard-working taxpayers.

House Concurrent Resolution 178 reforms welfare and Medicaid, and preserves, protects, and strengthens Medicare for millions of older

Americans. We make these reforms while increasing spending on all three of these programs, improving services and saving \$211 billion over 6 years.

This budget protects our Nation's natural resources and ensures a clean and healthy environment. The bill recommends increasing funding for actual Superfund cleanups by \$700 million. In New Jersey and around the country, this means that sites would get cleaned up more quickly and less time and money would be spent on litigation and overhead. This bill also provides more funding for our National Park System and safe drinking water. I strongly support this effort to assure Americans have cleaner air and water, greater access to outdoor public recreation, and to protect wilderness and historic areas.

Safe homes, streets, and communities are also a priority under our budget proposal and we recommend a net spending increase of \$9.3 billion, including increased spending for the violent crime reduction trust fund. We have focused over the past year on making our streets safer, improving law enforcement, and making commonsense reforms to our Department of Justice. This budget continues that focus and provides resources to carry out these priorities.

The House Republican budget also renews America's commitment to those who have served and those who continue to serve our country in the armed services. As a veteran myself, I am pleased that under our budget we were able to increase veterans spending to almost \$40 billion and reject the Clinton administration's proposed cuts in veteran's medical care, VA hospitals, medical research, and the National Cemetery System.

This budget also continues our efforts to reduce the size of our Federal Government. Last year, we greatly reduced the size and spending of Congress. This year, we greatly reduced the size and spending of Congress. This year and over the next 6 years House Concurrent Resolution 178 envisions savings of \$5 billion by imposing a moratorium on constructing and acquiring Federal buildings, reducing overhead, and reducing funding for the Executive Office of the White House by 15 percent.

Finally, unlike other proposals House Concurrent Resolution 178 returns money to the hands of the American people while reducing the deficit. Our proposal eliminates corporate tax loopholes, provides an adoption tax credit, and contains a \$500-per-child tax credit. This resolution provides \$122 billion in permanent tax relief, of which the majority will go to taxpayers earning between \$30,000 and \$75,000 annually.

I am pleased to support this 6-year budget resolution that makes commonsense spending decisions, sets priorities, continues adequate levels of spending on important Federal programs to protect our health, safety, environment. This budget resolution is true to our commitment to balance the Federal budget and live within our means. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the plan to balance the Federal budget by the year 2002. I rise today because I am committed to balancing the Federal budget to free future generations

of Americans from the shackles of an enormous national debt.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation has not had a balanced Federal budget in a generation. Since that last balanced budget, budget deficits have climbed to over \$100 billion, topping \$300 billion along the way, and the public national debt has ballooned to \$5 trillion. That represents a debt of nearly \$19,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. The annual interest on the debt alone is over \$235 billion. Two hundred thirty-five billion dollars that must be spent to service the debt. Two hundred thirty-five billion dollars that cannot be spent on educating our children, for providing for our veterans, and returning poor Americans to work. Mr. Chairman, the time has come to stop the failed tax and spend policies of the past, and return fiscal sanity to this Nation.

A balanced budget should provide a smaller Federal Government by slowing its growth. The balanced budget plan supported by the Republican majority increases Federal spending by \$2.5 trillion between now and the year 2002. Our balanced budget increases the money available for student loans. House Concurrent Resolution 178 allows increases in Medicare spending while ensuring its solvency for future generations. The Republican plan curbs a bloated, inefficient Federal bureaucracy, removes decision making from inside the Washington beltway and returns it to the States, and ensures the future of this Nation for our children.

A balanced budget should adopt tax policies that allow Americans to keep more of their take-home pay and allow investors and corporations to create jobs and stimulate economic growth. Our budget enacts a \$500-per-child tax credit, eliminates the marriage penalty, provides a tax credit for adoption expenses, and creates new savings mechanisms. American families will be able to keep what they earn. Families also will save more for their own and their children's future. By allowing families to keep more of what they earn, our balanced budget will boost this Nation's sagging national savings average. Greater savings means more dollars in the economy for job creation and economic growth.

Coupling increased savings with a capital gains tax reduction and a reduction or elimination of growth-impeding corporate taxation, a balanced budget will provide the stimulus for economic growth and job creation. In a time when the Nation's economy is growing at an annual rate of less than 3 percent and many Americans are faced with increased job insecurity, House Concurrent Resolution 178 will provide a boom for the economy and create millions of new jobs. As our budget moves toward balance, the Federal Government will need to borrow less from the national savings pool. Corporations will have access to more money to invest in capital improvements which will boost efficiency while lowering operating costs. Lower costs allow corporations to create new jobs and raise wages.

Mr. Speaker, leading economic experts have concluded that once the Federal budget begins to come into balance, interest rates will begin to drop. On a mortgage of \$100,000, a 2-percent drop in interest rates will save the

mortgage holder \$2,161 on interest payments for each year of a fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage. On a student loan of \$11,000, a 2-percent interest rate drop would save the student \$2,167 over the life of the average 10-year loan. On a \$15,000 car loan, the rate drop would save the loan holder \$180 each year of a 5-year loan.

Mr. Speaker, we must balance the Federal budget. We must shrink the size and scope of the inflated Washington bureaucracy and return power to the State and local level, closer to the American people. We must reform the Medicare system to ensure its solvency for future generations. We must reform the failed welfare system that rewards inactivity and discourages work. We must allow Americans to keep more of what they earn by providing tax cuts and promoting increased savings. We must allow businesses to create jobs and stimulate economic growth by providing pro-growth tax incentives.

The economic benefits that are derived from balancing the Federal budget are enormous. The time has come to end the tax and spend, Big Government ways of the Congress. A balanced budget will ensure the fiscal prosperity of this Nation now and provide an economically sound future for our children. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, today, I must express my profound disappointment at the majority's inability to address the need to end the U.S. dependence on imported oil.

Renewable energy development is our best hope of moving away from foreign oil, and moving toward environmentally sound energy choices. Support for the Department of Energy's Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Programs is vital for our national energy security, particularly as renewables become increasingly cost-competitive and effective.

In addition, DOE's Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Programs support 45,000 jobs nationwide.

It is inconceivable to me that the majority would phase out our investment in renewables. The long-term cost savings renewables promise should make these programs a national priority, not a target for short-term budgetary gains.

I urge the Congress to reject the budget resolution's treatment of renewable energy. We should restore and reaffirm our national commitment to renewable research and development.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 178, the Fiscal Year 1997 Republican Budget Resolution. The American people must clearly understand that the Republicans' Fiscal Year 1997 Budget Resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 178, which eliminates 130 programs and the Department of Commerce and the Department of Energy, is a continuation of their attack on the most vulnerable among us, children, seniors, veterans, and hard working families across the country.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have decided to ignore the message of the American people to protect the quality of life, to protect the environment, and to protect education.

Instead, they have intensified their attack on those in the dawn of life, our children and those in the twilight of life our seniors. Programs and services that are critical to helping to ensure a reasonable quality of life for the most vulnerable are being gutted, once again, so that the GOP can give a tax cut to the wealthy.

Medicare is cut \$158 billion threatening access to quality health care for millions of seniors. Provisions that were designed to help control the escalating cost of health care services for seniors are being repealed. Medicaid is cut \$72 billion. Poor children, disabled persons, and low-income seniors are at risk of losing their health care coverage. Medicaid is converted to a block grant, and States are left to determine eligibility, and the duration and scope of health services to be provided. In addition, State funding match requirements are reduced.

By cutting over \$4 billion from financial aid, the Republican budget reduces the opportunity for hard working families to help their children get a college education. In addition to eliminating, student aid funding provided by the State incentive grant program, and fellowships and scholarships, the direct lending program is also eliminated.

By dramatically cutting funding for housing and the earned income tax credit, the Republican budget will make it increasingly difficult for low-income hard working families to make ends meet. These families are already struggling, the added burden could destroy them.

Banking and housing programs are cut \$5.3 billion. Welfare-related programs are cut \$53 billion and converted to a block grant. The job opportunities and basic skills program and the child care services program are among the programs slated for elimination.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget threatens the stability of families across the country. Families do not want a handout, all they need, from time to time, is a helping hand to help them get back on their feet.

Mr. Chairman, these GOP budget tactics and misplaced priorities should come as no surprise to the American people. The Republicans touted last year that if they did not get the cuts in funding that they needed in the fiscal year 1996 budget, to give a \$245 billion tax cut to the rich, the crown jewel in the GOP's Contract With America, they would shut the Government down. And, as each of us recalls, they did just that, our Republican colleagues held the American people hostage, shut the Government down, and denied them access to critical services. That GOP tantrum cost the American people \$1.5 billion, and it needlessly increased the deficit.

The GOP touted last year that if they did not get the cuts they wanted in fiscal year 1996, they would cut programs

and services further in fiscal year 1997, and they are doing just that. You may also recall that our Republican colleagues emphasized throughout the fiscal year 1996 appropriations process, that the fiscal year 1996 cuts were just a downpayment on their budget gutting mission to give a tax cut to the rich.

This outrageous fiscal year 1997 budget is extremely harmful to America's families and citizens, no one is safe from the tremendous pain and suffering that would result if this measure is passed.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of our Nation's children, working families, veterans, and seniors, this bill must be defeated. I ask my colleagues to join me in voting no, on House Concurrent Resolution 178.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget resolution continues the assault on civilian research and development initiated in the first session of the 104th Congress. As compared to the President's request, House Concurrent Resolution 178 cuts over \$3 billion in fiscal year 1997 and nearly \$18 billion over the 6-year period from civilian science agencies. A summary of some of the anticipated impacts follows:

#### NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

If implemented, the Fiscal Year 1997 Republican Budget Resolution would have a deeply negative impact on the nation's civil space program. Not only does it cut the national Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA) budget by almost three quarters of a billion dollars more than the Administration over the six-year period, but it makes those cuts in a manner that would fundamentally destroy the balanced program that has been a hallmark of the space program since its inception almost four decades ago.

Specifically, the Budget Resolution would slash the funding for the Mission to Planet Earth (MTPPE)—a major national environmental research and monitoring initiative—by a third (i.e., by almost \$2.8 billion over six years), effectively canceling the project as currently conceived. In addition, the Budget Resolution would cut NASA's aeronautics budget by almost \$900 million over the same period. A cut of that magnitude will jeopardize important research initiatives in aircraft safety; improvement of the nation's air traffic management system; development of quieter, more fuel-efficient aircraft; and many other important areas. The aeronautics funding cut is particularly troubling in view of the fact that the aviation sector has traditionally made a huge positive contribution to the U.S. trade balance and has been the source of hundreds of thousands of high-tech jobs for American workers. In sum, implementation of the Budget Resolution would do damage to NASA and to the nation's R&D capabilities.

#### NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Although the Republicans have proclaimed that they assign the highest priority to basic research in the federal R&D budget, NSF, the agency with the broadest charter for support of basic research and science education, would decline in actual buying power. Although there is proposed a 3% growth for NSF's research accounts, the resolution provides for no growth in its education direc-

torate and other critical operations. In addition, the increase proposed for the research account is about \$40 million below the President's request, which would provide 4.7% growth. This translates into nearly 500 fewer research projects being funded in fiscal year 1997.

The Budget Committee's report language continues the indirect assault begun last year on the social and behavioral sciences at NSF. The report endorses the elimination of one scientific directorate and states that "no reductions are assumed to NSF basic research on the physical sciences". This position is taken despite the widespread support for the social and behavioral sciences from the scientific community. The President of the National Academy of Sciences, Dr. Bruce Alberts, has stated that research in these areas have made significant contributions to the store of knowledge and to the ability to meet critical societal challenges and that NSF supported projects in these disciplines have contributed significant advances in research. In contrast, the President's budget request for NSF places no restrictions on areas of inquiry in the basic research programs, relying instead on the agency's merit review processes through which scientists select the most promising research directions to advance fundamental knowledge.

#### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The budget resolution would cut energy efficiency and coal, oil and natural gas R&D by 50% from FY 96 levels in the first year and would terminate them altogether in four years. It would make a 48% cut in solar and renewable R&D programs in FY 97 and larger unspecified cuts in the out years. [Although not considered energy R&D, the budget resolution would also cut Energy Information Administration programs by 42% from the FY 96 level.]

Now that the Nation's attention is once again focused on the vulnerability of America's energy supplies, it is ironic that the resolution eliminates those very programs that offer some potential for avoiding or ameliorating future situations like this year's sudden and sharp increases in oil and gasoline prices. These programs help Americans develop new energy resources, use energy in increasingly efficient ways, and otherwise keep our cost of using energy as low as possible. Beyond these energy security and economic benefits, these programs provide environmental benefits by reducing our use of energy resources and by developing economically attractive and cleaner ways to produce and use existing and new energy resources.

Also included herein is a letter signed by nine Republican Members of the Committee on Science expressing a desire for alternative levels of funding for these programs than contained in the Budget Resolution or those contained in the Committee's authorization bill.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

The guidance provided in this Budget Resolution and its accompanying report paint a clear picture of the Republican's hostility towards environmental protection issues and the illogical basis for some key Republican policy positions. The budget resolution assumes that elimination of funds for EPA's science programs will result in greater availability and use of sound science by the Agency in its attempts to protect public health and the environment. Appendix 2 of the report makes clear the Republican position that all regulations are simply a drain on the budget and on our economy. Clearly, this is no endorsement for the utilization of agen-

cy regulatory authority to achieve environmental protection goals.

In theory, one logical alternative might be the use of non-regulatory initiatives, in cooperation with business, to achieve public health and environmental goals. However, here too, the Budget Resolution concludes that non-regulatory programs are also unacceptable. Three of EPA's Office of Research and Development non-regulatory programs: the Environmental Technologies Initiative, climate change research, and indoor air research are singled out for elimination.

Environmental technologies create jobs, generate trade surpluses, and result in economic activities with fewer negative effects on the environment. These are the things that Republicans have asserted can be achieved without regulation. Apparently they also think this can be achieved without funding or participation by the agencies charged with protecting the environment.

The evidence that our climate may be impacted by human activities has been increasing, not decreasing over time. Rather than approach this situation from an informed position, the Republicans choose to ignore the problem by shutting down the flow of information. History has taught us that ignorance does not come cheap. The small amount of money saved by eliminating global climate change research will not balance the budget and puts us at risk of huge expenditures in the future.

The cancellation of indoor air research in EPA is justified by assuming that this is a responsibility of OSHA. There are two major flaws in this assumption. First this assumes that there are no health problems associated with air quality in residences—this is not supported by the facts. Second, barely 30 pages further in the report the Budget Resolution calls for the termination of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

Drastic cuts in environmental research funding and termination of voluntary, non-regulatory initiatives done in cooperation with industry are unlikely to achieve a cleaner environment and adequate human health protection at lower costs. Although the majority's rhetoric declares solid support for environmental protection, the policies and funding priorities contained in this resolution make it clear they are unwilling to back up their rhetoric with real resources.

#### NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

Although the proposed reductions in FY 97 are largely absorbed by an elimination of Congressionally earmarked programs and the Administration's own plans to phase out the NOAA fleet and corps, reductions in later years can only be accommodated by a substantial cutback in NOAA's core missions relating to weather services, environmental and resource management, and research and development. The Budget Resolution would cut over \$2.7 billion, or 20%, from NOAA's core mission over the six year period. Under these circumstances, NOAA would need to:

Delay the ongoing installation of new technologies and field restructuring to support Weather Service Modernization;

Cut in half future weather satellite coverage resulting in a blackout should a working satellite fail.

Withdraw from its participation in supporting DOD in critical meteorological services including the converted polar meteorological satellite program and in providing nautical charts and data for safe naval operations;

Scale back fishery management nationwide leading to increased overfishing and allocation conflicts;

Scale back on coastal programs that protect productive and diverse habitats for fish and wildlife, promote cleaner coastal waters for recreation and seafood production, and foster healthy coastal ecosystems;

Eliminate nautical charting activities and navigational services that provide for safe and efficient seagoing commerce;

Reduce research activities relating to improving operations for predicting severe weather including hurricanes and tornadoes; and,

Reduce research activities relating to atmospheric and oceanic monitoring that supports long-term climate forecasts.

These proposed reductions and the resulting impacts on NOAA's programs will sacrifice American lives, property and the national security by crippling weather service modernization and operations, preventing the recovery of fisheries and protected species, severely curtail vital research, and jeopardize safe and efficient seagoing commerce.

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

This resolution again calls for the cancellation of the technology partnership programs within the Department of Commerce. The elimination of the Advanced Technology Program, the Manufacturing Extension Program, and the National Information Infrastructure Grant Program would result in a cut of \$330 million in R&D from the FY 1996 level and \$526 million from the FY 97 request level.

Elimination of the Advanced Technology Program would result in the cancellation of new program competitions expected to yield over 100 new awards. To date, ATP has yielded over \$1 billion in private sector matching funds. In addition, the Government would be forced to renege on out year commitments to over 500 innovative companies. ATP is a rigorously competitive, cost-shared program that fosters technology development, promotes industrial alliances, and creates jobs.

Elimination of the Manufacturing Extension Program would force the closure of 75 MEP centers across the country that provide valuable technical assistance to our Nation's 381,000 smaller manufacturers. Surveys of client data from MEP indicate an 8:1 return on the Federal investment.

Elimination of National Information Infrastructure Grants would result in no funding for roughly 165 projects designed to ensure access to advanced innovative telecommunications and information applications across the country.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, May 7, 1996.

Hon. JOHN KASICH,

Chairman, Committee on Budget, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KASICH: As Republican Members of the House Science Committee, we are writing today in support of continued funding for research and development programs which provide our nation with a sound alternative energy policy.

On Wednesday, April 24, 1996, the House Science Committee marked up our FY'97 Authorization bill without including the title on the Department of Energy, specifically the Energy Supply Research and Development programs. Since it is unlikely any new authorization actions will occur on these critical programs before the Budget Committee markup, we wanted to go on record as strong supporters of alternative energy research and development programs. As a number of Asian and European countries develop significant global economies, the United

States will be forced to compete for an ultimately smaller share of the world's finite oil supply. These programs hold the key to our nation's future energy needs.

#### RENEWABLE ENERGY AND EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS

Between FY'95 actual spending and FY'97 proposed budget levels (based upon the FY'96 budget resolution), domestic discretionary spending has been reduced by 9.2 percent. However, the House Science Committee draft mark and the potential budget resolution mark would result in a 62 percent reduction in renewable energy programs during a two year period. Renewable energy and efficiency programs are vital to both a healthy environment and a sustainable future energy policy. With that in mind, these programs should not suffer dramatically disproportionate cuts in comparison with science programs in particular and with unwise domestic spending in general.

#### FUSION ENERGY PROGRAM

Last year the Science Committee recommended a substantial decrease in the fusion budget and called for a restructuring of the program. In line with the recommendations of the Fusion Energy Advisory Committee (FEAC), DOE has worked to address these concerns. The first signs of this long-term redirection appears in DOE's FY'97 budget request, which calls for strengthened support for plasma physics, more research into alternative fusion concepts, increased innovation, and continued participation in the international fusion program. We urge the Budget Committee to support DOE's ability to maintain a viable fusion energy program within the FEAC report recommendations.

As you proceed with the budget resolution for FY'97, we ask that renewable energy and efficiency programs be considered a priority and not be unfairly or disproportionately cut.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

MATT SALMON,  
SHERWOOD BOEHLERT,  
CURT WELDON,  
TOM DAVIS,  
MARK FOLEY,  
ROSCOE BARTLETT,  
CONNIE MORELLA,  
VERN EHLERS,  
STEVE STOCKMAN.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NORWOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAMP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 178) establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1997 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, pursuant to House Resolution 435, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Pursuant to clause 7, rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 226, nays 195, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—226

|               |               |               |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Allard        | Frisa         | Myers         |
| Archer        | Funderburk    | Myrick        |
| Armedy        | Galleghy      | Nethercutt    |
| Bachus        | Ganske        | Neumann       |
| Baker (CA)    | Gekas         | Ney           |
| Baker (LA)    | Geren         | Norwood       |
| Ballenger     | Gilchrest     | Nussle        |
| Barr          | Gillmor       | Oxley         |
| Barrett (NE)  | Goodlatte     | Parker        |
| Bartlett      | Goodling      | Petri         |
| Barton        | Goss          | Pombo         |
| Bass          | Graham        | Porter        |
| Bateman       | Greene (UT)   | Portman       |
| Bereuter      | Greenwood     | Pryce         |
| Bilbray       | Gunderson     | Quinn         |
| Billrakis     | Gutknecht     | Radanovich    |
| Bliley        | Hall (TX)     | Ramstad       |
| Blute         | Hancock       | Regula        |
| Boehert       | Hansen        | Riggs         |
| Boehner       | Hastert       | Roberts       |
| Bonilla       | Hastings (WA) | Rogers        |
| Bono          | Hayworth      | Rohrabacher   |
| Brownback     | Heffley       | Ros-Lehtinen  |
| Bryant (TN)   | Heineman      | Roth          |
| Bunn          | Herger        | Roukema       |
| Bunning       | Hillery       | Royce         |
| Burr          | Hobson        | Salmon        |
| Burton        | Hoekstra      | Sanford       |
| Buyer         | Hoke          | Saxton        |
| Callahan      | Horn          | Scharborough  |
| Calvert       | Hostettler    | Scarfefer     |
| Camp          | Houghton      | Schiff        |
| Campbell      | Hunter        | Seastrand     |
| Canady        | Hutchinson    | Sensenbrenner |
| Castle        | Hyde          | Shadegg       |
| Chabot        | Inglis        | Shaw          |
| Chambliss     | Istook        | Shays         |
| Chenoweth     | Johnson (CT)  | Shuster       |
| Christensen   | Johnson, Sam  | Skeen         |
| Chrysler      | Jones         | Smith (MI)    |
| Clinger       | Kasich        | Smith (NJ)    |
| Coble         | Kelly         | Smith (TX)    |
| Collins (GA)  | Klim          | Smith (WA)    |
| Combest       | King          | Solomon       |
| Condit        | Kingston      | Souder        |
| Cooley        | Klug          | Spence        |
| Cox           | Knollenberg   | Stearns       |
| Crane         | Kolbe         | Stockman      |
| Crapo         | LaHood        | Stump         |
| Creameans     | Largent       | Tate          |
| Cubin         | Latham        | Tauzin        |
| Cunningham    | LaTourette    | Taylor (MS)   |
| Davis         | Laughlin      | Taylor (NC)   |
| Deal          | Lazio         | Thomas        |
| DeLay         | Leach         | Thornberry    |
| Diaz-Balart   | Lewis (KY)    | Tiahrt        |
| Dickey        | Lightfoot     | Torkildsen    |
| Doolittle     | Linder        | Upton         |
| Dornan        | Livingston    | Vucanovich    |
| Dreier        | LoBiondo      | Walker        |
| Duncan        | Longley       | Walsh         |
| Dunn          | Lucas         | Wamp          |
| Ehrlich       | Martini       | Watts (OK)    |
| Emerson       | McCollum      | Weldon (FL)   |
| Ensign        | McCrery       | Weldon (PA)   |
| Everett       | McDade        | Weller        |
| Ewing         | McHugh        | White         |
| Fawell        | McInnis       | Whitfield     |
| Fields (TX)   | McIntosh      | Wicker        |
| Foley         | McKeon        | Woff          |
| Forbes        | Metcalfe      | Young (AK)    |
| Fowler        | Meyers        | Young (FL)    |
| Fox           | Mica          | Zeliff        |
| Franks (CT)   | Montgomery    | Zimmer        |
| Franks (NJ)   | Moorhead      |               |
| Frelinghuysen | Morella       |               |

NAYS—195

|              |            |             |
|--------------|------------|-------------|
| Abercrombie  | Berman     | Brown (OH)  |
| Ackerman     | Bevill     | Bryant (TX) |
| Andrews      | Bishop     | Cardin      |
| Baessler     | Bonior     | Chapman     |
| Baldacci     | Borski     | Clay        |
| Barcia       | Boucher    | Clayton     |
| Barrett (WI) | Brewster   | Clement     |
| Becerra      | Browder    | Clyburn     |
| Bellenson    | Brown (CA) | Coburn      |
| Bentsen      | Brown (FL) | Coleman     |

|               |                |               |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| Collins (IL)  | Jefferson      | Pelosi        |
| Conyers       | Johnson (SD)   | Peterson (FL) |
| Costello      | Johnson, E. B. | Peterson (MN) |
| Coyne         | Johnston       | Pickett       |
| Cramer        | Kanjorski      | Pomeroy       |
| Cummings      | Kaptur         | Poshard       |
| Danner        | Kennedy (MA)   | Rahall        |
| de la Garza   | Kennedy (RI)   | Rangel        |
| DeFazio       | Kennelly       | Reed          |
| DeLauro       | Kildee         | Richardson    |
| Dellums       | Kleczka        | Rivers        |
| Deutsch       | Klink          | Roemer        |
| Dicks         | LaFalce        | Rose          |
| Dingell       | Lantos         | Roybal-Allard |
| Dixon         | Levin          | Rush          |
| Doggett       | Lewis (GA)     | Sabo          |
| Dooley        | Lincoln        | Sanders       |
| Doyle         | Lipinski       | Sawyer        |
| Durbin        | Lofgren        | Schroeder     |
| Edwards       | Lowey          | Schumer       |
| Engel         | Luther         | Scott         |
| English       | Maloney        | Serrano       |
| Eshoo         | Manton         | Sisisky       |
| Evans         | Markey         | Skaggs        |
| Farr          | Martinez       | Skelton       |
| Fattah        | Mascara        | Slaughter     |
| Fazio         | Matsui         | Spratt        |
| Fields (LA)   | McCarthy       | Stark         |
| Fliner        | McDermott      | Stenholm      |
| Flake         | McHale         | Studds        |
| Flanagan      | McKinney       | Stupak        |
| Foglietta     | McNulty        | Tanner        |
| Ford          | Meehan         | Tejeda        |
| Frank (MA)    | Meek           | Thompson      |
| Frost         | Menendez       | Thornton      |
| Furse         | Millender-     | Thurman       |
| Gejdenson     | McDonald       | Torres        |
| Gephardt      | Miller (CA)    | Torricelli    |
| Gibbons       | Minge          | Towns         |
| Gilman        | Mink           | Trafficant    |
| Gonzalez      | Moakley        | Velazquez     |
| Gordon        | Mollohan       | Vento         |
| Green (TX)    | Moran          | Visclosky     |
| Gutierrez     | Murtha         | Volkmer       |
| Hall (OH)     | Nadler         | Ward          |
| Hamilton      | Neal           | Waters        |
| Harman        | Oberstar       | Watt (NC)     |
| Hastings (FL) | Obey           | Waxman        |
| Hefner        | Olver          | Williams      |
| Hilliard      | Ortiz          | Wilson        |
| Hinchee       | Ortiz          | Wise          |
| Holden        | Owens          | Woolsey       |
| Hoyer         | Pallone        | Wynn          |
| Jackson (IL)  | Pastor         | Yates         |
| Jackson-Lee   | Payne (NJ)     |               |
| (TX)          | Payne (VA)     |               |

NOT VOTING—12

|              |             |         |
|--------------|-------------|---------|
| Collins (MI) | Lewis (CA)  | Packard |
| Ehlers       | Manzullo    | Paxon   |
| Hayes        | Miller (FL) | Quillen |
| Jacobs       | Mollinari   | Talent  |

□ 1648

Mr. CHAPMAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on Thursday, May 16, 1996, and was unable to cast my vote on rollcall vote No. 179, which was the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 178, the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on this rollcall. I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following rollcall vote No. 179.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, due to a family emergency, I missed rollcall votes 178 and 179 pertaining to the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution. Had I been present, I would have

voted on rollcall No. 178, "no" and on rollcall No. 179, "yes." I request unanimous consent that my statement be included following the vote in the permanent record.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 178, the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 582 AND H.R. 1972

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 582 and H.R. 1972.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the esteemed leader of the majority, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], to give us the schedule for the coming week and perhaps beyond.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have concluded our legislative business for the week and I might say in time for Mr. KIKa DE LA GARZA to make his 5 o'clock plane which has worried me all day long.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I am sure that is greatly appreciated.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have concluded our legislative business for the week.

On Monday, May 20, the House will meet in pro forma session. There will be no legislative business—and no votes—on that day.

On Tuesday, May 21, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Members should note that we do not anticipate votes until after 5 p.m. on Tuesday, May 21.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday next, the House will consider: Seven bills under suspension of the rules—a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices; the rule for H.R. 3259, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997; and H.R. 3415, a bill to repeal Clinton's

1993 gas tax, which will be subject to a rule.

On Wednesday, May 22, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to consider H.R. 1227, a bill relating to payments for employees who use employer-owned vehicles and H.R. 3448, the Small Business Job Protection Act, both of which will be subject to the same rule.

On Wednesday we will also take up H.R. 3259, the Intelligence Authority Act for Fiscal Year 1997. Members should be prepared to work well into the evening on Wednesday, May 22.

On Thursday, May 23, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to consider H.R. 3144, the Defend America Act of 1996, which will be subject to a rule.

Mr. Speaker, we should finish legislative business and have Members on their way home by 6 p.m. on Thursday, May 23.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in knowing whether there is any time in the future where the dime that was added to the gas tax by Senator DOLE will be brought before the Members for a vote.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for the inquiry. It was rather interesting.

Mr. FAZIO of California. On a more relevant note on the schedule, I wondered if the gentleman could tell me, looking down the road at the long-term schedule, with the House returning from Memorial Day on Wednesday, May 29, after 2 p.m., many Members are really wondering whether or not there would be some possibility of a further movement of that 2 p.m. time frame to perhaps 5 p.m. so perhaps members from the Far West could travel and be here for votes. How immutable is the 2 p.m. on return from the Memorial Day break?

Mr. ARMEY. Let me thank the gentleman for that inquiry. That is something we have under consideration. We certainly want to be sure that we are able to resolve that early next week so that Members can have an opportunity to make whatever plans they can. I should only say that it is something that is possible at this point. I just do not feel comfortable with saying anything more definitive than that.

Mr. FAZIO of California. But it is possible that perhaps early next week we could have some notice that you have made that change?

Mr. ARMEY. I would hope to have that.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I appreciate that.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 20, 1996

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

—  
 HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY,  
 MAY 21, 1996

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, May 20, 1996, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 21, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

—  
 DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR  
 WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON  
 WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

—  
 REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3415, REPEAL OF 4.3-CENT INCREASE IN TRANSPORTATION FUELS TAXES

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-580) on the resolution (H. Res. 436) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3415) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 4.3-cent increase in the transportation motor fuels excise tax rates enacted by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 and dedicated to the general fund of the Treasury, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

—  
 REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3259, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-581) on the resolution (H. Res. 437) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3259) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

—  
 REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3144, DEFEND AMERICA ACT OF 1996

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-582) on the resolution (H. Res. 438) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3144) to establish a United States policy for the deployment of a national missile defense system, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

—  
 CONTINUING NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-214)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I hereby report to the Congress on developments since the last Presidential report of November 28, 1995, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order No. 12170 of November 14, 1979. This report is submitted pursuant to section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c). This report covers events through March 1, 1996. My last report, dated November 28, 1995, covered events through September 29, 1995.

1. Effective March 1, 1996, the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control ("FAC") amended the Iranian Assets Control Regulations, 31 CFR Part 535 ("IACR"), to reflect changes in the status of litigation brought by Iran against close relatives of the former Shah of Iran seeking the return of property alleged to belong to Iran (61 *Fed. Reg.* 8216, March 4, 1996). In 1991, Shams Pahlavi, sister of the former Shah of Iran, was identified in section 535.217(b) of the IACR as a person whose assets were blocked based on proof of service upon her in litigation of the type described in section 535.217(a). Pursuant to that provision, all property and assets located in the United States within the possession or control of Shams Pahlavi were blocked until all pertinent litigation against her was finally terminated. Because the litigation has been finally terminated, reference to Shams Pahlavi has been deleted from section 535.217(b). A copy of the amendment is attached to this report.

2. The Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal, established at The Hague pursuant to the Algiers Accords, continues to make

progress in arbitrating the claims before it. Since my last report, the Tribunal has rendered one award, bringing the total number to 567. The majority of those awards have been in favor of U.S. claimants. As of March 1996, the value of awards to successful U.S. claimants from the Security Account held by the NV Settlement Bank was \$2,376,010,041.91.

In February 1996, Iran deposited funds into the Security Account, established by the Algiers Accords to ensure payment of awards to successful U.S. claimants for the first time since October 8, 1992. The Account was credited \$15 million on February 22, 1996. However, the Account has remained continuously below the \$500 million balance required by the Algiers Accords since November 5, 1992. As of March 1, 1996, the total amount in the Security Account was \$195,370,127.71, and the total amount in the Interest Account was \$37,055,050.92.

Therefore, the United States continues to pursue Case A/28, filed in September 1993, to require Iran to meet its obligations under the Algiers Accords to replenish the Security Account. Iran filed its Statement of Defense in that case on August 30, 1995. The United States filed a Reply on December 4, 1995. Iran is scheduled to file its Rejoinder on June 4, 1996.

3. The Department of State continues to present other United States Government claims against Iran and to respond to claims brought against the United States by Iran, in coordination with concerned government agencies.

In November 1995, Iran filed its latest Response concerning the United States Request to Dismiss Certain Claims from Case B/61. The United States had filed its Request to Dismiss in August 1995 as part of its consolidated submission on the merits. Iran had previously filed its initial response in July 1995, and the United States filed a reply in August 1995. Case B/61 involves a claim by Iran for compensation with respect to primarily military equipment that Iran alleges it did not receive. Iran had sought to purchase or repair the equipment pursuant to commercial contracts with more than 50 private American companies. Iran alleges that it suffered direct losses and consequential damages in excess of \$2 billion in total because of the United States Government refusal to allow the export of the equipment after January 19, 1981, in alleged contravention of the Algiers Accords. Iran's November 1995 filing failed to show why the Tribunal should not dismiss immediately certain duplicative or otherwise improperly pleaded claims from Case B/61.

In December 1995, the Department of State represented the United States in hearings before the Tribunal on two government-to-government claims. In the first, Chamber Two heard oral arguments in Case B/36, the U.S. claim

against Iran for its failure to honor debt obligations created by the sale of military surplus property to Iran shortly after the Second World War. In the second, also before Chamber Two, the Department of State presented the U.S. defense in Case B/58, Iran's claim that the United States is liable for damage caused to the Iranian State Railways during the Second World War.

In January 1996, in Case B/1 (Claims 2 & 3), Iran filed its Rebuttal Memorial Concerning Responsibility for Termination Costs, along with 20 volumes of exhibits and affidavits. In this briefing stream, the Tribunal is asked to decide whether Iran or the United States is liable for the costs arising from the termination of the U.S.-Iran Foreign Military Sales program after Iran's default and its subsequent seizure of the U.S. embassy in Tehran in 1979. The United States is currently preparing a comprehensive response to Iran's brief.

In February 1996, the Departments of State and Justice represented the United States in a hearing before the full Tribunal in a government-to-government claim filed by Iran. Case A/27 is an interpretive dispute in which Iran claims that the United States is liable under the Algiers Accords for Tribunal awards issued in favor of Iran against U.S. nationals. The United States maintains that its obligation under the Algiers Accords is satisfied by the availability of domestic judicial procedures through which Iran can enforce awards in its favor.

Also in February 1996, Iran and the United States settled Iran's claims against the United States filed before the International Court of Justice concerning the July 3, 1988, downing of Iran Air 655 and certain of Iran's claims against the United States filed before the Iran-United States Tribunal concerning certain banking matters. The cases in question were dismissed from the International Court of Justice and the Iran-United States Tribunal on February 22, 1996. The settlement, *inter alia*, fulfills President Reagan's 1988 offer to make *ex gratia* payments to the survivors of the victims of the Iran Air shootdown. The survivors of each victim of the Iran Air shootdown will be paid \$300,000 (for wage-earning victims) or \$150,000 (for non-wage-earning victims). For this purpose, \$61 million was deposited with the Union Bank of Switzerland in Zurich in an account jointly held by the New York Federal Reserve Bank, acting as fiscal agent of the United States, and Bank Markazi, the central bank of Iran. Of an additional \$70 million in the settlement package, \$15 million was deposited in the Security Account established as part of the Algiers Accords. The remaining \$55 million was deposited in an account at the New York Federal Reserve Bank, from which funds can be drawn only (1) for deposits into the Security Account

used to pay Tribunal awards to American claimants or for the payment of Iran's share of the operating expenses of the Tribunal, or (2) to pay debts incurred before the date of settlement and owed by Iranian banks to U.S. nationals. Under the terms of the settlement, no money will be paid to the Government of Iran.

4. Since my last report, the Tribunal has issued one important award in favor of a U.S. national considered a dual U.S.-Iranian national by the Tribunal. On November 7, 1995, Chamber Three issued a significant decision in Claim No. 213, *Dadras Int'l and Per-Am Construction Corp. v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, awarding a dual national claimant \$3.1 million plus interest for architectural work performed for an Iranian government agency developing a housing complex outside Tehran, Iran.

The Tribunal held hearings in four large private claims. On October 23-27, 1995, Chamber One held a hearing in Claim No. 432, *Brown & Root, Inc. v. The Iranian Navy*, involving contract amounts owed in connection with the construction of the Iranian Navy Chahbahar and Bandar Projects in Iran. On January 18-19, 1996, Chamber One held a second hearing in Claim Nos. 842, 843, and 844, *Vera Aryeh, et al. v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, in which allegations of fraud and forgery were considered. Finally, the United States Government filed a Memorial on the Application of the Treaty of Amity to Dual United States-Iranian Nationals in three private claims before the Tribunal: Claim No. 485, *Riahi v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, in Chamber One on January 29, 1996; Claim No. 953, *Hakim v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, in Chamber Two on February 27, 1996; and Claim No. 266, *Aryeh, et al. v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, in Chamber Three on February 29, 1996. The Memorial argues that a good faith interpretation of the ordinary meaning of the 1955 Treaty of Amity leads to the conclusion that it protects all persons deemed to be U.S. nationals under U.S. laws when they undertake activities in Iran, regardless of whether they also possess another nationality.

5. The situation reviewed above continues to implicate important diplomatic, financial, and legal interests of the United States and its nationals and presents an unusual challenge to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. The Iranian Assets Control Regulations issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 12170 continue to play an important role in structuring our relationship with Iran and in enabling the United States to implement properly the Algiers Accords. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to deal with these problems and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 16, 1996.

IN MEMORY OF ADM. MIKE BOORDA

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a great deal of sadness and I know that every Member of the House joins me.

A little earlier our colleague, JACK MURTHA, rose to announce the tragic news of the death of Adm. Jeremy Boorda, known to many of us as Mike Boorda. Mike Boorda is a historic figure. He is the only Chief of Naval Operations to have entered at the very lowest level of the Naval ranks and rise to a four-star admiral and Chief of Naval Operations.

At this time we do not know all the facts surrounding the untimely death at approximately noontime today. But what we do know is that the Nation has lost one of its finest men, one of its finest soldiers, one of its finest sailors, one of its finest leaders.

Mike Boorda was a sailor's sailor. Mike Boorda was an American's American. He was a success story. He was, in sum, an individual for whom all of us could have the greatest respect and deepest affection.

Mr. Speaker, it is with unrestrained sadness and grief that I rise to express to all of the men and women of the U.S. Navy and all of the men and women of our armed services an empathy of personal loss to each of us in this House and to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Washington, NORMAN DICKS.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment him for taking the floor and his very sensitive remarks. Mike Boorda and his wife Betty were friends of mine. They paid a great honor to my wife and I by coming out to the commissioning of the U.S.S. *Ranier* in Bremerton. I have never met a finer sailor or a person of whom I was more proud, someone who had come up through the ranks as an enlisted person to become the Chief of Naval Operations, the first time that has ever happened.

He was a tremendous leader, a person who cared deeply about the sailors, the people in the Navy and how these long deployments affected them and their families.

□ 1700

He was a tremendous leader. My heart goes out to his family. This is a tragedy. We have lost a great leader of the U.S. Navy, someone who will be missed.

I just want to commend my friend, Congressman HOYER, for taking this time. Mike Boorda will be missed, and

is someone that has served our country well. I appreciate the gentleman for taking this special order.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

My district is one that has the naval submarine base in Groton. It is something we are all very proud of. The loss that we all feel, the previous speakers have expressed it, there was no one who had a better sense of the average sailor, to the complex overview of the entire structure of the Navy. I have never met anybody who was more broadly admired or anyone who did the job that he did. He will be missed by our community, those in the Navy, and those outside the Navy who worked with him as well. It is a great loss for the Navy family, and for the country as a whole.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, and I yield to my friend from Georgia.

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

I did not know Mike Boorda personally, but I knew of him and followed a career that was meteoric. I heard of this this afternoon, standing back there talking to RON DELLUMS, and he was crushed, as was I. Our Nation is going to suffer a great and tragic loss. Our side, as well as yours, is going to miss this great man.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and would echo his words, that there is no partisanship in the grief. Each and every one of us in this House, representing every American, will grieve for the loss of such a brave and gracious and warm and capable human being.

I am glad to yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to express a sense of deep loss and regret. When the news traveled through our office, I did not personally know Admiral Boorda, but my father-in-law, Captain Robert McManis, served with him in the Navy in his 30 years, and he often told me of the admirable traits that Admiral Boorda brought to that job, of his true and deep compassion for the sailors in our Navy, of his abiding faith in the U.S. Navy, as the defender of freedom in this country. And I appreciate your kind words in expressing on behalf of all of us here in Congress that deep sense of loss and regret that came to us when we heard of this tragedy today.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to my friend from Florida, Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

As someone that has NAS Pensacola in our district and CSS, and somebody that actually was with CNO this past

weekend in Pensacola, it is a great loss to the entire naval community. He took time out of his busy schedule to come down and help us open up with President Bush the Naval Air Museum. The genuine affection that the people of Pensacola and the entire naval community had for Mike Boorda was just overwhelming that night.

Let me just say something in closing. It was not an easy job that Admiral Boorda had. There is a lot of conflict in the Navy, and a lot of social problems. It was a difficult time that the Navy was going through.

I just want to go on record as saying I could not think of a man, any man or woman in the Navy, that I would rather have guide the Navy through those difficult times. He always carried himself with a tremendous amount of dignity, and I had a great deal of respect for him. We will sorely miss him in Pensacola and throughout the naval community.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I yield to my friend from New Mexico, Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, knew Admiral Boorda. We had several dealings on a variety of national security and foreign policy issues. He was an outstanding man. He was always up front. He was candid, he was honest, he was gracious, as you described him, and I wish to participate in mourning his great loss to the country.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, as has been stated, Admiral Boorda served this Nation with honor and distinction and carried out his duties in that manner, and we are required on this sad day to carry out ours.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I will now yield to my friend from Mississippi, General MONTGOMERY, who is one of the Members of this House who knows the armed services the best, who serves as one of our highest ranking members of the Committee on National Security, and in that capacity has dealt very closely with and knows very well our late friend, Admiral Boorda.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for taking this time.

Really, I feel like I have just lost a brother. He was close to all of us. It is just a terrible shock, this sadness that it happened. Admiral Boorda, as has been mentioned here, of course, was an enlisted person and went up through the ranks.

I had the opportunity to go with him to about three different bases, and he would not come to your base unless you would give an hour's time to be with the enlisted personnel. They would sit there and they would give

him problems, and I saw him solve the problems, right in that base, right on the scene. No question about it, he was probably one of the most popular naval officers that we have ever had in the Navy.

I even, and I am sure the gentleman tried too, after he retired where he might move and live, his father died in the naval home down on the Mississippi Gulf Coast, and Admiral Boorda every week, flying a commercial flight, would come down to see his father when he was sick. He liked that area, Admiral Boorda did, and he thought about moving down there after his retirement.

I thank the gentleman for taking the time. This is a great tragedy to our Nation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, in ending, let me simply say that from time to time we lose individuals who are very special, very unique who have made an extraordinary contribution to their country and to their fellow citizens. Admiral Jeremy "Mike" Boorda was one of those.

May God bless him, and may God keep and bless his family.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### A WAR ON DRUGS REALLY SHOULD BE DECLARED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I took a 1-minute on the floor to discuss a problem that I think the American people demand we address. According to experts, 70 percent of all crime in this country is caused by people who are dealing in drugs or are drug related one way or another. Our kids are being infected by the drug culture. It is destroying our inner cities and our suburbs. It is causing a myriad of problems.

The prisons are filled with people who have dealt with drugs, used drugs, or committed crimes while under the influence of drugs, and each one of these people that are incarcerated cost up to \$30,000 a year to keep in jail. Yet the war on drugs goes on and on and on, and nothing seems to be accomplished.

We read every day that more and more people have been arrested, more cocaine has been picked up by the DEA, and yet we hear about tons and tons of cocaine that is getting past them into the United States, even though they are working very, very

hard to keep that kind of thing out of here.

Now, I was in a place called the Upper Yuagua Valley in Peru about 4 years ago, and I found that 65 percent of all the coca in the world is produced in this one valley that is about 25 miles wide and about 150 to 200 miles long. We know exactly where two-thirds of the world's coca is produced. And right across the border in Bolivia another 20 to 25 percent of the world's coca is produced. So about 90 percent of the world's coca that is turned into crack and cocaine that comes into our country and affects our kids and hurts our society and costs the taxpayers billions of dollars is in these two locations, and we are not doing a darn thing about it.

They have people down there we are paying to cut down these coca plants with a thing that is kind of like a metal weed-eater, and a good campesino cutting down these coca fields can only cut down about an acre a day. As fast as they cut it down, it is replaced tenfold by the drug dealers down there, the Medellin cartel and the others, and we cannot stop them. And we call this a war on drugs.

So I said to my colleagues this morning and I say to the administration and anybody else, Mr. Speaker, that might be paying attention, that if there is a war on drugs, I missed it. And if we do not really have a war on drugs, then let us declare a war on drugs. We could put an aircraft carrier off the coast of Peru, load it up with a herbicide called tebucyron, or spike, and at 5 o'clock in the morning take off and fly up and down the Upper Yuagua Valley and drop these little pellets that are environmentally safe. We could do the same thing in Bolivia. We would have to fly a little bit further. But we could knock out 90 percent of the world's coca production in a week. I hope everybody is listening. In 1 week we could knock out 90 percent of the world's coca production. Now if you do not have coca, you cannot make coca paste, and if you do not have coca paste, you cannot make crack cocaine or cocaine. All of the chemicals that they use to perfect coca paste and make crack cocaine that is dumped into the tributaries that is going into the Amazon River and the other rivers down there, that will no longer be going into those rivers, thus infecting the environment and killing the environment.

So I would like to say to my colleagues today, if we really wanted to stop cocaine, or if we really want to destroy the poppy plants and heroin use in this country, we know where they are producing it. All we have to do is have the guts to go in there and destroy it. And we have the ability to do it.

Now, the State Department, I talked to them about it, and they said well, we cannot violate the territorial sanc-

tity of a sovereign nation, meaning we cannot go across the border of Peru or Bolivia without their permission.

What are they going to do, shoot down our planes? Of course they would not do that. The fact of the matter is the war on drugs really is not a war on drugs; it is a hollow political statement that does not mean a darn thing. And we are spending billions of dollars nipping around the edges and our kids continue to be infected with this sort of thing.

□ 1715

We could deal with it very quickly. So I want to say to my colleagues, in closing, there is a way to deal with it. Go down there and destroy the coca plants and they will not make crack cocaine. They will not make cocaine, and it will send a tremendous signal to the drug cartels around the world, and that is, if they plant that stuff, we are going to destroy it.

Now, some of my colleagues say, well, then they will start making designer drugs in the United States. Well, if they do that, we can nail them at their laboratories because we will be able to pinpoint those. Now we know where the coca is coming from and we are not doing a darn thing about it, and it is a crying shame because it is killing American citizens.

#### TRIBUTE TO SAM RAGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great journalist, a great poet, a great North Carolinian, a great American—Sam Ragan—who died Saturday, May 11, 1996.

Born, Samuel Talmadge Ragan, 80 years ago in Granville County, Sam was devoted to his wife of 56 years, Marjorie, their two daughters, Talmadge and Nancy, his two grandchildren Robin and Eric, his family and a host of friends. He was also devoted to his community, to North Carolina and the people who call them home.

Consider his poem:

#### THE MARKED AND UNMARKED

I cannot say upon which luminous evening  
I shall go out beyond the stars,  
To windless spaces and unmarked time,  
Turning nights to days and days to nights.  
This is the place where I live.  
I planted this tree.  
I watched it grow.  
The leaves fall and I scuff them with my feet.  
This is the street on which I walk,  
I have walked it many times.  
Sometimes it seems there are echoes of my walking—

In the mornings, in the nights,  
In those long evenings of silence and stars  
—the unmarked stars.

During his life Sam marked the way for those who would come after him. His résumé was long, varied, and impressive. His accolades and awards too numerous to list. After college graduation, he began his career in journalism when journalists were men of letters.

As an editor in Wilmington, NC, early in his career, when Sam needed a sportswriter, he hired a young man named David Brinkley. In 1941, Sam joined the Raleigh News and Observer as State editor.

During World War II, he served in Army Intelligence for 3 years and then returned to the News and Observer in 1946, where he became the managing editor in 1948. From 1957 to 1968 he served as the executive news editor for the News and Observer and the Raleigh Times.

In 1968, he moved to Southern Pines and purchased the Pilot Newspaper; serving as editor, publisher, and business manager until his death. Under his stewardship, the paper grew from a weekly with circulation of 3,000 to a twice-a-week newspaper with circulation of 16,000.

Former Gov. Terry Sanford said "Sam Ragan was one of North Carolina's treasures. He was a crusading editorial force at the News and Observer where he fought for the improvement of education, the elimination of racial injustice and the broadening of economic opportunities.

In 1972, North Carolina led the Nation by creating the first State cabinet-level position for the arts. Sam Ragan was appointed as the first secretary of cultural resources by then Gov. Bob Scott who said he appointed Sam because he embodied the perfect mix of businessman, manager, and artist.

In 1982, Gov. Jim Hunt appointed Sam Ragan North Carolina "Poet Laureate for Life." He was only the third person to hold the honorary title.

Sam's tall frame, flowing white hair, trademark bow tie and fedora hat, made it easy, even for those who did not know him, to pick him out of the crowd. He had an affinity for people which was readily acknowledged and returned by those who met him.

Sam always found a moment to speak with a visiting tourist, a student, or a local resident, who dropped by his office to visit; along with the civic leaders, business leaders, political candidates and elected officials who sought his counsel.

Those who are acquainted with Sam Ragan's professional activities are fully aware that as an editor he fashioned a distinguished career of recording and examining newsworthy events. How remarkable, then, that in his poetry he focused on ordinary people, the small incidents of daily life, the quiet unfolding of nature—events that never rated a headline. His unique talent

transformed simple everyday occurrences. He made ordinary people special and special people ordinary.

Throughout his life, Sam used his indomitable spirit, his influence and his opinion to steadfastly champion the arts. He enriched our literary, cultural, and journalistic heritage and the quality of our life.

To paraphrase our beloved poet laureate:

And sometimes remembering is all we have.  
Other sights and sounds  
Flood the memories  
of someone very special.  
Sam, you had a wonderful journey,  
And it's the journey that counts,  
Not the getting there.  
Here in Washington the azaleas are in bloom  
Across the miles I am proud  
and others share my pride in you—  
The very special you.

Mr. Speaker, Sam Ragan was truly a Renaissance man, a man for all times. How fortunate we are that he graced our time.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following information from "Who's Who in America" regarding Samuel Talmadge Ragan.

#### WHO'S WHO IN AMERICA 1996

Ragan, Samuel Talmadge, newspaper editor, publisher, educator, poet laureate; b. Berea, N.C., Dec. 31 1915; s. William Samuel and Emma Clare (Long) R., m. Marjorie Usher, Aug. 19, 1939; children: Nancy, Ann Talmadge. A.B., Atlantic Christian Coll., 1936, Litt.D., 1972; Litt.D., U.N.C., 1987; D.Letters, Meth. Coll., 1980; D.Lit., St. Andrews Coll., 1987. Newspaperman in N.C. and Tex., 1936-; mng. editor, author column Southern Accent in Raleigh (N.C.) News and Observer, 1948-69, exec. editor Raleigh News and Observer, also Raleigh Times, 1957-69; editor pub., author column The Pilot, Southern Pines, N.C., 1969-; sec. N.C. Dept. Arts, Culture and History, 1972-73; conductor program, commentator sta. WTVD, Durham, 1969-; spl. lectr. contemporary issues N.C. State U., 1959-68; dir. Writer's Workshop, 1963-; instr. creative writing St. Andrews Coll., 1970-, Sandhills Coll., 1969-; cons. editor St. Andrews Rev., Pembroke Mag. Author: (collected poems) The Tree in the Far Pasture, 1964, To the Water's Edge, 1971, Journey Into Morning, 1981, In the Beginning, 1985; The Democratic Party: Its Aims and Purposes, 1961, The New Day, 1964, Free Press and Fair Trial, 1967, (with Elizabeth S. Ives) Back to Beginnings, 1969. In the Beginning (with Thad Stem Jr.), 1984, A Walk Into April, 1986, Collected Poems, 1990, Editor: Weymouth Anthology, 1987; Contbr. editor: World Book Ency., 1964-; author articles, poems. Pres. Friends Coll., Inc., N.C. State, 1961-62; mem. N.C. Library Resources Com., N.C. Govt. Reorgn. Comm., 1970-; moderator N.C. Writers Forum of Charlotte, 1963-; Trustee N.C. Sch. Arts, 1963-72; mem. N.C. Adminstrn. of Justice Council, 1964-, chmn., 1980-83; bd dirs N.C. Symphony Soc., 1975-79. Served with AUS, 1943-46, PTO. Recipient N.C. Tercentenary Poetry award, 1963. Spl. Citation for Contbns. to Journalism Atlantic Christian Coll., North Caroliniana Soc. award, 1981, Disting. Svc. medal DAR, 1974, Edward Arnold Young award, 1981, Disting., Svc. medal DAR, 1974, Edward Arnold Young award for Poetry, 1965, 72, 91, Morrison award for contbns. to arts N.C., 1976, N.C. award for achievements in arts, 1979, R. Hunt Parker

award for contbns. to lit., 1987, N.C. Artists awarded United Arts Coun., 1990, Caldwell award for contbns. and achievements in humanities, N.C. Humanities Coun., 1993; inducted into N.C. Journalism Hall of Fame, 1984; appointed Poet Laureate N.C. for life, 1982. Mem. N.C. Lit. Forum (moderator 1956-), N.C. Writers Conf. (chmn. 1962-63), Eastern N.C. Press Assn. (past pres.), N.C. Press Assn. (pres. 1973-74), Asso. Press Mng. Editors Assn. (dir. gen. chmn. continuing studies 1961, sec. 1962, v.p. 1963, pres 1964), Am. Soc. Newspaper Editors (dir., chmn. freedom of info. com. 1968), Roanoke Island Hist. Soc. (dir.), N.C. News Council (past pres.), N.C. Arts Council (chmn. 1967-72), Am. Newspaper Pubs. Assn., N.C. Lit. and Hist. Assn. (pres. 1977), Friends of Weymouth (pres. 1979-84), Sigma Delta Chi. Democrat. Presbyterian. Club: Sandhills Kiwanis (Southern Pines); Builders Cup 1985. Homes: 255 Hill Rd Southern Pines NC 28387-6633 Office: 145 W Pennsylvania Ave Southern Pines NC 28387-5428.

#### APPRECIATION FOR ALL WHO FOUGHT RECENT NEW MEXICO FOREST FIRES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, imagine being face to face with a powerful beast that can frighten the most ferocious bear. This beast is a forest fire, and the U.S. Forest Service has recently confronted two immense fires in northern New Mexico. The U.S. Forest Service in our State has done a splendid job in containing these two fires and they deserve great credit.

I want to express my appreciation to Chip Cartwright, the regional forester in New Mexico; Leonard Lucero, the head of the Carson Forest; Al Defler, head of the Santa Fe Forest; and Gary Schiff of the Forest Service, whose well-executed planning led to the containment of these fires which threatened our communities and our treasured forests in New Mexico.

I also want to include for the RECORD a step-by-step analysis of exactly what the Forest Service has to do to contain a forest fire, and I will submit that information for the RECORD.

The statement highlights the mission of the Forest Service, which involved air attacks, the safe evacuation of residents, the coordination of hundreds of firefighting crews, and the overall exceptional communication that was coordinated by the Service. All this was being done while fire was burning on very steep slopes with high fuel loads, strong wind gusts, and unseasonably hot and dry weather.

Over 7,000 acres were burned. Entire communities were threatened by the fires, which creates a tremendous amount of stress that Forest Service officials must endure while making on-the-spot decisions. One decision included an ordered evacuation of the residents of Lama in northern Taos County.

As the raging storm headed their way it was critical that the evacuation was handled in an orderly and calm fashion. Most individuals worked around the clock fighting both fires, which occurred one after the other. Gary Loving, for example, just completed his duties as incident commander for the Dome fire in the Santa Fe when he was called to duty in the Carson.

While our Federal employees who manage public lands have been the subject of much criticism, now is the right time to acknowledge them for their true dedication and devoting to their duties as protectors of the land.

Before I close, I also want to mention the wonderful efforts of the volunteer firefighting organizations, New Mexico forestry officials, Federal, State, and local agencies, the Red Cross, the residents of Lama and Red River, Questa, Taos, White Rock, Jemez, Los Alamos, and Santa Fe, and everyone who gave their time toward fighting these fires. These individuals have shown an entire Nation how caring about one another and rallying together and working together can overcome any tragedy.

I also want to thank the Small Business Administration, Phil Lader especially, the Administrator. Just today, the Small Business Administration has announced that Taos County, where this fire took place, is a Federal disaster area. That means that the residents of Lama who lost their homes, and there is a total of 31 families, can now apply for low-interest loans. In the same vein, businesses that were struck down by the fire can apply for low-interest loans to rebuild.

Mr. Speaker, here is evidence of the Federal Government being able to help. Recently, the Federal Emergency Management Agency went to northern New Mexico to inspect damage, and they are working to see if they can be helpful, along with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Here we have a situation where nature strikes, there are a lot of victims, and then the Federal Government can come in with some good programs and well-trained people and help citizens.

Mr. Speaker, New Mexico is also not burning. Only 1 percent of northern Taos County burned. We are sending a message out to the rest of the country from New Mexico that we welcome visitors; that the State is not on fire; that we have some of the best hiking and fishing and cultural representation of our country in our State. And we hope that despite this tragedy, that America will come to New Mexico.

The fire is under control. The Carson and the Santa Fe are still at risk, and if visitors come they have to be very careful about not initiating any camp fires or throwing matches on the ground or being careless because we are faced with a very, very precarious situation, especially in the Carson.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by once again thanking members of the

U.S. Forest Service for the splendid job they did in containing these two fires in New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, the information referred to earlier is submitted herewith:

**REPORT ON THE HONDO WILDFIRE AND OUR APPRECIATION TO THOSE WHO FOUGHT THE BLAZE**

(By Congressman Bill Richardson)

At 12:30 PM on Sunday, May 5, our Taos Zone Dispatcher, Paul Mondragon, received a report of a fire spreading in San Cristobal canyon. Phil Tafoya, a Carson National Forest law enforcement officer, was dispatched to the scene. Fifteen minutes later, Marc Trujillo, the Carson's Fire Management Officer, ordered an air attack. By 2:15 PM planes were dropping their first loads in efforts to save homes and contain the fire.

In the meantime Ron Burnam, Red River Fire Marshall, and his fire crew as well as the Hondo/Saco and Taos Fire Departments were on site attempting to save homes from the ground. By 3:30 PM, Paul and Marc were ordering bulldozers and other heavy equipment to build fire lines around homes and communities. By 4:00 PM, it was apparent that this was a raging fire storm and Lama residents' lives were in danger as the storm headed their way. Carson National Forest and local fire officials recommended evacuation of the Lama area.

At 4:00 PM local forest officials, realizing the severity of the fire, requested a full Type I fire team. Within hours this team of world class fire fighting specialists began to arrive. At 5:30 PM Carson National Forest Supervisor Leonard Lucero and Marc Trujillo flew over the fire and sized up the situation. By this time the fire had reached 9000 feet in elevation and was headed for Flag Mountain, just south of the Village of Questa.

Given the rate of spread, Carson National Forest officials in coordination with State Forestry and local officials and the State Police began the evacuation of residents on the southern edge of Questa and the Town of Red River. Before midnight the Class I Team, headed by incident Commander Gary Loving, arrived, having just finished work on the Dome fire near Los Alamos, New Mexico.

Within 24 hours, 32 twenty-person fire crews, six helicopters, 24 fire engines, and five tankers were working to protect homes of local residents and contain the fire. A small city of over 1000 firefighters, fire fighting strategists, safety and information officers, cooks, communications specialists and many more appeared on a mesa just west of the fire. The challenges facing the team were daunting: fighting a fire that had already engulfed almost 7000 acres, devastated one community and was threatening two others. The fire was burning on very steep slopes, fuel loads were very high, wind gusts were strong, and the weather was unseasonably hot and dry.

Yet, within days, the team managed to contain the fire. Much of the work was done by helicopters which dumped over a million gallons of water on the fire. What is perhaps most miraculous is that not a single life was lost, nor any serious injuries, neither firefighters nor residents. And from the time the team arrived, not a single home was lost.

On behalf of all of my constituents, I want to say thanks. Thanks to Supervisor Leonard Lucero and the entire Carson National Forest team for their swift response. Thanks to local volunteer fire fighting organizations, BLM, State Forestry Officials, Red Cross, the National Guard, our State Police and all the local volunteers for all working together

seamlessly under great stress. Thanks to a wonderful community who pulled together to help those in need. Thanks to the Class I fire team and firefighters who came from all over the nation to help us. You are truly the best on the planet!

The Forest Service certainly receives their share of knocks from some who sometimes disagree with their decisions. But not this time. No one is knocking this agency in my district for these efforts. The men and women who helped us are nothing less than heroes. And we thank them from the bottom of our hearts. Muchas gracias a todos por su ayuda!

**ALLOCATION OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME**

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the place of the gentleman from California [Mr. FILLNER].

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

There was no objection.

**EXPLANATION OF BUDGET PROCESS AND VOTES ON BUDGET PROPOSALS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk a little bit about the budget process that has just passed, to put on the record the reasons I voted the way I did. I voted for the Coalition budget; I voted for the President's budget, both designed to get us to a balanced budget within a 6-year period, the same as the parameters set in the Republican leadership budget. I voted very strongly against the Republican budget.

Why did I vote for two and not the third? Well, basically the reason is, Mr. Speaker, because the first two at least recognized the importance of investment in the future for our young people, for our economic growth. Because those budgets, while they did balance in a 6-year period, the same as the Republican leadership budget, at the same time those budgets did not attempt to give tax breaks to the wealthiest individuals in this country.

The coalition budget had no tax cuts in it, recognizing that we have contradictory goals if we are trying to reduce the revenues coming in by cutting taxes and at the same time balancing the budget.

The President's budget, while it did have a tax cut in it, was a limited tax cut targeted for middle income working families and low income working families.

Neither of these budgets tried to take it out of the hide of low-income working people, such as the Republican leadership budget did, particularly because the Republican leadership budget sought to greatly reduce the earned in-

come tax credit. That is the tax cut that was greatly expanded only 2 years ago, that gives tax relief to working families earning under \$26,000 a year.

□ 1730

I was also concerned because the Republican leadership budget would cut education again, and that is a battle we had just fought. It would eliminate the Department of Commerce. If anyone can tell me why, at a time when we have got a department that is actually generating jobs, generating contracts, has brought in \$80 billion of contracts and developed a national export strategy for the first time, why we seek to eliminate it. It seems to me it is simply a matter of ideology, and that is not a satisfactory reason.

I was also concerned, Mr. Speaker, because of the cuts that are proposed in Medicare and Medicaid. I have great problems in the Republican budget with the assumption of balanced billing. In other words, a senior citizen may now be charged more by the provider and the senior will be billed directly for that, as opposed to the senior paying out of pocket being limited, as is presently the law.

I am concerned about the cuts in Medicaid, because I think what that is going to mean is that it will go to the States in a block grant, but not satisfactorily enough to meet the needs. At the same time the needs will expand, the funds will decrease.

Those are a lot of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I voted against the Republican budget but for the coalition and President's budget. I have heard a lot of talk, Mr. Speaker, about the need to, and certainly we all agree that there is a need to make sure that our young people are not burdened by debt. At the same time, there is also a compelling need to make sure they are not burdened by ignorance through lack of educational opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, there is a compelling need to make sure that our young people are not burdened by lack of opportunity because we are not investing in our economy. There is a compelling need to make sure that our young people are not burdened by the problems of crime because we are not investing adequately enough in crime control and putting police officers on the street. There is a compelling need to make sure that our young people have a future, and you have to invest in order to make that future.

So I have thought that the two budgets that I did vote for balanced the budget over 6 years, what they did was to seek to keep those domestic investments up and growing, and at the same time, to reach that goal of a balanced budget within a 6-year period.

One concern I have, Mr. Speaker, is that none of these budgets adequately addresses the need of domestic infrastructure investment, that none of

these budgets addresses the need to increase the growth rate in this country. The problem is that, if you accept the growth rate in any of the budgets, Republican or Democrat, and say that that is all we are going to grow, that is a ticket to economic stagnation over a period of time.

However, having said that, certainly the coalition budget and the President's budget, I felt, certainly offered much more satisfactory blueprints for the future than the Republican leadership budget. So I offer that as my explanation of why I voted the way I did, and why I am going to keep pressing for domestic investment so that our economy can grow.

#### ALLOCATION OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I take the gentleman's place.

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

There was no objection.

#### LET'S SAVE MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss one of the most important issues facing my constituents in east-central Florida.

It is an undisputed fact that Medicare is running out of money and will be bankrupt in just 5 years.

For me, this is not a partisan issue. This is a personal issue. I am a doctor and my patients depend on Medicare. I have a father who is dependent on Medicare.

I know the value of this program for my patients and my family, and I am 100 percent committed to finding a solution to protect Medicare for current and future beneficiaries.

As a medical doctor I've been disappointed that some have sought to use Medicare to gain political advantage. This is not a political issue.

The Medicare trust fund began going broke last year, it is already \$5 billion in debt this year, and will be completely broke in 5 years. We don't have time for politics as usual.

I hear some talk about cuts in Medicare. There are no cuts in our plan.

The plan I voted for increases Medicare spending from \$5,200 per person in 1996 to \$7,000 per person in 2002. That's an \$1,800 increase in Medicare spending.

We do want to spend smarter. We do want to attack waste, fraud, and abuse. We want to give seniors choices in health care.

I urge those who have made this a partisan issue, to look beyond partisan politics and come to the table to work

with us to do what is right for our seniors and future Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, I call for bipartisan efforts to restore and preserve our Medicare beneficiaries.

#### THE MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to agree with the comments of the gentleman from Florida about the Medicare cuts being not cuts but just slowing of the growth. This is something that we are finding in our State of Arkansas, people are being deceived by ads being paid for by special interests, and I am glad that that is brought up.

Mainly what I want to talk about today is the minimum wage. I am an employer, a restaurant owner, as well as a Member of Congress from Arkansas. All of those things are important in this discussion. But before I get into more of the specifics, I would like for us to direct our attention to something that we have not seemed to bring to center stage as much as we should. In the business world, in the marketplace, it is the consumer, the person who is buying the goods, who is the boss. We lose sight of that fact.

Mr. Speaker, if the boss finds that he or she cannot afford the price of the goods, then the boss will go to somewhere else where they can find a better price. If in fact the boss cannot go where he or she can get good service, they will go somewhere else. So all the time that we are talking about raising the minimum wage, we are not considering the fact who is paying it.

The consumer, the people who buy the goods are paying it. In my particular instance, it is the person who comes into restaurants, and no question I am biased in that viewpoint, but I want to share with this body some of the bases for my being opposed to the raise, to the rise in the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, some people think that the cost that we have in restaurants, the only increase that we will have in the minimum wage debate is what we will pay in addition to the present wage that we give now or whatever the increase might be, but that is not true. Everything that we buy, the meat, the lettuce, the tomatoes, even the transportation, the paper goods, all of these things will have increased prices or at least the push up from increased prices.

So, if I am going to sell a taco for 89 cents and I want to keep the same margins that I have had before, which I am entitled to, I have to look at the boss and say, OK, can you afford two more pennies or 91 cents? When that boss says no, I am going to pay that, then what we have to do is reduce the num-

ber of employees, which then cuts down on the service. It either cuts down on the service or makes it more difficult for the other employees who are having to work without adequate coworkers.

So the effect is that it pushes at the seams of those people who are in the penny business, like we are in the restaurant business. There are 16.7 percent of our employees in Arkansas who are on the minimum wage right now. Those are people who are getting their first-time jobs. Any employer will tell you that the first-time employees are good in one respect in that they have not been taught the wrong thing. The other respect is that they have to be taught.

So there is a learning period that goes and we pay the minimum wage. During some period of time, depending on how alert the employees are or how determined they are, they really are not worth the \$4.25 because you have to put so much into them. Then you get the \$4.25 employee if they think that that is the ceiling, that is all they are going to get, the employer finds that as he, the employer, sends the employees out to greet the customers and care for them. If an employee stays on minimum wage too long, there is a staleness that occurs.

I do not believe an employee should manage to stay more than 2 years on average on minimum wage. We hope that they will either grow through achievement and improvement in our own operation or they will go get another job and take a good recommendation with them. So the minimum wage is a limiting factor in some sense.

If you go into a business or restaurant where their minimum wage employees have been there for 4 or 5 or 6 or 7, 10 years, you are going to find a place where the service is not as good as it should be. So there is a misconception that we employers want to pay the minimum wage and get a profit from it. That is not the case. We want people to be worth more and we want to gauge that by productivity, not by the decision of liberal politicians who come in and for their own benefits give a minimum wage which in effect is an unfunded mandate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention one other thing, and that is that the people who are hurt the most by this inflationary push of expenses and cost were the people who are on minimum wage. For example, if my tacos have to go from 89 cents to 91 cents, those two extra pennies are going to have an inflationary effect. Those pennies will affect the minimum wage people to a greater extent. It is regressive to a greater extent than they would be for somebody else who is not on minimum wage. So the inflationary effect, not only will they lose some jobs because we will have to reduce the work force in order to meet the minimum wages, but there is also this factor that they

are going to have to meet inflation at the most serious level.

So what I have said I am going to do is file an amendment to say let the States decide. Eleven States now pay more than minimum wage, and I am going to prepare and file an amendment to ask that the States be allowed to decide what minimum wage they want.

#### REPORT FROM INDIANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my weekly report from Indiana. Every weekend, Ruthy and I travel around the Second District from Richmond to Muncie, to Anderson, to Greenfield, and Greensburg. So often people share with me amazing stories about their friends and neighbors and the things that they are doing in their communities. These individuals are good people who make our communities a better place to live. They give us hope for the future and our best days are yet to come.

In my book, these individuals are Hoosier heroes. Hoosier heroes because they set examples for all of us to live by. But more importantly, they make us proud.

Today I would like to share a special story about a 10-year-old boy name Dustin Sagester. Now, Dustin comes from Greensburg, IN. Our parents' generation probably would think that Dustin's story is, well, frankly, a little bit normal. But today, in today's world, it is far from normal. Dustin Sagester found a wallet down on North St. in Greensburg. Inside that wallet was \$500 cash.

Mr. Speaker, the owner of the wallet, who lives in a neighboring town of Columbus had lost his wallet 4 days earlier. The owner had given up on the wallet. He had given up on all hope of ever collecting that \$500. The owner was Jason Humphress. He frankly said that he had written it off. But you know what? Little Dustin Sagester never looked inside that wallet.

He walked right into a local store, billing store, and he turned it in. He turned it in so that the rightful owner could have his wallet back. His parents, Don and Tressy, taught him that when you find something that does not belong to you, you do not keep it and say, hey, it is my lucky day. You recognize that it belongs to someone else. Your new-found luck is somebody else's misfortune.

They taught Dustin that you do your best to find the rightful owner, and that is exactly what Dustin did. He did not know that there was so much money inside. He just knew that the wallet and whatever was inside was not his.

Mr. Speaker, I share this special report from Indiana because the people of Greensburg have recognized Dustin as one of their heroes, and I want my colleagues and all of the American people to know that Dustin is a Hoosier hero. I share this story because I think it is time that we all learn that we have to follow those basic moral values that our parents taught us so long ago, and that Dustin sets an example for the young people of this country.

□ 1745

That is my report from Indiana for this week, Mr. Speaker.

#### PROGRAMS THAT HELP PEOPLE MOST GET BIGGEST BUDGET CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we have just completed phase I of the most important process that takes place here in the Congress, and that is the budget of the United States of America for a 1-year period that deals with the fiscal 1997 budget, which will run from October 1, 1996 to September 30, 1997.

It is important that the public understand that the budget that we have discussed today in the budget process is only the beginning. It sets the upper limits in terms of expenditures in broad categories, that the real spending process which gets into great detail is the appropriations process.

Now, the Committee on Appropriations oversees the appropriation process, and the way the budget appropriations process was handled in the first half of the 104th Congress, it may be that the Committee on Appropriations could just send the rest of us home and take over and run the rest of the session because the other committees have very little power in the decision making, and this particular Congress, controlled by the Republican majority, we have less power than ever.

You know, if Congress really were to be truthful about the way it is organized, about who has real power, then it is the Committee on Appropriations, it is the Committee on Ways and Means, the two or three committees that the way they have stacked the deck and the way they guarantee control from the top have all the power. The Committee on Appropriations has far too much power.

You could organize Congress another way. Each one of the committees that has jurisdiction and authorization could also have the power to appropriate because they have the knowledge, they deal with the particular functions in an ongoing fashion, they have the oversight responsibility. They know more about each one of the func-

tions than the Committee on Appropriations knows.

For example, in education you have a Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunity, which has existed for years under another name called Education and Labor Committee, and members of that committee know a great deal about education legislation, they know a lot about how the schools operate, they know a great deal about policies and experiments and research and the knowledge that has accumulated on that committee. But when it comes to making the vital decisions about how money is going to be appropriated, it is the Committee on Appropriations which will make the decisions about how money is appropriated for education.

Now, most corporations would go out of business if they were organized that way, where the greatest amount of knowledge and know-how is concentrated in one place and the decision making, which is vital, is concentrated another place. But that is the way it operates.

So the budget starts the process, education is function 500, and this budget sets the parameters in terms of we cannot go over the figures that are set in the budget process for education. Of course, the figures are set not just by this House of Representatives, but the Senate also will have to deliberate and pass their own budget bill. There will be a reconciliation, and then the Senate and the House together will have the final say on this particular budget process because it does not go to the President.

The President started the budget process when he sent a budget to us, and these are reactions and responses to his budget. So when the budget process is finished, he does not get it back; he will not have a chance to veto the budget. Each one of the appropriation bills that then comes out of the budget process will go to the President in each one of these functions: Labor, education, health care, et cetera.

I think it is important to take note of this at this critical point. We are often to the process which matters most to the American people. How will the Federal dollars be allocated? How will the dollars that flow into the Federal Government from all over America—they are not Federal dollars; that is the wrong term—all dollars come from neighborhoods, they come from families, they come in individuals. The dollars that make up the Federal Budget are our dollars, and how will they be allocated to meet our needs, to meet the needs of the majority of the people? That is a critical question.

There has been a lot of talk about States rights and States rights to do various things, and in many cases States are assuming rights to spend money that comes back to them from the Federal Government, great

amounts of money that did not flow out of their particular State. There are a large number of States that get far more money from the Federal Government than they pay into the Federal Government from their population.

That is the way the American system is structured. We are one Nation, and the money does not flow to the States on the basis of their contribution, it flows based on many different factors. Some States are more fortunate than others at landing defense contracts. Some States are more fortunate than others in having big power projects. The TVA is not located in New York because we did not have the kind of situation where the water and the necessary conditions to create a Tennessee Valley Authority was there. So Tennessee Valley Authority was a Federal project that poured large amounts of Federal money into Tennessee. For various reasons, NASA is located in Florida, and part of it is located in Texas, and on and on it goes.

The Speaker's district has the largest contract to manufacture fighter planes. F-22 fighter planes are manufactured in Marietta, GA, which is part of the Speaker's district.

So you have large amounts of money flowing to the States from the Federal Government, and the States now said they want the right to do everything themselves. I would be willing to listen to that argument and say that in this budget-making process let us give States the right to spend money that they generate; the amount that they receive from the Federal Government, which is above the amount that came out of the State in terms of taxpayers, let us cut that off and give it back to the States which are generating the money.

I have made this argument many times because I really am very concerned about the fact that traditionally New York State has always been on the giving side and the giving has been very great, you know. It rose as high as \$23 billion in 1993, and in 1994 it is \$18 billion. We are sending to the Federal Government more than \$18 billion more than we are getting back from the Federal Government. Before that, in 1993, we were sending \$23 billion, and I am very concerned about this, and I keep speaking about it and bringing it up as often as I can because I think that New Yorkers ought to know this, people in New York ought to know this, and I think the people in the other States on the other end who are receiving the money ought to know this, that if we have States' rights, the people in New York would be far better off if they kept their \$18 billion at home, and the States that are receiving the extra money, let them fend for themselves.

You know, that is an argument in States' rights that nobody has offered, but we ought to take a close look at that.

So as we go into the budget-making process, the appropriations process will follow that. It is important to understand some of these basic contradictions and facts. But understand also that for the 104th Congress under the leadership of the Republican majority, this is now phase II, phase II of the drive to remake America.

You know, Speaker GINGRICH always says that politics is war without blood and that we are in a war to remake America. Those analogies and the comparisons with war are the Speaker's comparisons, and we have to live with them, I guess, and certainly they have prosecuted the effort so far as it was war. We have had a situation where the Republican majority has moved in a way that you move in war, you know, with a rapid movement. You know, it is revolution, it is extremism, it is not letting up, pushing to try to accomplish a great deal over a short period of time. There is a sense of desperation introduced into legislative process. They want to remake America, and they see themselves as having 2 years to remake America.

Automatically you have a process by which mistakes are bound to be made, dislocations in great amounts are going to take place. Maybe a great amount of people are going to suffer. The Speaker says that it is war without blood, but maybe some people are going to bleed as a result of the rapid movement of our Government to remake itself.

So far in phase I, I would say that the Republican majority has been very successful. I apologize to my Democratic colleagues who like to say that we have succeeded, but if you look at the situation in terms of the budget process, the Republican majority, the juggernaut, the great Wehrmacht of the Republican's war machine that has moved forward and established beachheads and gone for the jugular in so many cases laid out a plan where they were going to cut the budget by huge amounts of money and moved in very radical ways, very extreme ways, to accomplish that. As we all know, at one point they even shut down the Government, we shut down the Government more than once, as a result of the extremist agenda that they were trying to accomplish.

Well, it was all over, and we finally got all of the appropriations bills passed. Too many Democrats have said that we won a major victory. We did not win a major victor. The Republicans achieved \$23 billion in cuts. There were \$23 billion in cuts, and you might say, well, we wanted to downsize and streamline the Government, so why not call it a victory for everybody? Problem is that all the cuts are concentrated in nondefense areas. It is the programs that help people most that receive the biggest cuts.

Yes, we won some victories in terms of phase I in this war to remake Amer-

ica, we made them back away from \$5 billion in education cuts. Thanks to the common sense of the American people and their understanding of what was going on in education, they rallied, they let their Representatives know that they understood the nature of the education cuts, and they put enough people on the spot to make the majority retreat on \$5 billion worth of education cuts.

But there were \$23 billion in other cuts that were made. Some of them might have been legitimate. There is always waste in a government as big as ours, and nobody is going to argue that you cannot cut a lot of waste out. But we wonder if they really zeroed into places where the waste is. Pentagon is not downsizing. The Pentagon military establishment, as we know it, is not streamlining. In fact, in this budget, phase II of the new budget that was passed today, there is \$13 billion in increases for military expenditures. So they are not downsized.

In this budget there is no mention made of the CIA bringing it under control and guaranteeing that you never have a situation again where the CIA will accumulate \$2 billion in a petty cash fund. I talked about that before. Our auditors discovered that \$2 billion was accumulated in the CIA petty cash fund.

What steps are we taking to see that does not happen again? We have the Federal Reserve, that had \$3.7 billion accumulated in what they call the rainy day slush fund, the rainy day fund for the Federal Reserve Bank, and in 79 years they never had a rainy day. The General Accounting Office said they never had losses in 79 years. So that is a place where waste is taking place on a large scale; \$3.7 billion in the Federal Reserve.

There is nothing in this budget that talks about efforts to collect money that is lying around in various agencies like that.

So we have phase II now beginning, and the budget that has been introduced by the Republican majority for phase II in their war to remake America, this budget is as extreme as the first one was. There are a few trimmings here and there, but basically there is no change in direction. So anybody that thinks that we have stopped the juggernaut, that we have contained the war to remake America, the extreme war to remake America, you are dreaming. It is not happening. In this cut there are extreme—in this budget there are extreme cuts.

I am glad to see that again we made a breakthrough on education. There are no proposals to totally eliminate the Department of Education anymore, so that is a plus because we were in a situation where we were about to eliminate the Department of Education and become the only industrialized nation in the world not to have a central department of education.

□ 1800

Our public education is very weak as it is, and we do not necessarily want the kind of bureaucracy that some of the other nations have, and we do not want to give the kind of power to our Department of Education that they may have in Germany or in Japan, but we definitely need to keep the Department of Education.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the Republican majority for backing away from the threat to eradicate the Department of Education. But it still has many education cuts. The budget eliminates many education programs.

What is particularly troublesome is the deep cuts in training programs; for instance, the funding for programs in the careers bill. The careers bill is where they lumped all the training programs together in one bill, and they have cut that by 42 percent, 42 percent. That is going toward one-half. These are job training programs.

Mr. Speaker, how do we expect to go forward into the 21st century and to re-adjust our economy to meet all the challenges of a high-technology economy if we are not going to give people training? How do we expect to have a work force that is being dislocated, downsized, and shuffled around? The legitimate term for it is "churning"; there is churning going on in the work place, there is churning going on in the big corporations, and the workers in the process are being churned around, spewed out, and they can always find a job somewhere else, although they have lost their regular job that they might have been on 10 or 15 years.

So the churning process, if it is going to be humane and going to help people pick up and go on, it needs to have training programs, but the training programs have been cut by 42 percent in this Republican phase II budget.

As I said before, the phase II budget is really a continuation of what we had before. It is not very different in every respect. It is still extreme. The retreat on education is only there because of the fact that we have gotten the American people alerted. They are watching to see what happens with education. They are on the job, they are letting their Representatives know, Republicans and Democrats, and they will not tolerate any drastic cuts in Head Start programs, they will not tolerate drastic cuts in title I programs. So we have that much accomplished, but everything else is still moving forward.

The contract to remake America and the budget, the budget-balancing effort, is really an assault on the New Deal programs that were developed by Franklin Roosevelt. It is an assault on the programs that were developed in the Great Society, programs by Lyndon Johnson. It is a frontal assault of trying to wipe those programs out.

Saving money is only secondary, if it is important at all, because they are

proposing to put large amounts of money into star wars, which, of course, has accomplished very little. Billions have been spent there already and it has accomplished very little.

There is no great hurry to invest large amounts of money in building a star wars system or a system to intercept missiles, when the technology probably will be far better if we wait a little later to do the building. So the President's proposal that we do research and we prepare is more than adequate. But they are going to waste money in that area, so money is really not the problem. Money is not the greatest concern.

Destruction of the New Deal programs, destruction of the Great Society programs: They want to destroy Medicaid, they want to destroy Medicare, they want to wipe out programs that have benefited people for years, and they want to do this in the interest of a small, elite group that will make a great deal of money off the destruction of these programs and the replacement of these programs with other programs.

So it is important to see the new budget as phase 2 of the war. The new budget is a blueprint for invasion, for destruction. The new budget is more of the scorched earth policy that started with the majority takeover in 1994. It is extreme, it is revolutionary, it is harmful. People will literally die as a result of what is being done in this area.

In education and training, for example, the details can become important, depending on where you sit. Goals 2000, which they proposed to eliminate last time, is again eliminated in this budget. Innovative education programs, strategies, grants, eliminated. Bilingual and immigrant education programs are eliminated. New funding for Perkins loans, student-centered grants are eliminated. Howard University funding is eliminated.

Libraries are cut 20 percent; libraries, which have a tiny amount of money, I think \$110 million, a very tiny amount of money when you consider all the libraries across the country that exist and that need help as we go toward meeting the educational needs of the 21st century, they are cut 30 percent.

Twenty-four other education programs are eliminated. Aid to education, institutional development, is cut \$46 million. National and community service programs again are eliminated, AmeriCorps.

That is a bargaining chip. They eliminate a program that they know has a high priority at the White House, and they are going to bargain later on to get the White House to accept some of these other cuts as a result of restoring that.

The Davis-Bacon Act and the Service Contract Act are eliminated. The Davis-Bacon and Service Contract Act

require prevailing wages to be paid on Federal construction jobs and in Federal facilities across the Nation, and that is eliminated; although what has happened is that the prevailing wages are very close, in most cases, to minimum wages in many parts of the country at this point.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting will be eliminated, privatized by the year 2002. The National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, eliminated.

So what is new? The battle plan remains the same, the invasion plan remains the same. The scorched earth policy remains the same. There is not very much that is new here.

In energy, in a time of skyrocketing increases in energy prices, this budget proposes real cuts in energy funding by 47.05 percent. It wipes out all funding for research on fossil fuels, solar, and renewable energy and energy conservation, at a time when we are recognizing more and more that our environment and the dangers that the environment faces from pollution are not fantasies of environmentalists, they are very real.

People have died of certain diseases. Asthma is increasing in our big cities in large amounts. The percentage increases are quite large of people suffering from asthma and other respiratory diseases. The handwriting is on the wall that the environment is not something to be left to a handful of people who have a vision, but the environment ought to concern everybody. Then we are going to wipe out all funding for research in the areas that will deal with the pollution factors that related to that increase.

Transportation. It phases out funding that supports mass transit operations. Again, pollution will be increased, because in big cities people will drive cars more and more and use other vehicles above the surface because they cannot get money to keep supporting our subway systems. Even our bus systems above ground that do cause a problem with pollution, it is better to have more buses carrying more people than to have more cars carrying more people, because you get less of a pollution factor when you have buses instead of cars. But we are cutting the capital assistance to mass transit. We are eliminating any new starts, support for any new starts in the mass transit system.

At a time when we are trying to get people off of welfare and get them to work, we are going to make it more difficult for them to get to work, because it is going to cost more to get to work. We also at the same time are going to continue polluting the air.

In the area of crime and law enforcement, this budget defunds, wipes out the COPS Program, and abandons efforts to put 100,000 new police officers on the street by the year 2000. We

thought we had settled that one, it is such a popular program across the country. We thought that the extremists would certainly yield to common sense and yield to the fact that the American people had made it clear that they want the COPS Program, they want the cops on the streets. But in this budget, no, we continue the same practice that was started in the first budget of this session. The extremist blueprint calls for an elimination totally of the COPS Program.

The earned income tax credit, which is a way to give tax relief for low-income working people, we got a \$20 billion cut in this budget for the earned income tax credit, which really provides great relief to people at the lowest levels. They say they want a tax cut, but the one tax cut that is already in effect, they take it away, in effect, for people at the lowest levels, they take it away.

They still want a tax cut, however. It is being proposed for the rich in large amounts. Twenty billion dollars has been taken away from the earned income tax credit. This cut reduces the after-tax increase of almost 8 million households in America; 6.8 million children will be hurt by this cut. This change is particularly offensive in light of the Republican rhetoric about moving people from welfare to work. We ought to make work pay. We ought to reward people when they go to work, but the earned income tax credit, which was doing that, is being drastically cut.

There is nothing in this budget about minimum wage. Minimum wage is not a function of government. The taxpayers do not have to pay for minimum wage, so it is not in the budget. It will not be in the appropriations bill. A minimum wage increase is a situation where employees pay additional wages.

The proposal that was put forth by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHART], the Democratic minority leader, and the proposal that was endorsed, sanctioned by President Clinton, is a proposal for a 45 cent increase over the present minimum wage; 45 cents one year and 45 in another year, 90 cents that will not be in the budget, 90 cents that the taxpayers do not have to shell out. So the minimum wage increase is not going to cost us anything. Seventy-four percent of the people in America say that a minimum wage increase is a fair approach to guaranteeing that people have the opportunity to earn a decent living.

Nevertheless, the extremist blueprint, the invasion plan, refuses to entertain any increase in the minimum wage. I said before that this is about more than saving money, and the fact that the Republican majority has dug in and is adamantly opposed to a minimum wage increase is just one more indication that saving money and balancing the budget are not the only agenda.

The agenda is designed to wipe out the New Deal programs, to wipe out the Great Society programs, and the agenda is designed secretly to wipe out the gains made by working people, to destroy the effectiveness of unions. A tax on working people, a tax on unions, are not part of the Contract With America. You will not find anything in there that says they want to destroy Davis-Bacon, that they want to change the Fair Labor Standards Act so that people cannot get their overtime.

Nowhere in the Contract With America does the Republican majority say we want your overtime. But they do want your overtime. Not only are they moving in ways which deny a minimum wage increase to all workers, but the workers who have been working for years, the workers who have enjoyed overtime when they had the necessity to be employed overtime, they would get overtime pay, we are not being told that they should not get overtime pay, that they should get comp time.

So the blueprint for the second half of the Republican war to remake America, it wants your overtime. One of the targets, one of the objectives is to take your overtime; nor to give you a minimum wage increase, but also to take your overtime. It is not in the budget. I am digressing from discussion of the budget, but it is part of the design to remake America.

It is part of a situation where, to please contributors, to please certain elite groups, the workers must be sacrificed, the workers must be given the status of serfs, peons, or sharecroppers. The workers must be put in a position where they have to beg. They must be put in a position where they have no power.

There are other moves to change labor law which we will discuss next week, but certainly the minimum wage, denial of the minimum wage increase, it should be noted, is not a budgetary item. It does not cost the taxpayers anything, but that is part of this great blueprint.

First I want to comment for the tax package. The EITC is one place where taxes are being added, and a tax increase is being forced on the low-income people by removing \$20 billion in funding for the EITC. The tax package in this budget, on the other hand, does still provide for people who are rich to have a decrease in their taxes, and part of the drive to cut Medicare and to cut Medicaid and many other worthwhile programs is to generate still the funds to fund the tax increase.

Probably the most devastating part of this effort to remake America is the part that focuses its guns on Medicare and Medicaid. That is a life and death matter. You are dealing with people's health and you are dealing with lives. We have large expenditures for Medicare, we have large expenditures for Medicaid, yes.

□ 1815

I can think of no more noble expenditure of public funds than to expend those funds to promote the health of people or to save lives. In New York State, we have large expenditures of funds for Medicare and Medicaid. In fact, our State has been criticized for spending more on Medicaid than any other State in the Union.

Yes, we do have those large expenditures. It costs the people of the State a great deal because they are matching, New York State matches the funds 50 percent, unlike other States that have a better match where the Federal Government pays a larger percentage than the State. The percentage paid for Medicaid in New York State is 50 percent. So we are spending large amounts of money like anywhere else in the country.

We probably could trim the budget by eliminating waste, we could probably trim the budget by eliminating some corruption. Waste and corruption always exist in any program where human beings are involved. The minute you invent the program, the hustlers and the swindlers will move in and find a way to unjustly squeeze large amounts of money out of the program.

Therefore, you have to have inspectors general and you have to have strict law enforcement, you have to have accountability. We just always assume that any program, and it does not matter whether it is health care or housing, in the private sector they have devices going all the time to protect the interests of the employers and the owners from their own employees. Stealing is one of the ongoing universal traits through the world of human beings.

So Medicaid can be cut for corruption and for waste. Nobody wants Medicaid to operate more effectively and more efficiently than the constituents in my district. Since the beginning of Medicare and Medicaid, we have watched abuses and complained about abuses and sought to have the money directed as much as possible in providing health care and less in making doctors rich or in making health care facilities rich. It has been an ongoing struggle.

There was a time when people worked strictly on charitable contributions. That was a painful situation where most people who needed health care had to go to an emergency room. Then we did move into a period where Medicaid was in operation and poor people who qualified through the means test for Medicaid could for the first time have the luxury of preventive health care. They could have a doctor, they could have a situation where they did not have to wait until they were half dead to go to the emergency room.

But we saw the Medicaid mills develop. Medicaid mills were obvious facilities that were taking large amounts

of money and giving poor service, and we complained about those for years, and we saw the waste and wondered if the system was not designed to guarantee that certain people would get rich. So there have been improvements in that. There are still further improvements that can be made.

Now we have the HMO's, the health maintenance organizations. In many ways health maintenance organizations are a big improvement over Medicaid mills. Health maintenance organizations when they are operating properly and when they respect the patients and the community that they operate in are a great improvement over Medicaid mills, but if health maintenance organizations are to move in ways which try to give less service and make more money, then they become worse than the Medicaid mills and must be stopped.

So we have a situation here where there is still a drive on to remake Medicare and to remake Medicaid. This second phase of the Republican majority's war to remake America does let up a little on Medicare, but it becomes worse for Medicaid than it was before. The Republican proposal for Medicare cuts funding \$168 billion over the next 6 years. It continues to rely on the untested and potentially dangerous medical savings account, known as MSA. Medical savings accounts are the centerpiece of the Republican proposals for Medicare.

The proposal would set up a system whereby the healthiest and the wealthiest seniors would leave the Medicare system and many of the doctors who treat them would refuse to continue treating other seniors who depend on Medicare. The proposal could truly end universal health care coverage for the elderly.

In other words, Medicare is only about 30 years old and Medicare could be brought to its knees if you introduce medical savings accounts, because medical savings accounts would cover from 85 to 90 percent of the people who are healthy and who need very little health care. The insurance companies would move in and pick off those people, and the number of people in the Medicare system would drop so drastically and to such a low point until the funding of the Medicare system would fall apart.

So the MSA is a direct threat, it is a gun aimed at the heart of the Medicare system. But that is being proposed again with great gusto. As you know, it is already in legislation that is moving through the House. The Senate and House have agreed and will soon send a bill to the President which might contain the MSA proposal. The MSA proposal has received few public hearings, very few people know about it. I am taking the time to talk about it here now because most people just know it as a set of initials. The MSA, as one re-

spected columnist Robert J. Samuelson recently said in the Washington Post, quote, "we should not unleash a health care upheaval simply as an afterthought. Clearly this proposal would cause serious harm to America's senior citizen population and it goes far beyond any change that the electorate wants."

The people, the voters, the patients do not want MSA's. It will be a radical change in their health care and wipe out a system that they have come to depend on.

Of course, finally, the Republican plan for Medicaid is even more extreme and it has a potential to cause as much or more harm than the Medicare package. Medicare is a basic program whereby the Federal Government helps States provide health care for the poorest and most vulnerable people in our Nation. This budget proposes to cut Federal Medicaid funding by \$72 billion.

To make matters worse, the Republican proposal allows the States to drain large amounts of money out of the system by significantly reducing the requirement that the States have a maintenance of effort. At the same time it allows a return to the State financing gimmicks of the past that were banned in 1992 at the urging of the Bush administration.

The majority's plan will send a loosely defined block grant back to the States without the current guarantees of care for low-income children, pregnant women, disabled people or senior citizens. By relying heavily on the Republican Governors for the design of their new Medicaid package, the Republican Congress has proposed a program that allows States to reduce their financial commitment to the program without any guarantee that poor people and seniors will have the necessary care.

The Republican plan abolishes the current entitlement for individuals. Entitlement. Remember the word "entitlement." There is probably no more noble concept in government than entitlement. Sometimes it is abused but when you have entitlements for means-tested cases, means-tested entitlements, means-tested entitlements, it means that you have to prove and show that you are poor, that you are in need in order to be able to qualify for the entitlement.

We have some entitlements that are not means-tested. The agricultural entitlements are not means-tested. You can be a millionaire and still get agricultural subsidies. The biggest socialist program in America, the most socialist program that continues to exist and over the next 7 years will still be with us, is the agricultural subsidy program.

It has many different facets. Agricultural subsidies for various reasons, there are Farmers Home Loan Mortgages, there are many, many different

ways in which socialism and agriculture takes care of people who have a great deal of money.

In fact, in Montana I point out, in Montana, the Freemen out there, the siege that is going on now, those people are people who receive large amounts of money. They are led by a person who received up to \$800,000 in Federal loans and subsidies, and he does not want to pay it back. They reached the point where they felt they had the right to keep it and the right to not be held accountable for paying it back. Their property was taken, so they are in a revolutionary mode now. They have guns and are ready to fight because the subsidy, the socialism in agriculture has thoroughly corrupted them to the point where they have lost their perspective completely.

So the loss of the entitlement, benefits defined by the State, when you lose the entitlement, the Federal Government no longer stands behind the guarantee of health care to everybody who needs it and if you meet the means test, you lose the entitlement, the block grant goes to the State, the State has a finite, set amount of money in their budget, when they spend that amount of money, then the people who are in need after that will not get any help.

The States will also define the benefits that continue to go to some groups that are covered by Medicaid. States will not have to provide health care to certain people that are covered right now. Children in poverty will not be fully covered because the Republican proposal, the scorched earth proposal goes after the health care of children between the ages of 13 and 18.

Children ages 13 to 18 living in poverty would lose their Medicaid coverage because they are not on the list of people that the Federal legislation would require the States to serve. So a State could cut that out if it wants to. Disabled persons, people with disabilities. The States would be in a position to define who has a disability and who does not have a disability. It is unlikely they would cover all of the 6 million disabled persons who now are receiving Medicaid. Six million disabled people in this country, people with disabilities, are receiving Medicaid now. The likelihood is that if the States are able to define who has a disability and who does not have a disability, most of these people would lose their coverage. Again there is the low-income Medicare beneficiary, people who do not qualify for welfare who are covered in some States, and they will lose their coverage also if you give the Medicaid total over to the States.

That is the worst feature, the Medicaid assault. The assault on Medicaid is probably the single worst feature of the Republican majority budget. The assault on Medicaid is a life and death issue. The assault on Medicaid is worthy of a long discussion. The assault on

Medicaid is worthy of a mobilization of people all across the Nation.

We have a great deal to lose. Medicaid is as close as we have gotten to universal health care. Medicaid, which provides health care to everybody who needs it, who is poor and can pass the means test, Medicaid is as close to universal health care as we have gotten in this country. We are the only industrialized country other than South Africa that does not have universal health care in one form or another.

So we are about to lose that. I am particularly concerned about it because in New York City, it seems that the extremist forces are out ahead of the Republican majority here in Congress. The Republican majority here in Congress have been thwarted in their efforts to end the Medicaid entitlement. They have been thwarted in their efforts to take steps that would reverse the quality of care in nursing homes. But we have a Republican Governor who has moved on nursing homes and tried to suspend the regulations, a Republican Governor who is threatening to change the way hospitals are funded for indigent persons, to take away that funding altogether if they do not agree to some new proposals that he had made. We have a Republican Governor who has proposed to close down one of the hospitals in my district, Kings Borough Psychiatric Center. Kings Borough Psychiatric Center is the only psychiatric center in Brooklyn. Brooklyn is a borough which has 2.5 million people; 2.5 million people is enough to need a psychiatric center with 500 beds. It has been there for 100 years. But now they are proposing to close down Kings Borough Center.

The juggernaut in New York, the Wehrmacht in New York, the scorched earth policy in New York is moving faster than the policies here at the Federal level. The mayor is proposing to sell certain hospitals. The mayor is proposing to lease certain hospitals. A notice was just issued day before yesterday that 1,600 hospital workers will be laid off immediately between now and the middle of June and between now and January 1, 8,000 hospital workers will be laid off in New York City.

This is radical, this is extreme, this is a life and death matter. Not only will patients die as a result of the extreme changes within the hospitals, but there some people employed in these hospitals who are earning basic pay as janitors, as cleaners, as maids, some people who are technicians. There are large numbers of people who will be out of work as a result of this reduction in the service for health care. Health care is a service, first of all, and that is its most important function. But health care is also an industry. It is one of the most noble industries mankind has ever created, and it does provide jobs.

So we have a situation where we are moving in an extreme manner and in a

year's period 8,000 people will be thrown out of work and the work that they do in the hospitals will be dislocated and confused, and people will literally die as a result.

□ 1830

War has been declared on the health care system of the people of New York city. War has been declared by the Governor. War has been declared by the mayor. The war in New York State and the war in New York City is very much interrelated with the war that has been declared here in Washington.

In fact, the war began here. The move is here, once the proposals by the Clinton administration in the 103d Congress went down the drain. Those proposals were good proposals, idealistic proposals, and proposals which were complicated because of the fact that they reached out toward the goal of universal health care.

We can come with legislation that is much simpler as we can, in incremental steps, probably improve the health care system. But if we want to reach the goal of universal care, universal health care for everybody, it requires a complicated system. It requires something which is very unusual and calls on our present system to be restructured.

That is what the Clinton administration program required. It was the proper approach in terms of setting the goal and seeking the goal of universal health care. The fact that the complications led to a political problem does not diminish the validity of the Clinton health care proposals.

Now we are without that national goal and without that national guidance, and we are in a situation now where we have a stampede on to restructure and to reengineer the health care system. In a place like New York, we are talking about nearly 8 million people, health care for nearly 8 million people, so it is a very tempting target.

The stampede on now is a stampede toward privatization. It is a stampede that begins with the ideas that there is a lot of money to be made if they create a health care-industrial complex. A government health care-industrial complex means that the private sector will own it, the private sector will run it, but the funding for it will still come out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Just as the funding for the military-industrial complex comes out of the taxpayers' pockets but is run by private enterprise, and great amounts of money are made out of it, now we have a foolproof system that will go on forever. The health care-industrial complex is not like the military-industrial complex. It will be here forever, and we then do not have to worry about never having a justification for it.

The military-industrial complex has done well long after it is needed at the level it is needed. it is still here. We

needed a military-industrial complex to win World War II, and we needed a military-industrial complex at a certain level to fight the cold war and to maintain the security of the free world. All that was necessary, but we have not needed the extremes in spending that we have, and we certainly do not need to justify adding \$13 billion more to the existing defense budget.

That is a victory of the military-industrial complex. Its power exceeds its usefulness, but that is one of those complexes and we are governed by many different complexes in this country. Complexes have a great impact on our policies.

We have a banking-industrial complex that really is the biggest swindle of all. The banking-industrial complex pulled off the savings and loan swindle and that may cost the American people, before it is over, about a half trillion dollars to bail out the savings and loans and the other banks. There were other banks also, not savings and loans, but banks that went bankrupt. We are going to be out a half a trillion dollars by the time the Resolution Trust Corporation and all the mechanisms that were set up and designed to do this are finished.

So we have a health care complex now, health care-industrial complex. Large insurance companies, large pharmaceutical companies buy HMO's. HMO's are health maintenance organizations. They are not evil automatically. They are not inherently evil. In fact, the Health Insurance Program of New York, called HIP, has been in existence for half a century. It was a great step forward in health care.

HIP still exists, but HIP was a non-profit-making enterprise. It is not designed to make a profit. Although they make surpluses and they have probably been taken care of very well, it was not designed to make profits, and it has worked very well.

We can have profitmaking HMO's also, and that has been proven in some places. They make profits and they also give good service. There are communities which insist that they are going to get good service or else they are going to get rid of the HMO's, so they have good service.

But in big cities and communities like the majority of the communities that my district covers, there is an attempt being made to come in and stampede the situation and restructure, reengineer the health care system for the benefit of the big HMO's, and the insurance companies and pharmaceutical companies are going to stand behind them.

They are not listening to doctors. They are not listening to hospital administrations. They are definitely not listening to community leaders. They are very seldom listening to elected officials. We need to reestablish the dialog, and the only way we can get that

dialog is by confronting them with a situation which brings to a halt the grand design to redesign our health care system.

So we have the mayor proposing to sell one of the hospitals in my district; the Governor proposing to close down another one; the layoffs of thousands of people taking place; and all this is happening very rapidly, and in the meantime the shadow of the Medicaid entitlement being taken away looms over our head.

The Medicaid entitlement will be converted to a block grant automatically. Right away there is a reduction in the amount of funds available for Medicaid because the proposal is not just to give the State what it now gets but to cut the amount of money. The State will have the power then to cut the benefits. So we will have several rapid shocks to the health care system all at once.

For this reason, this Sunday, we are mobilizing all over the city. Not just in my district but all over the city there are demonstrations at hospitals called Hospital Support Sunday. Churches are leading their congregations to hospitals that are threatened and they are having rallies to send a message to the mayor and to the Governor that we are the people, the health care system is for us, those of us who are patients and those of us who are alive and will someday probably become patients. We want a voice in the restructuring. We do not want the insurance companies and the pharmaceutical companies and the HMO's to restructure our health care for their benefit. We could like to have a voice in the restructuring of the system for the benefit of all the people.

We have three demands. One is that they freeze the situation as it is now. Do not have any more sales of hospitals. Do not try to lease hospitals. Stop downsizing and streamlining, cutting the budget so that the hospitals are not able to function properly. If they cannot function properly, people stop coming, and then they use the fact that their number of patients is declining as a justification for cutting the staff.

It is a vicious game that is being played with our health care system and we want it to come to an end. We want the assault on our health care system as part of the war we make in America to come to a halt.

Maybe we can make a deal. In every war, no matter how vicious the war may be or how ambitious the maniacs are who drive the war, they do make some arrangements. As bad as the Third Reich was under Hitler, they did not attack Switzerland. For various reasons they never attacked Switzerland. As bad as they were, they did not go on to attack Sweden. They did grab little Norway because it was in the way in terms of their own strategies. They did terrible things but there were some

places where even the vicious Nazis did not cross the line.

Maybe we can have a deal with the people who are trying to remake America and a Speaker who declares that politics is war without blood. Perhaps we can have a safe haven out there in health care, put it off the invasion map, take it away as a target and let us not do terrible things that our grandchildren might spit on our graves as a result of hearing about.

Let us not destroy the health care system for the elderly, which may throw people out on the streets. Because in Medicaid two-thirds of the money from Medicaid goes to nursing homes. One-third goes to poor families, and they are important, too, but two-thirds goes to nursing homes.

Many people in those nursing homes are people who were middle-class people, who had some means before they got ill and lost their jobs and lost their faculties and for various reasons became impoverished. Once they become impoverished then Medicaid is all there is left to take care of them. Take away Medicaid and they are literally in the streets.

So we do not want to hastily, in the process of remaking America, do things that would end up being counted as atrocities sometime in the future as people look back. We do not want to do thing that in the process of trying to justify them we would take ourselves into some kind of immoral era similar to the Nazi era.

People with disabilities in Nazi Germany became people who ought to be destroyed, and it is to the credit of the German people that they would not consent to euthanasia as long as they knew about it. But when they singled out a particular ethnic group, they did go on and try to destroy a whole ethnic group. The seeds were sewn.

Human beings or nations should never begin to think in certain directions. Human beings and nations ought to automatically want to structure systems that provide for the preservation of life. To be pro-life in the most profound sense is to try to preserve the health care system; to try to see to it that at least every person has an opportunity to maintain good health and to benefit from the modern life-saving devices, and to in some way know that we care about them that far.

We cannot guarantee them an income, we cannot guarantee them a lot of things, but let us put the health care system into a safe haven status and say we are going to try to guarantee that decent health care is provided for everybody. We are going to try to guarantee that systems are maintained. We want to streamline them, make them more efficient, eliminate the waste and corruption, but we are going to maintain systems that are adequate.

We cannot maintain adequate systems if overnight we are going to make

a decision to close hospitals in a big city like New York. The closing of the hospitals has not been discussed by the doctors and the administrators, it has only been discussed behind closed doors by politicians who want to make a score and save money over a short period of time. So that kind of restructuring is going to be a scorched earth kind of restructuring where people's lives will not matter.

We will not stand by idly and watch this kind of restructuring of our health care system in New York City. I hope that the rest of Americans understand that we are at a critical point and they too must get out take a look at what is happening, who is making what plans about their health care system, who is making what plans about how many hospitals we are going to have in a given area, and about the nature of those hospitals.

A burn unit cannot be maintained by an HMO. A burn unit needs a large population to support. A burn unit needs to exist within the structure of a hospital. MRI's are very expensive and cannot be maintained in some doctor's office or some clinic cannot maintain an MRI. If the hospital goes, then we have a situation where the justification and the rationale for a number of other services that are based on a density of population will no longer be there.

So we must fight to keep hospitals, or at least to have people sit down at the table and give us the blueprint; show us how they will maintain the quality of services, if they are going to restructure and eliminate certain hospitals or certain aspects of the current health care.

Now, we have the analogy of politics as war without blood. In every war monumental mistakes are made. The nature of war is such that it is going to grind down and eat up, chew up, and abuse large numbers of people because it is an emergency and we cannot set our own scenarios. We have to react to the enemy. There are a number of things in the nature of war. That is why the analogy that politics is war without blood is a bad analogy.

We should not have to move in an atmosphere of war. We should not have to rally to meet a crisis that does not need to be created. Health care could be kept at some kind of rationale level. Health care should be kept off the table.

Yes, eventually, HMO's, profit making HMO's, may make money in health care. Eventually Wall Street may have stocks in the health care industry do very well. But let us try to do that and make capitalism and the profit motive work for the benefit of the people. Let us not allow the situation to get totally out of hand and a scorched earth policy to leave us with ruins in our health care system.

Once we close a hospital, reopening it is almost impossible. Once we close

down certain kinds of facilities, we cannot bring them back. And we must force those who are in place of decision-making and power to stop, listen, and negotiate.

Our demands in New York City are three basic demands. Freeze the situation. Do not go any further. Disclose your plans. Let us see what is happening. And they negotiate. And this is a pattern that I offer to the rest of the country.

□ 1845

It is your health care. This invasion plan will roll right over you unless you rally and guarantee that you are respecting and that your health care does not become cannon fodder in this so-called war to remake America.

#### TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL BULKELEY AND ADMIRAL BOORDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKEEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, those that were watching the proceedings in this Chamber earlier saw some brief 5-minute or shorter tributes to the Chief of Naval Operations, the highest ranking naval officer in the world up until a few hours ago this afternoon when the early reports are telling us he took his own life in the Chief of Naval Operations traditional officer's home, just a few blocks from here in the Navy Yard on the Anacostia River.

Mr. Speaker, I had been intending to come to the floor tonight to finish a tribute to Adm. John Duncan Bulkeley, who had served 55 years on active duty, retired just a few years ago in 1988, and was the squadron commander of the PT boats that took General MacArthur off Corregidor. I pointed out that in an otherwise beautiful funeral ceremony on Patriots' Day, April 19, the only sad note was that there were no Cabinet officers, no Vice President. Bill Clinton had held the wreath with Admiral Bulkeley at the 50th anniversary of D-day, the Normandy invasions to begin the day at dawn.

Together they held a wreath honoring all those who died at sea, the Coast Guardsmen driving the landing craft up to the beach, the few naval craft as they secured the waters of the English Channel for the Allied forces that died, those that died leading up to it, those that died in secret operations in the months leading up to it where we lost hundreds of sailors and soldiers, and it was kept secret for 25 years.

That wreath was to commemorate all who were lost at sea, including those landing barges that were blown up by shore artillery and mortar fire sent out by the Germans. At the funeral, which

I talked about here 6 days ago, I said that the first eulogy for Admiral Bulkeley, this Medal of Honor winner, holder of two Distinguished Service Crosses, Navy Cross, two Purple Hearts, two Silver Stars, French Croix de Guerre. The first speaker was the CNO, the Chief of Naval Operations, Jeremy Michael Boorda, Mike to his friends.

Mr. Speaker, I have in front of me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. How could I or anyone have known that, while praising Admiral Boorda here at this very lectern on the leadership desk, that 6 days later he would be joining Admiral Bulkeley in heaven? This is phenomenal that our country is getting hit with so many hammer blows of people dying. It must be tied into something to do with what the Holy Father in Rome calls the culture of death.

I got through most of Admiral Boorda's eulogy for Vice Admiral Bulkeley, and I had the son of the actual PT boat, signal boat commander, PT 41, George Cox Jr., a late-in-life child is, I guess, the way they say it, not the grandson but the direct son of George Cox, Ensign George Cox, who was actually at the helm of the PT boat when Admiral Bulkeley with the last of his two boats out of only six to begin with, when Manila, the Pearl Harbor of Manila was December 8, across the date line, when George Cox was watching Junior, he is an LA of CLAY SHAW of Florida, legislative assistant.

I opened with words of Ronald Reagan that I used the next day when I was the graduation speaker at a beautiful traditional Catholic Christian college in Front Royal out in the beautiful Shenandoah Valley of Virginia. I talked about what Ronald Reagan had told us all to do in his goodbye words on January 11, 1989, 9 days before combat Navy hero, 58-mission George Bush was sworn in. And that is what I titled this piece, or our wonderful recorders that took the title from my words. It says President Reagan commands us, remember our heroes, remember our past.

Mr. Speaker, I read beautiful moving passages of President Reagan's words, then told some history about Admiral Bulkely that was my tribute to him and to George Cox, Sr. with George, Jr. watching. Then I got into Admiral Boorda's remarks. And then I read the stunningly beautiful tribute to Admiral Bulkely from his second son, an active duty Navy captain, Peter Bulkeley, and my time ran out. So I was going to come back at some point this week and finish reading, because I promised Admiral Bulkeley's son and his three daughters, beautiful daughter-in-law, that I would read it word for word, it was that good.

That is what I thought Ronald Reagan wanted us to do, as RON KLINK

on the other side performed a moving historical tribute to the people of Crete and how it might have been the key battle that, although lost, delayed Hitler's invasion of Russia and thereby turned the course of history in World War II.

So I was going to come back tonight and finish Peter Bulkeley, Capt. Peter Bulkeley's tribute to his dad. And now I have to do that and a tribute to Mike Boorda. I have Mike's biography in front of me. What a life. Just on two pages. Bulkeley served 55 years. Boorda served 40. Fibbed about his age. The one time you can talk about fibbing, downgrade the word from lie. When you are trying to wear the uniform of your country and say you are older than you are, God must smile. That is certainly not a venial sin. That is a fib to serve your fellow man. He fibbed on his age in November 1938. He is my brother's age, 2 years older, younger brother, and he joined in November 1938. Was an enlisted man for 8 years, excuse me, 6 years, and was a Navy petty officer first class. Attack squadron 144, carrier airborne early warning squadron 11.

My older brother's son, a Navy lieutenant commander who has served in the gulf 30 or some combat missions in one of these squadrons, he had all this enlisted experience and was selected for commissioning under the integration program in 1962, 34 years ago. I will get to Mike Boorda's tribute in a minute, but let me tell you again what Mike Boorda said about Admiral Bulkeley. Quoting myself, I finished talking about SONNY MONTGOMERY, SAM GIBBONS, World War II veterans in this House that had the only tribute to World War II other than about 10 or 15 that I did, was a month after the war had passed its 50th anniversary.

I finished talking about them and I said: Mr. Speaker, I just do not understand why people are not listening to what Ronald Reagan said about talking about history. So Admiral Boorda begins his remarks. Mr. Speaker, this is his title of his tribute to Bulkeley on April 19, but I am saying it 6 days ago. Admiral Boorda says: You may cast off when ready, Johnny. Those were MacArthur's words to Squadron Commander Bulkeley. I am sure Bulkeley, as I discussed with George, Jr., turned to Ensign Cox and said—I am sorry, those are my words.

I am sure that when Bulkeley heard those words from MacArthur he turned to his PT boat skipper Ensign Cox and said: George, let's move it out of here, anchors aweigh. Those were my remarks. Admiral Boorda began, I say, this is Boorda. Will Rogers said that we cannot all be heroes. Then another aside of mine: Mr. Speaker, I say, by the way, Admiral Boorda beautifully delivered this, Mr. Speaker. Back to Mike: Some of us have to stand on the curb and clap as those heroes go by. When he made that statement, Will

Rogers could only have had one type of person in mind, John Bulkeley.

We gather here today—this is the new chapel at Fort Myer, in this place meant for heroes and applaud a true American hero as he passes by. And we come together here as the rest of America stands up and cheers for a man who symbolizes the very best about our Nation. While we are saddened to no longer have the great John Bulkeley with us, Boorda continues, it is not a day of sorrow. He would not have liked or allowed that. Today is a day meant to remember, to give thanks.

Then I point out that Admiral Boorda goes on page after page telling about his early years. I put it all in the RECORD later. He tells about the film, "They Were Expendable," America's leading man John Wayne, America's sweetheart, Donna Reed. And Boorda talked about Admiral Bulkeley, how he lived his life for our navy and his country.

This is what Boorda did for 40 years. Bulkeley did so with guts and heart and, most important, with honor. His service stands as a tribute to every sailor.

This was obviously coming from Boorda's heart, Mr. Speaker, because he always considered himself a sailor. He said: Every American, every person on this Earth who cherishes freedom, Bulkeley's life touched more than just us. It touched the world. And so today America says—boy, these are words from the grave. I give Mike Boorda's words back at him, Mr. Speaker: Thank you, shipmate, for giving us the very best. And while we knew that you were always special, too extraordinary to ever need our thanks, we just thought you would like to know.

The words he ended with there were the way this legendary Adm. John Duncan Bulkeley would write a short memo, sign it and then write a four-page PS. He would always sign the PS: Just thought you would want to know.

Now, I do not want to confuse, Mr. Speaker, anybody who follows these proceedings, but I think at this point I would like to do a tribute to Admiral Boorda, the highest ranking American naval officer in the world this morning.

Talked to our colleague, Commander DUKE CUNNINGHAM on the phone at 10, and I think I have a right to say what he told DUKE, that he was feeling pressure from the White House and Secretary Perry to undercut the Republican defense authorization budget that restores much modernization that is needed to our military, that he was under terrific pressure.

He had an interview with the news magazine this afternoon, just an hour after he died. He was getting hammered in the press a little bit, but that would not have bothered someone with 40 years in our great Navy.

But as I talk about Bulkeley later through the mouth of his son, Captain

Peter Bulkeley, think about the fact that I will be back at that chapel in Myer for Admiral Boorda's funeral in a few days. This is amazing. Mike Boorda went through Officers Candidate School in 1962 in Newport, RI. Got his naval commission as a very experienced young ensign August 1962. So he would have been 24 years old. He served in destroyers, combat information center on the Porterfield, went to destroyer field in Newport, became a weapons officer on the U.S.S. *John Craig* and other destroyers, served on the *Parrot* and mine sweeper. Then he was a weapons instructor.

There is just so much here. I am going to skip through it because a lot of it is the dry bio of years and years of superb service going everywhere your country and your Navy tells you to go.

Mr. Speaker, here is where I first met him. After he was the commander of cruiser, destroyer Group 8, the Greyhounds of the Sea, and as carrier battle group commander embarked on the *Saratoga*, one of our first big angle deck carriers, he also served as the commander of battle force Sixth Fleet in 1987 in the Med.

□ 1900

And then he comes to D.C., and this is where I met him. In August of 1988 he became chief of naval personnel, a teenager of 17 up through the ranks. Everyone thought this was the crowning glory of his career, vice admiral, 3 stars, going to take care of all the kids and gals in the Navy and all the chief petty officers in the officer corps. He served there for 3 years.

In November of 1991, that is 5 years ago now, he got his fourth star. Has been a four-star general for what would have been 5 years this November, and in December 1991, 4 years ago last Christmas, he became the commander in chief of all the allied forces in southern Europe; I saw him there a year after that; and then commander in chief of all the U.S. naval forces in Europe, headquarters in London, England, in those traditional buildings that go all the way back to those D-Day victories, World War II.

On February 1, 1993 while serving as commander in chief, he assumed the duty of commander, Joint Task Force Provide Promise, responsible for the supply of humanitarian relief to Bosnia-Herzegovina. He set up the air land and air drop dangerous night mission, C-130s coming at 10,000 feet, trying to target air drops with parachutes of heavy medical supplies and food into the besieged people of that poor war-torn land of Bosnia. He set all that up.

He has the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, the Distinguished Service Medal, second time, Legion of Merit, third award, Meritorious Service Medal and a number of other campaign awards.

He was our 25th Chief of Naval Operations.

What a history from 1775, John Paul Jones. I have not yet begun to fight. John Burrey, an Irishman, the father of our Navy Marine Corps, born November 10, same year, 1775. What a history. Only 25 CNOs.

His beautiful wife, Irishwoman Betty Moran, they have four children. It says nine grandchildren, but that is wrong. I was told today four more arrived just since this bio. No, 2 more. He has 11. I have 10. There is so much to live for, four children. Well, he has got exactly what I have. I have five children. So he has 15 children and grandchildren, I have 15 children and grandchildren. I want to get out of here some day and live for them to pass on everything that I hope is wise that I have learned in life.

Two of his sons are naval officers, Mr. Speaker. What a tragic depression must have borne down on that naval officer's chest. What a tragedy.

Just thought you would want to know that we have lost a great naval commander, a young teenaged boot going through probably Great Lakes Naval Center, where so many friends of mine went through. What an inspiration he was to the kids out there on the ships, and the young gals.

How tall was he, Mr. Speaker? Could not have been more than five foot 2, 3, 4; probably five-five. What a dynamite package. We are going to miss you, Mike.

So over there at that beautiful new cathedral at Ft. Myers, resplendent in his white uniform, a pallbearer also, of course. Many vice admirals sitting in the front row, one three-star general. Should have been a lot bigger than that for Admiral Bulkeley.

Mr. Speaker, FDR pinned on his Medal of Honor. We have got a Medal of Honor winner in the Senate. I think that should have dropped everything to be there. Got 2 or 3 Navy Cross holders, a former Navy Secretary over there. No Navy Secretary. Great Army three-star there, No. 2 man, but MacArthur pinned on his Distinguished Service Cross. Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, under Roosevelt, pinned on one of his Navy Crosses, he got another Distinguished Service Cross, but at least he had Mike Boorda, CNO, speaking up for him.

At this point what I would like to do so that it is a coherent record is put back in, and I will bring this down and give it to the recorders, Mr. Speaker, all of the first part of Peter Bulkeley's tribute, which took his dad through his Annapolis years through China through meeting the beautiful English girl Alice, marrying her, the dark days in the Philippines, his days as the wild man of the Philippines, his clothes ragged, the both covered in grease and diesel fuel and held together with spit and wire and prayers, and Peter's beautiful words that will be in the RECORD, took him right up through the end of World

War II, the stories of D-day, the stories that I told because I had heard it and forgotten it. It was in Peter's words about sinking two German Corvettes, capturing the Nazi commanders; maybe they were not Nazis, just naval officers, but they refused to salute Old Glory, a Naval tradition, as they were rescued and brought up on the deck of Admiral Bulkeley's first major combat surface ship, the destroyer *Endicott*, and he had them thrown back in the water.

I am told last Friday how the story was repeated to me by several of the crewmen from the *Endicott* that were there to pay tribute at the funeral to John Duncan Bulkeley, and, Peter, I got to the point where I read his words telling that story, a true story how the German on the third time around worked the trick, as Captain Peter said, and he finally saluted Old Glory, and then I told something that was not in Peter's remarks told to me by the helmsman Joe Caine, who was about 20, and that was about 50 years ago plus 2, so he is about 72 years old now, spry and as chipper as ever.

He told how Admiral Bulkeley took two Jewish members of the crew from Brooklyn, from the Bronx, and gave them Thompson submachine guns and took them into the officer's ward where they had these two German Corvette commanders, captains, and said, "Now, do you speak English?" And they did. They were educated. And he said, "Well, these two fellows here have a good Bronx background, and they're Jewish. I thought you might want to know that if you make a move, you're in a lot of trouble. Cover him, guys." One was named Gottlieb and the other, they said it was either Rosenberg or Rosenstein. It was quite a story.

So that is where my time ran out, and I pick up admiral—not admiral. Maybe some day another admiral in the Bulkeley family because Peter had also talked about all the naval officers and heroes going all the way back to the battle of Trafalgar and the victory and Lord Nelson. So I picked up Peter Bulkeley's words in his eulogy for his dad, and I will continue from here, and it will have his full eulogy in the record.

Let me pause, Peter says. The admiral was a strong believer in standards. Some may say he was from the old school, as the enemy captain of one of the Corvette soon learned. I have not read this, so I will do this. Coming up the sea ladder, the German commander would not salute the colors of the *Endicott*. He was promptly tossed back into the sea. On the third time, that did the trick, and he was taken prisoner and allowed on deck.

I heard this story a long time ago, but last year, this would be 1995, I had the privilege of attending one of the *Endicott* ship's reunions and was told the same story over and over by the

crew that served and loved their captain so well, John Bulkeley.

World War II closed, and the admiral emerged as one of the Navy's and America's most decorated heroes, having been awarded the Medal of Honor, the Navy Cross, the Army Distinguished Service Cross with Oak Leaf Cluster in lieu of a second award, two Silver Stars, Legion of Medal with Combat V, the Purple Heart twice over, the Philippine Distinguished Conduct Star, and from France the French Croix de Guerre, which by the way, my father earned the hard way, with three wound chevrons that are now called Purple Hearts, in World War I, Mr. Speaker.

Asked about his many decorations, John Bulkeley would only comment, "Medals and awards do not mean anything. It is what is inside of you, how you feel about yourself, that counts."

With an eye to the future, John Bulkeley looked forward to the day he would become an admiral in the Navy he loved so much. As President Kennedy in the early months of his administration dealt with an ever increasing crisis over Cuba, the admiral got his wish and, for a quarter of a century, would serve as a flag officer in the Navy.

As I am reading this, Mr. Speaker, I am picturing Boorda, Admiral Boorda, sitting there in the front row. How many days ago? Eleven? Twenty-seven days ago.

Challenged in his first assignment as commander of the Guantanamo Naval Base, Bulkeley met and defeated the challenge of Fidel Castro's threats of severing the water supplies of the base. Today Guantanamo stands as a symbol of American resolve because men like John Bulkeley stood up and refused to bend and took the initiative to stare down belligerent threats of lesser men not friendly with America. Perhaps a tribute of the time was a wanted poster offering 50,000 pesos for commander—Captain Bulkeley, dead or alive, by the Communist leadership of Cuba, along with the description a guerrilla, the worst species. I take it back. He was a flag officer by this time.

At Guantanamo, for those that have visited, there is a hill that overlooks the northeast gate, a gate with a sign that reads "Cuba, Land Free from America." I remember standing there with former members Bob Lagomarsino and Eldon Rudd of Arizona.

Peter says, "I stood with my dad on that hill almost 32 years ago. Cuban troops began moving about. They were armed. My dad's 19-year-old driver, a Marine lance corporal, comes running over and stood directly in front of the admiral ready and willing to take the bullet that could end the life of his commander."

The admiral loved his Marines, and the Marines loved and respected him in return. He would be with them day and

night in fatigues ready to conduct war, if necessary, but more, to defend Americans and the land of the free against the Communist yoke of tyranny.

Colonel Stevens, the former commanding officer of the Marine barracks at Guantanamo, wrote just recently adding three more stories to the legend of John Bulkeley. The admiral had the compassion of the men in the field, taking time again and again to bring them relief, whether cookies on Christmas morning or visiting with them at odd hours of the night to ease their nerves. They loved this man, the young men—not so young. The 70-year-olds at his funeral from the *Endicott* told me he knew every man's name on the ship; every nickname and would pop up in the dead of night to have coffee with whoever was on watch in the wee hours of 2, 3 and 4 o'clock in the morning.

The admiral would construct on that hill, his hill overlooking the northeast gate in Guantanamo, would construct the largest Marine Corps insignia in the world as a quiet reminder that the U.S. Marine Corps stood vigilant over this base, and in tribute a Marine would write John Bulkeley, Marine in sailor's clothing. Camp Bulkeley is still there in Guantanamo today, and that Marine anchor and globe has a fresh coat of paint.

John Bulkeley never forgot his early years, the hard iron-like discipline, the poor material condition of the fleet and the need to always be ready. He was talking about the '30s, 1930's. In this own words, to be able to conduct prompt, sustained combat operations at sea assigned as the president of the Board of Inspection and Survey, inspector general position unique to the Navy. The Army and Air Force do not have this as you know, Mr. Speaker: a post held by many distinguished naval officers since its inception almost since the beginning of the Navy. Bulkeley's boundless energy would find him aboard every ship in the Navy from keel to the top of the mast, from the fire control system to inside a boiler discussing readiness and sharing sea stories and a cup of coffee with the men who operate our ships, our planes and our submarines. This throughout the end of this 55-year career. He was relentless in his quest to improve the safety and material condition of the fleet and the conditions for the health and well-being of those men. He conducted his inspections by the book and strict accordance with standards, as many a man well knows, but his love for the sailors always came through.

His "Just thought you'd like to know" memos was another invention of his that was designed to be a, quote, unofficial report, unquote. But of course they were often greeted by a groan by the recipient in the Navy's leadership knowing that John Bulkeley had another concern that needed attention, and the number of information

addresses receiving the same "Just thought you'd like to know" letters often were longer than the letter itself. The admiral would laugh about his informal invention less than 30 days ago. That is last March.

After 55 years of commissioned service, John Bulkeley retired to private life. I was there at his retirement ceremony with Admiral Trost, then Chief of Naval Operations.

□ 1915

"John Bulkeley, as you recall, did not like notoriety and wanted to keep a low profile, throughout his life, even his last day in his Navy. His ceremony, as requested, was brief and to the point. Held in the CNO's office, with family present, all he sought after giving his entire life to his country and his service was to have the CNO's flag lieutenant open the door so he could slip his mooring line and leave quietly.

"Today we celebrate the final journey of a great American, John Bulkeley, and let him sail away."

Ironically, we should have all the flags in D.C. at half mast today, Mr. Speaker, for Adm. Jeremy "Mike" Boorda.

"We should not mourn, for he would not want that, preferring we celebrate his long life, fruitful life, and the life he chooses to lead. When asked to describe his own life he said," listen to this, Mr. Speaker, 'Interesting, Fascinating, and Beneficial to the United States.'"

Would not every Congressman and Senator like to say their career was interesting, fascinating, and beneficial to the United States of America?

"The spirit of John Bulkeley is here. You can see it everywhere. You can see it in the faces of our young sailors and marines, the midshipmen and our junior officers who will be challenged to live up to his standards of integrity, loyalty, bravery, and dedicated service to country and to service.

"John Bulkeley's career and service to the Nation spanned six turbulent decades of this century, he saw firsthand desperate times and the horrors of war. Yet he was also a father, marrying the woman he loved, and in his own words, 'It was the best thing I ever did.'" He said that to my face at D-day when he introduced me to his wife and several of his grown children.

Peter continues: "And raised the family he could be proud of, because we are proud of him." Then, in a tearful moment in the audience for us, Mr. Speaker, Capt. Peter Bulkeley looked at his mother, and he says, "Mom, you were his right arm, his closest friend for a long and full life. You gave him your love and your support. You truly were the Wind beneath his Wings," and they had played that hymn. "Yellow roses and his Colt 45 that he gave to you on your wedding night, while he stood watch out in Swatow Harbor,

China provide us comfort of this love for you and his service to country. Before he passed away, every member, child, and grandchild, sons and daughters-in-law all came to be with him in his last days. This by itself is testimony of the legacy he leaves behind and the love his family had for him.

"Today we face a different challenge than what John Bulkeley did. Old enemies are our allies. But now there are new foes who challenge our country's interests and our way of life sometimes, even inside our own borders." Narcotics.

"Admiral Bulkeley's efforts and sacrifices for a better world, a free world, his integrity and honor, and a combat-ready fleet, ready to conduct prompt, sustained combat operations are his legacy to our Nation.

"Seated before me are many of the warriors that fought alongside the admiral, shared in his beliefs, his determination, his losses, his grief, and his unfailing lover of family, service, and country.

"With his passing, the watch has been relieved. A new generation takes the helm and charts the course. His Navy, he shaped for so many years, is at sea today, stronger and better because of him, operating forward in far-away places, standing vigilant and engaged in keeping peace and helping our fellow man, but ready for war.

"In his own words, he leaves this with you: 'Be prepared. Your day will come, heaven forbid, when you will be called to go forward to defend our great Nation. Your leadership, bravery, and skill will be tested to the utmost.'" He continues with his dad's words: "You should never forget that America's Torch of Freedom has been handed down to you by countless others that answer their country's call and often gave their lives to preserve freedoms so many take for granted. This torch is now in your hands. You have a great responsibility to uphold duty, honor, country. God bless each of you and protect you.

"Just thought you'd like to know."

"So, we gather together today to say farewell to a man we love, a man we respect and cherish, a man that did his duty, that made his mark in life, and left the world a better and safer place. Peter Bulkeley looked toward his father and said, 'God bless you. Dad. All lines are clear.' A beautiful tribute. I could look over about 6 people, see the tears in the eyes of the Naval CNO, Chief of Naval Ops."

So I will just make Peter's tribute to his legendary father a tribute to your 40 years, Admiral Boorda: God bless you, Mike, all lines are clear. I will see your family over at Fort Myer Cathedral.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a tough week. My honor has been challenged more than once by some of the biggest papers in this country: U.S.A. Today,

New York Times, L.A. Times. People who are ignorant of what I am trying to do for our military have been taking cheap shots at me all week long. They just bounce off my back, because I am the one who has done the research on this moral crisis in our country and in my beloved military, all the services. I have never felt parochial about the Air Force. I belonged to all the forces.

I will spend all day tomorrow at West Point. I have four or five cadets up there from my little California, Orange County, district. I will have lunch with them, I will meet with the instructors. I come back here Saturday, and I am going to the ordination of 12 priests, the biggest ordination of priests anywhere in this country this year in a diocese, Arlington, across the river, that is on fire with the Holy Spirit; great priests. One of them is my son-in-law's priest from the Mission San Juan Capistrano, Joe Dressler. He is coming back here to meet with some of his underclassmen from the seminary that he studied at.

Then on Sunday, I am taking my wife and the Air Force is driving me down to an Air National Guard base at Richmond, and I am going to fly the F-16, if I pass my morning physical down there, with an Air National Guard squadron of great tradition; flew the F-105 Thunder Chief after Vietnam for years, and now flies the F-16 Falcon.

They have been given the duty of working out the tactical reconnaissance mission in pods on F-16's, instead of taking over the whole aircraft of the F-101 Voodoo, the RA-5 Vigilante in Vietnam, or the RF-4 Phantom in Vietnam and all over the world, all over the world, right up through Desert Storm.

Now, instead of a dedicated reconnaissance fighter aircraft, we are going to have a pod and a mission where in every fighter squadron, or in handpicked squadrons, there will be a few aircraft capable of reconnaissance and fighting if they get in trouble and have to jettison the pod; quite an airplane, that single-engine single-seat single-tail F-16. I will be doing that.

Next weekend, depending on our votes, I am going up to Greenland to close the circle on trips that I have made to the North Pole with Admiral Mauz, another great four-star nuclear engineer who runs all the nuclear programs in the Navy. He took AL GORE and I up to the North Pole to go under the North Pole ice cap on the U.S.S. *Sea Horse*.

Navy officer Bart Roper, back seat radar intercept officer who is now the AA of the gentleman from Florida, JOE SCARBOROUGH, who was earlier doing a tribute to Admiral Boorda; Lt. Comdr. Bart Roper, now working as one of our allies on the Hill, he took me down to Antarctica. I flew with the greatest Navy pilots I have ever flown with in my life, old Huey helicopters, ski-equipped LC-130's. They call themselves the ice pirates. I have a great

patch of theirs on one of my flight jackets.

I want to see how our Air Force operates at Greenland. I have wanted to do that all my life, since when I had a young commander who said, "I am sending you to Thule, Greenland, Dornan, if you don't shape up." So I am going to go up there to see one of our young men and women up there who was on one of our key flights with one of our C-141 aircraft, the stretch B model that is aging.

This is what I did all the time as a regular back-bencher, a minority member activist, a ranking minority member, and now on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and chairman of Subcommittee on Military Personnel, I know what I am doing on this floor, Mr. Speaker, when I put forward an amendment not to have homosexuals in the military.

It won so big in full committee they did not even vote, and it won so big here Wednesday nobody would challenge me with a vote, but behind the scenes they are talking about dumping it in conference, in a secret star Chamber session, with Senators who either had never served or do not work their tail off the way I do visiting with the men and women in the field at all ranks, from sailors and boot camp young men going through paratrooper training in Benning or Special Forces senior heroic Delta Force master sergeants and first sergeants.

I visited the graves of our two Medal of Honor winners, Randy Shugart and Gary Gordon, Gary up in the land of his birth in Lincoln, ME, Shugart born in Lincoln, NE, but buried up in Carlisle, PA. I took my son Mark to both of their graves, so he could see what heroes were sent to their death by a stupid foreign policy in the filthy alleys of Mogadishu.

I only learned in the last few weeks that they held up the arms and legs of our men to show to the crowd. I saw pictures this week of young punks wearing the sunglasses of our aviators, or Durant's crew after they had murdered all of them. Durant, fortunately, came home. I met with him at Fort Knox. It is just amazing that people will ascribe to me motives for what I am doing without ever talking to a man or woman in uniform.

I called a smart-alecky reporter, David, and I will not mention his whole name, he writes for Armed Forces Journal International. He starts off and says, "Dornan is now a bad joke because he has done all the social stuff in the military." I got him on the phone, he was very respectful last night, I called him from an Intel secure phone, because we had a briefing going up there about the dangerous world we live in, and I said, "Where do you get off? Have you worn a uniform?" "No, I haven't. You have got me there."

"Where do you get off telling me that and ripping me up in the press?" I said,

"I'm not bothered by the heat. I kind of like Harry Truman's line, take the heat or move on, but you don't follow me through the Pentagon, you don't go to the funeral with me at Arlington, where I got 5,000 people the Armed Forces the Expeditionary Medal by myself; no help in the Senate, none, nobody."

They fought me. Senior four stars fought me in the Pentagon, but I was there to meet Colonel Pickett, whose son, Lieutenant Colonel Pickett, was executed with a bullet to the back of his head by the Communist FMLN, the Faribundo Marti, down in El Salvador. I met his grandson. I listened to them play taps standing on his grave at Arlington, the only one of our 21 men killed in a battle with communism, where we were not going to give them decorations for even showing up, just an Expeditionary Medal.

None of these reporters were with me. They do not know anything about the military, anyway. They do not know that my heart goes out to these thousand people who have been given a slow, long death sentence with a fatal venereal disease; no matter how they caught it, that is what it is, it is syphilis II, and it is fatal.

And they all know that they serve in the military, restricted in duty, not worldwide deployable, not deployable anywhere, never again to be trained. All their combat training, if they had it, has gone down the drain. One hundred thousand healthy men and women have been discharged, Mr. Speaker, and we politically protect a little group of 1,000, all because of the homosexual lobby trying to drive the agenda here.

□ 1930

Let me just tick off some items here. Item this month—World News Washington Post. Spread of AIDS in China Alarms the Chinese. The prediction here is identical to the prediction I brought to the floor 10 year ago about Bangkok, Thailand and the Indian cities, huge population centers along the Ganges, Delhi, Bombay, Calcutta and it has all happened in southern Asia, it has all happened in Thailand.

Look at this article here. None of the centers know anything about this but it is in the papers today.

In the L.A. Times today, Mr. Speaker:

"House Okays Defense Bill with Dornan Provisions." They say that I have renewed the ban on abortion. I did not renew anything. It is law. Clinton was forced to sign it on February 10. It is law. The other side brought it up. The same people who want us to have so-called partial birth execution style organized crime. I agree with some Italian-Americans who called me and said, "BOB, we love you, please don't use the word Mafia. It is an unfair word." It is organized crime. It is in every country. It is organized crime in

Moscow and they call it Mafia. We ought to just call it organized crime unless it is Sicily where it is specifically Mafia. But this is ridiculous, what they write. I did not bring up the abortion issue. HIV, I am right. Homosexuals in the military. I am right. Then it says the bill would renew provisions contained in previous defense bills. No; it is law. Then it says staffers for Senate Republicans who oppose inclusion of all these social agendas, the HIV ban, the homosexual ban, the ban on Hustler magazine on military bases, PX's, and commissaries.

It says those who oppose it said they gained assurances from the House GOP leadership that at least the AIDS provision would be eliminated. Oh, they are not so sure about going back to George Washington and Ronald Reagan and George Bush's homosexual ban.

None of my leaders better have done this. I went to all of their staffer here, my pal Mr. ARMEY's staff, my classmate from my comeback in 1984, TOM DELAY's staff, another member of the class of 1984. I said, did anybody talk to them, to the L.A. Times, to Norman Kempster and tell anyone?

Well, actually, it is the Senate staff saying this, not Members, staffers saying our leadership is going to dump on DORNAN. Well, I am a conferee this time. This is not like the appropriations bill where Republicans gutted out for the first time in 20 years that I know of, unidid public law that was fair to men and women in the military. Listen to this. Here is why I am going to make my case in conference and take names. Nothing says we have to be secret in conference.

"African Armies Weakened by AIDS Virus." This is in the Stars and Stripes May 5. Weakened is hardly the word for it, Mr. Speaker. Zimbabwe, the Zimbabwean Army has been declared by the United Nations no longer acceptable for deployable duty. That means more duty for us. Do you know why? Three out of every four soldiers, officers, enlisted men, NCO's are infected with the AIDS virus. They are all going to die within the next few years. The former commander is dying of AIDS, the commander before him is dead of AIDS and he has the AIDS virus, the current commander, three out of four.

How about Kenya? Uganda? They are pushing 70 percent, or 6 out of every 10. How about Thailand, 3 or 4 out of every 10 soldiers in Thailand infected with the AIDS virus. When we test people coming to our command and staff schools, artillery schools, armor schools, if they test HIV positive, we send them home. The armies around the world are being ruined by the AIDS virus.

Am I not entitled to say I want my military mercifully with honorable discharges and the best medical treatment in the world hopefully, if people

would work with me, the same doctors, the same 35 to \$40,000 a year spent on each of these 1,000 people that have it in the military, I am entitled to say, if it is micro-redeployability for other people, even though it is only a thousand, a percentage of a percentage point in the world where there are only 191 nations and less than 100 fit for U.N. duty, where they even have trained and disciplined military, every Nation that is X'ed off by the United Nations, by Boutros Boutros-Ghali, it means U.S. men and women who will never be deployed with AIDS, the AIDS virus, they are out when they get AIDS, the HIV AIDS virus, that means more deployability for us on a macro level.

Look at this item. Column from last year by Jeffrey Hart. I just found it in my records. He writes about Michael Warner, this is a friend, Jeffrey Hart's column, an intelligent fellow who is HIV negative but a homosexual activist, he said, why gay men are having risky sex.

On the assumption that the Voice, a New York City weekly, is not part of your regular conservative reading list, I will give you a brief outline of Mr. Warner's startling article. Warner reports that among large numbers of homosexuals, the risk of death is now part of the emotional appeal of sex, as something experienced and shared, and that sex under the threat of death is, well, better sex.

More about that when I do my rebuttal to Mr. GUNDERSON next Wednesday.

Look at this, Mr. Speaker. Baby flushed down the toilet of a Northwest Airlines airplane. Flight 25. Did you read where they found a little baby strapped in its seat at the tragic Valujet crash of Flight 592?

Well, here is a little baby that was not killed in a crash on God's call but the mother on a plane from L.A. to Manila at the Japanese stop, a big Boeing 747 of Northwest Airlines, the police find a baby. It appeared to be 2 days old. Was it born on board? Was it carried on board dead or alive, then disposed of? Was it wrapped in the toilet paper before the flight even left L.A.? We just do not know. This is last Friday. Northwest is working with the legal authorities. Plane was filled with passengers, 349. Two hundred sixty-six of them left the plane. Then for hours they had to hold the other 83 passengers there and finally they let them go on to Manila. All of that because of a little baby a few hours or a couple of days old, one little baby, part of the umbilical cord was still attached. How is that baby any different than what people in this House, including 33 Democrats who have Catholic in their biographies, how is that any different from killing that little baby with its head held in the birth canal, distressing the mother, I do not know how that is supposed to help the mother, she is

in a forced birth situation, and they take the little baby's brain out with suction equipment.

Here is an item, Mr. Speaker, "Vatican Calls Clinton Abortion Veto Brutal Act of Aggression." Here is the exact statement on April 19, the day I am out, that Admiral Boorda is speaking at Admiral Bulkeley's funeral, the same day, Patriot's Day in the United States. This in practice amounts to an incredibly brutal act of aggression against the preborn. The fact that this Presidential decision legalizes this inhuman procedure morally and ethically imperils the future of the society that condones us. The Holy See completely supports the position taken by the cardinals of the United States and the National conference of Catholic Bishops.

Today, Mr. Speaker, in Lincoln, NE, that same town where Medal of Honor winner Randy Shugart was born 37 years ago, today several dozen Catholics were excommunicated for belonging to Planned Parenthood, a phony Playboy magazine group called Catholics for a Free Choice and several other groups, about a dozen groups. The bishop there is named Fabian Bruskwitz. The clerical holy gauntlet has been thrown down, Mr. Speaker.

I had hoped to come to the floor tonight to talk about happy things. Tom Tracy, a friend of mine, is a distinguished Irish-American leader. I have got his great tribute in front of me, how he has honored all Irish-Americans. I am going to save this for next week and do Tommy Tracy right.

I will close on this item, Mr. Speaker. Time magazine, April 29. My friend from Crossfire, Michael Kinsley, did dozens of shows with him. He says:

"Character is a tempting issue and theme for the Republicans. Part of the answer lies with the media. Skeptical scrutiny of Presidents, it seems, is on a permanent upward ratchet. This is a good thing by and large but it is rough on any incumbent President. Part of the answer lies with Clinton himself. Not that his moral failings are worse than other politicians." Whoa, Michael, do not put me in that pack.

"But his relative youth which is not his fault and his occasional callousness, which is his fault, deprive him of gravitas." My 4 years of Latin tells me that means heaviness, weight, seriousness. "The anonymous novel," which my wife is reading, "Primary Colors, is especially good on the way Clinton's bad qualities and good qualities are two sides of the same coin. His ability to deliver a moving speech on great occasions is related to his ability to talk utter baloney with seeming sincerity. Reagan was a great communicator. Clinton, his opponents say dismissively, is a masterly politician. What's the difference?"

Kinsley goes on. "His enormous hunger for approval is what has led him to chase voters and to chase women and

his enormous capacity for empathy helps explain why he is apparently so good at both. The empathy is genuine and for all the mockery of 'I feel your pain,' for all the telling parallels between Clinton's political and personal promiscuity, it is his most valuable gift as a national leader."

And Congressman BOB DORNAN wrote in the margin, "Ugh."

We have got a tough time in this country. I have never seen so many important people dying in any administration and I am sure there is nothing related or conspiratorial about it but we have got a rough 173 days ahead of us to the next election.

EXCERPT FROM RECORD OF MAY 10, 1996

"Admiral Boorda, thank you for your very kind remarks. As our Chief of Naval Operations and as a personal friend of the Bulkeley family, we really appreciate your deep concern, your compassion, and personal kindness from all of us. Thank you again. For everyone, please sit back and relax and let me tell you a story about a very special man. Typical of the Admiral, he would want me to come to the point, so this is what he really wanted you to know. He had no regrets of his life, that he lives a long time, married the woman he loved, raised a family to be proud of, and served a Navy second to none."

Mr. Speaker, I pause here in Peter Bulkeley's opening eulogy to remind you and anyone listening to this Chamber proceeding that Ronald Reagan asked me to do things like this, that I may have my weird detractors who do not understand why I am concerned about the social decay of our country, why I want even defense publications like Armed Forces Journal International, or Roll Call, or the Hill, Marty, why I want you to pay attention to what Billy Graham said, poised on the edge of self-destruction. That is why I am doing this. I want people to hear these words about a real hero. Why no one showed up from this administration, unbelievably. The Army did send their No. 2 man, General Reimer's deputy.

I went to another tribute a few weeks later. It was not written up in the Hill or Armed Forces Journal International. It was not written up there. But I went to a ceremony at Arlington last Sunday where I was given some small piece of thank-you for getting 5,000 warriors—men and plenty of women—the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal for what they did in El Salvador. No Senators, no Congressmen except myself, nobody from the administration. As a matter of fact, the Senate and some strange blockage at the highest levels of the Pentagon did not want these 5,000 male and female warriors to get that medal. And now I have kicked open the door and we are going to get some Bronze Stars and some combat infantry badges and combat medical badges for these people. Nobody showed up there. A beautiful Sunday, playing taps from the grave of Army Colonel Pickett. I got to meet his dad, a retired Army Colonel Pickett.

How did Colonel Pickett die? On his knees with a Communist bullet from the FMLN shot into the back of his head, killed this young enlisted man lying wounded on the ground, the copilot Captain Dawson was already dead in the cockpit of their helicopter.

When did that take place? January 1991. Nobody noticed because a week later the air war of Desert Storm started.

I will close without any more interruptions, just sit back, as Peter Bulkeley says,

and listen to this story of a man who was a legend, and when I told BUCK MCKEON of our House that I could not believe nobody was there, he said, "You mean he outlived his fame."

He said, "If Ron Brown had lived to be Admiral Bulkeley's age, in his eighties, would anybody have remembered him or his less than 4 years as Commerce Secretary?"

No, I guess if you die young, on the line, you get buildings named after you. But if God gives you a good long life and a beautiful family, only a few remember and show up to say goodbye.

Peter continues:

When I pressed dad on 'no regrets,' he sheepishly told me with a twinkle in his eye that that wasn't quite altogether true. And he finally said, I do have one regret, Pete. I should have gotten a bigger boat. A destroyer is not too bad, but he was the kind of guy who could have handled a super carrier. So if you are contemplating a bigger boat, you know what to do.

I will not have in my lifetime a greater honor than today as an officer in our Navy and as his son, because I get to talk about my dad, Admiral Boorda, Admiral Larson, Superintendent at Annapolis, Admiral Trost, General Dubia, the number two man in the Army, General Blott, Assistant Secretary Perry, Assistant Secretary, Medal of Honor recipients, two of them from Army, Vietnam, another cause for freedom that Reagan and I both believed in, and so did Admiral Bulkeley, representatives of the Senate, none were there, and the House, one, members of the diplomatic corps, a couple, allied representatives from France, they were there, Philippines, Great Britain, members of our armed forces, all of them in uniform, friends from Hackettstown, New Jersey, and around the globe, all of those who served and knew Admiral John Bulkeley, and most especially my mom, my sisters, Joan, Rigina and Diana and their husbands, my brother at the organ, beautiful, my wife, all eight of the Admiral's grandchildren, we have come together to honor a great man, a patriot, a legend, a hero in the truest sense. A husband, a father, a friend; a simple man that did his duty as God gave him the ability to do, and the man that tried to keep a low profile, but somehow always ended up in the limelight of life.

Admiral John Bulkeley is a legend. He devoted his entire life to his country and to his Navy. Six decades of his life were spent in the active defense of America. Even after retirement in 1988, he remained engaged in the direction of our Navy and our country. He represented the Navy and the veterans at Normandy during the D-Day celebrations, laying wreaths and flowers of his and our fallen comrades. He provided running parallel to Utah Beach, and picking up wounded soldiers from the sinking minesweeper Tide and the Destroyer Cory.

His World War II exploits would not be complete without the mention of his love for destroyers, of which he would command many in his years to come. As Normandy operations wound up, he got his first large ship, the Destroyer Endicott, a month after D-Day. I told this story about the British gunboats, the two German Corvettes charging in as dawn's light broke. I told that story. I want to use every minute here. Peter tells it better than I did.

When I asked about dad about that action, he said "What else could I do but engage? You fight, you win. That is the reputation of our Navy, then, now, and in the future. You fight, you win."

[From Catholic News Service]

VATICAN CALLS CLINTON ABORTION VETO  
"BRUTAL ACT OF AGGRESSION"

(By Cindy Wooden)

President Bill Clinton's veto of the bill banning partial-birth abortions "in practice amounts to an incredibly brutal act of aggression" against the unborn, the Vatican said.

"The fact that this presidential decision legalizes this inhuman procedure morally and ethically imperils the future of a society that condones it," said Vatican spokesman Joaquin Navarro-Valls.

In its April 19 edition, the Vatican newspaper printed an Italian translation of the April 16 letter written by eight U.S. cardinals and the president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops condemning Clinton's veto of the bill.

"The Holy See completely supports the position taken by the cardinals of the United States and the National Conference of Catholic Bishops," Navarro-Valls said April 19.

"As has already been stated by the American cardinals, this presidential decision is 'more akin to infanticide than to abortion,' and thus it is not surprising that 65 percent of those who call themselves 'pro-choice' are opposed to partial-birth abortions," he said.

Navarro-Valls explained to reporters at the Vatican that the bill vetoed by Clinton would have banned a procedure used in late-term abortions. The spokesman, who is a medical doctor, said the procedure involves the partial delivery of the fetus before surgical scissors are stabbed into the base of its head. The brains are removed by suction, allowing for easier delivery of the rest of the fetus.

Clinton's decision to veto the bill passed by Congress is "shameful," the spokesman said, and "in practice, amounts to an incredibly brutal act of aggression against innocent human life and the inalienable right of the unborn."

Naturally, this situation makes even more urgent a greater solidarity in defense of the life of the unborn who cannot speak for themselves," he said.

Navarro-Valls said the fact that the United States will hold a presidential election in November played no part in the Vatican's decision to comment on Clinton's veto.

"The Holy See cannot say nothing," he said. "This is an ethical and moral problem which is very clear and very serious."

The same day the Vatican issued a statement condemning the Israeli bombing of a refugee camp in Lebanon, killing many civilians, he said. "We must also say something about this attack on defenseless, unborn babies."

Raymond L. Flynn, the U.S. ambassador to the Vatican, said he was informed April 18 "of the Holy See's disappointment with the president's veto."

[From Time, Apr. 29, 1996]

EVERYBODY DOES IT

(By Michael Kinsley)

In every presidential election from 1968 through 1988, the Democrats nominated a goody-goody (Hubert Humphrey, George McGovern, Jimmy Carter, Walter Mondale, Michael Dukakis). And they lost every election during those two decades except in 1976, when the Republicans also nominated a goody-goody (Gerald Ford). In 1992 the Democrats finally got—well, you might say cynical or you might say serious. They decided they wanted to win this time. So they nominated a man who is no one's idea of a

goody-goody. They nominated a slippery politician. Not coincidentally, he is also a morally flawed character with personal and (perhaps) financial peccadilloes.

Bill Clinton had not been President more than five minutes before many Democrats began reacting in horror to the realization that their man was not a plaster saint. Many Republicans, meanwhile, seemed resentful that the Democrats had stolen the election through the devious device of nominating someone who knew how to win.

It is pretty clear now that even if Clinton is re-elected, he is destined never to enjoy a period, as even Richard Nixon did, of genuine and heartfelt popularity while in office. The best he can probably hope for is a couple of weeks of golden-glow nostalgia when he leaves office in 2001 and a historical reevaluation some decades down the road. It is fortunate for Clinton that our voting system doesn't measure intensity of feelings, because his opponents dislike him with a seething passion while his supporters can rarely muster more than grudging acquiescence.

But why is that? Is Clinton's opportunistic floppery on, say, balancing the budget any more egregious than Bob Dole's on, say, abortion? Ronald Reagan's California business chums bought him a house while he was President, to barely a peep of protest; yet we are in our fourth year of pawing through the much smaller financial favors Clinton's Arkansas business chums tried to do him 14 years ago when he was Governor.

Yes, of course, repeat after your mother: "Everybody does it" is no excuse. But why is Clinton's "character" such a liability to him, when by any reasonable reckoning his professional and personal failings average out to a level of moral compromise so typical among Presidents and presidential candidates that it almost amounts to a job qualification?

Part of the answer lies in Republican strategy. With not much cooking on the foreign front, and with the economic issues that usually decide elections divisible into those that look pretty good right now (growth, unemployment, inflation, the deficit) and those for which the Republicans have nothing much to suggest (wage stagnation, middle-class angst), "character" is naturally a tempting theme. Part of the answer lies with the media. Skeptical scrutiny of Presidents, it seems, is on a permanent upward ratchet. This is a good thing, by and large, but rough on the incumbent. And part of the answer lies with Clinton himself. Not that his moral failings are worse than other politicians'. But his relative youth (which is not his fault) and his occasional callousness (which is) deprive him of gravitas.

The anonymous novel Primary Colors is especially good on the way Clinton's bad qualities and good qualities are two sides of the same coin. His ability to deliver a moving speech on great occasions is related to his ability to talk utter baloney with seeming sincerity. (Reagan was a "great communicator." Clinton, his opponents say dismissively, is a "masterly politician.") What's the difference? His enormous hunger for approval is what has led him to chase voters and to chase women, and his enormous capacity for empathy helps explain why he is apparently so good at both. The empathy is genuine. And—for all the mockery of "I feel your pain," for all the telling parallels between Clinton's political and personal "promiscuity"—it is his most valuable gift as a national leader.

It is hard to turn this point into a useful campaign slogan. "Vote for Clinton. He's Not

So Bad." "Re-elect the President. He's No Worse Than All the Others." Or "Bill Clinton: You Can't Have the French Fries Without the Grease." I don't recommend this theme to the Democratic National Committee. But it is pretty close to the truth.

As a Clinton supporter of moderate but steady enthusiasm, I've been bewildered by those liberals who've veered from wild ardor in 1992 to foaming dislike in the years since. The intense hatred Clinton evokes among conservatives is less puzzling but still a bit strange. Not since F.D.R., probably, has a Democratic President inspired such emotions in his opponents. But the F.D.R. comparison merely adds to the puzzle, since Clinton's agenda is far more modest and less ideologically charged.

Maybe an explanation lies in that old joke about academia, where, it is said, "the disputes are so vicious because the stakes are so small." The differences between Bill Clinton's agenda and Bob Dole's agenda are negligible in comparison with our political culture's huge need for rhetoric and disagreement between now and November. That means it's probably going to be an especially vicious campaign.

[From the Stars and Stripes, May 5, 1996]

#### AFRICAN ARMIES WEAKENED BY AIDS VIRUS

MANGOCHI, MALAWI.—In some African armies, half of the soldiers are infected with the virus which causes AIDS, a conference on the disease was told 24 April.

On a continent plagued by Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), the military faces extra risks and in some countries like Congo, the United Nations estimates every second soldier is infected with the HIV virus that causes the disease.

"Prevalence rates in many armies of the developing world, especially in Africa, are exceptionally high," Malawian Defense Minister Justin Malewezi told an AIDS conference for high-ranking military officers from 13 South and East African countries.

He said highly trained army and air force officers seemed to be particularly at risk and that countries might find it hard to train enough men to replace them.

"When the military is weakened, so too is the security of the country it is intended to defend," Malewezi said, opening the three-day meeting in the northern town of Mangochi.

Many countries in the region estimate up to a tenth of the population is infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV).

The World Health Organization director for Africa, Ebrahim Samba, said soldiers were a high-risk group because they were young, mainly between the ages of 15 and 24, sexually active and away from home for long stretches at a time.

"They are often in search of recreation to relieve stress and loneliness," he said in a message read to the meeting.

"They feel vulnerable in a profession which excuses or encourages risk-taking. Off-duty soldiers can be counted on to have money, but not necessarily condoms, in their pockets."

Samba said soldiers often paid prostitutes for sex or slept with women from the local community wherever they were based or deployed. Drug pushers also preyed on the military.

Stuart Kingma, a UN adviser on AIDS in the military, said Zimbabwe's army had an HIV infection rate three to four times higher than that in the civilian population.

One in two of the nearly 20 million people infected with the virus worldwide were in sub-Saharan Africa, he said.

Kingma listed Congo, Uganda, Gabon, Kenya and Zimbabwe as African countries where the situation in the military was particularly bad.

#### EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKEEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this evening I rise to address the Equal Opportunity Act, legislation which Senator DOLE and I introduced on July 27 of last year.

This legislation will, if enacted, end the use of race and gender preferences by the Federal Government in Federal employment, Federal contracting, and in the administration of other Federal programs.

The principles of equal treatment and nondiscrimination on which this legislation is based are principles which are at the heart of the American experience. They embody an ideal which generations of Americans have honored and sought to realize, an ideal to which we as a people have long aspired but an ideal which we have never fully attained in our life as a Nation.

On Saturday of this week, May 18, we will mark the 100th anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in Plessy versus Ferguson, the decision which represents the culmination of disappointment in the struggle for equality before the law during the 19th century.

In Plessy by a 7-1 majority, the Supreme Court of the United States held that Louisiana's law requiring railroads to provide racially separate accommodations did not violate either the 13th or the 14th amendments. Justice Henry Billings Brown, in delivery the court's opinion, explained the difference between a distinction based on race and prohibited discrimination.

He said as follows:

A statute which implies merely a legal distinction between the white and colored races has no tendency to destroy the legal equality of the two races or to reestablish a state of involuntary servitude.

Brown went on to observe that in the nature of things, the 14th Amendment could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based upon color. According to Brown, the 14th Amendment challenged in Plessy reduces itself to the question of whether the statute of Louisiana is a reasonable regulation.

Brown then concluded:

We cannot say that a law which authorizes or even requires the separation of the races is unreasonable.

This is a shameful decision. And although the segregationist doctrine embodied in Plessy has been rejected by the courts most strikingly in Brown versus Board of Education, the case itself has never been directly overruled. Indeed, the core holding of

Plessy that Government may make distinctions in the treatment of its citizens based on their race remains the law of our land.

Justice Harlan's dissent in Plessy, which, is recognized as the most famous dissent in the history of American jurisprudence, has been vindicated by history but the principles so eloquently articulated in that dissent has not finally been accepted by the courts. In words that would often be cited by those seeking to overthrow the Jim Crow system, Justice Harlan pronounced:

Our Constitution is colorblind. The law regards man as man and takes no account of his surroundings or of his color when his civil rights, as guaranteed by the supreme law of the land, are involved.

Harlan found a Louisiana statute unconstitutional because the Constitution of the United States does not permit any public authority to know the race of those entitled to be protected in the enjoyment of their civil rights.

Simply put, Government may not have regard to the race of its citizens when the civil rights of those citizens are involved.

The color-blind ideal was the touchstone of the American civil rights movement until the mid 1960's. In 1947, Thurgood Marshall, representing the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund in a brief for a black student denied admission to the segregated University of Oklahoma Law School, stated that principle unequivocally. Classifications and distinctions based on race or color have no moral or legal validity in our society. They are contrary to our Constitution and laws.

□ 1945

Marshall's support for the color-blind principle, which he later, unfortunately, abandoned, is vividly revealed by Constance Baker Motley, senior United States district judge for the southern district of New York, in an account included in Tinsley Yarbrough's biography of Justice Harlan. Judge Motley recalled her days working with Marshall at the NAACP as follows:

Marshall had a Bible, to which he turned during his most depressed moments. Marshall would read aloud passages from Harlan's amazing dissent. I do not believe we ever filed a major brief in the pre-Brown days in which a portion of that opinion was not quoted. Marshall's favorite quotation was our Constitution is color-blind. It became our basic creed.

Marshall admired the courage of Harlan more than any justice who had ever sat on the Supreme Court. Even Chief Justice Earl Warren's forthright and moving decision for the court in Brown did not affect Marshall in the same way. Earl Warren was writing for a unanimous Supreme Court. Harlan was a solitary and lonely figure writing for posterity.

In the face of the vociferous opposition to the Equal Opportunity Act, and any other proposal to end the use of preferences, we would do well to remember the long battle that was fought to establish a legal order based on the principles set forth in justice Harlan's dissent.

Professor Andrew Carl, in his admirable history "The Color Blind Constitution," identifies the centrality of the color-blind principle to the civil rights movement. Professor Carl says as follows:

The undeniable fact is that over a period of some 125 years, ending only in the late 1960s, the American civil rights movement first elaborated then held as its unvarying political objective a rule of law requiring the color-blind treatment of individuals.

In 1964, the U.S. Congress took a great stride forward toward the realization of that objective. With the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Congress established a national policy against discrimination based on race and sex.

It is the supreme irony of the modern civil rights movement that this crowning achievement was so soon followed by the creation of a system of preferences based on race and gender, a system contrived first by administrative agencies and the Federal courts and then accepted and expanded by the Congress.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act constituted an unequivocal statement that Americans should be treated as individuals and not as members of racial or gender groups; an unequivocal statement that no American should be subject to discrimination, which Senator Hubert Humphrey, the chief sponsor in the Senate of this legislation, defined as a distinction in treatment given to different individuals because of their difference race.

Yet the ink was hardly dry on the 1964 law when a process of transformation began and the system of preferences was erected piece by piece. This took place not because Congress had failed to express its intention clearly, but because of a court system and an administrative structure determined to pursue their own purposes despite the clearly expressed purpose of the Congress.

Since the issue of imposing quotas and granting preferences based on race to compensate for historical wrongs had been the subject of controversy during the year preceding congressional consideration of the 1964 act, Congress was careful to directly address the issue in the text of the law itself.

Section 703(j) of the act stated that nothing in Title VII of the act shall be interpreted to require any employer to grant preferential treatment to any individual or to any group because of the race of such individual or group in order to maintain a racial balance.

The managers of Title VII, Senator Clark of Pennsylvania, and Senator Case of New Jersey had submitted a joint memorandum on the subject where they stated, and I quote:

Any deliberate attempt to maintain a racial balance, whatever such a balance may be, would involve a violation of Title VII because maintaining such a balance would require an employer to hire or refuse to hire on the basis of race. It must be emphasized that discrimination is prohibited to any individual.

It is, I think, impossible to imagine a clearer more unambiguous statement of congressional intent on the subject of racial preferences. But in the face of this directly expressed purpose in the law, the bureaucracy and the courts decided to chart their own course. In the place of the principles of individual rights, equal opportunity and non-discrimination, which were embodied in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the courts and the bureaucracy moved forward with the establishment of a system based on the concepts of proportional representation, group entitlement, and guaranteed results. This approach was foreshadowed by Judge John Miner Wisdom of the fifth circuit in *United States versus Jefferson County*, where he upheld school desegregation guidelines promulgated by the Office of Education under Title VI of the 1964 act and stated, and again I quote.

The Constitution, according to Judge Wisdom, is both color-blind and color conscious. The criterion is the relevancy of color to a legitimate governmental purpose.

This is, indeed, a far cry from the clear principles articulated by Justice Harlan and doggedly pursued by the civil rights movement throughout most of its history.

The concepts of proportional representation, group entitlement and guaranteed results found full-blown expression in the Nixon administration's Labor Department order No. 4, which was first issued in November of 1969 and was aimed at the activities of all Federal contractors.

The order stated the rate of minority applicants recruited should approximate or equal the rate of minorities to the applicant population in each location.

This was clearly a mandate for proportional representation. A more direct conflict with the provision of 703(j) of the 1964 Civil Rights Act would be impossible to devise.

After a minor flack over order number 4, a revised order was issued by the Labor Department in February 1970. No substantive changes were made. The revised order number 4 provided that the affirmative action programs adopted by contractors must include goals and timetable to which the contractor's good faith efforts must be directed to correct deficiencies in the utilization of minority groups.

This construct of goals and timetables to ensure the proper utilization

of minority groups clearly envisioned a system of proportional representation in which group identity would be a factor, often the decisive factor, in hiring decisions. Distinctions in treatment would be made on the basis of race.

The concept of proportional representation embodied in order number 4 not only defied the intent of section 703(j) of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, but also contravened the express non-discrimination provisions of the Executive Order it was issued to implement. That is the Executive Order requiring affirmative action.

The course was set by the bureaucracy and the courts did little to interfere. With few exceptions, until the Supreme Court decided the *Adarand* case last year, the color-blind ideal was an eclipse. Year after year the system of preferences granted or imposed by the Federal Government grew with the active support of the Congress itself.

The dominant attitude was captured in 1978 in the opinion of Justice Blackmun in the *Bakke* case, which dealt with a California medical school's policy of preferential admissions for minority students. Justice Blackmun distilled the rationale for preferential policies. He said, and I quote, "in order to get beyond racism, we must first take account of race. In order to treat some persons equally, we must treat them differently."

In the face of the provision of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, that no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color or national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, the closely divided court in *Bakke* recognized that race could at least be a factor in determining eligibility for admission to an educational institution receiving Federal financial assistance.

The system of preferences is based on the notion that we can only overcome our history of discrimination by practicing discrimination. To guarantee the equitable apportionment of opportunities, Americans must be divided, sorted and classified by race and gender. It is the responsibility of government not to create a level playing field for all Americans, but to determine outcomes based on race and gender. Rather than dealing with its citizens as unique individuals who are equal in the eyes of the law, the Government of the United States must treat everyone as group members, as people whose biological characteristics determine the scope of their claims on our government.

The Equal Opportunity Act rejects this vision of America. It would overturn the status quo of race and gender preferences and return to the principles on which the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was based. In place of group rights, it

would establish respect for individual rights.

It is very important to focus on the specific provisions of the Equal Opportunity Act. Simply stated this legislation would prohibit the Federal Government from intentionally discriminating against or granting a preference to any person or group based in whole or in part on race, color, national origin or sex in three areas: Federal contracting, Federal employment, and the administration of other federally conducted programs or activities.

In addition, it would prevent the Federal Government from requiring or encouraging Federal contractors or the recipients of Federal financial assistance to discriminate or grant preferences based on race or sex.

Let me elaborate on a few key points. First, the bill applies only to Federal programs and activities. It, therefore, does not affect programs or policies administered by State and local governments, the private sector, or colleges and universities.

Second, the Equal Opportunity Act does not affect our comprehensive regime of anti-discrimination laws. All forms of racial and sex-based discrimination that are illegal under current law would remain so under the Equal Opportunity Act.

In addition, all remedies currently available to individuals who have been discriminated against will remain completely unaffected by this bill. Though you will hear claims to the contrary, it is simply not the case that this bill weakens, undermines or otherwise affects laws that make it illegal to discriminate on the basis of race and sex.

Third, the bill draws an important distinction between preferential treatment and affirmative action. Preferential treatment is prohibited and affirmative action, as originally conceived, is permitted and expressly protected.

I think we all recognize that the term affirmative action has come to describe a whole range of measures, from casting a wider net at the recruiting and outreach stage to outright quotas, set-asides and other numerical preferences.

Section 3 of the Equal Opportunity Act expressly provides that the government may continue affirmative action in the form of vigorous outreach and recruitment efforts. Steps taken to increase the size of the applicant pool for a contracting or employment opportunity, including steps targeted specifically at women and minorities, are permissible so long as at the decision stage all applicants are judged in a nondiscriminatory manner; that is, without regard to their race or sex.

If the bill does not affect anti-discrimination laws or nonpreferential forms of affirmative action, then what does it do? It would, in short, put an end to all Federal programs that will

require the Government to take into account the race or sex of American citizens and to treat them differently based on what group they belong to.

There is frustrating unwillingness on the part of many people to acknowledge what we all know; namely that there are many, many such programs and policies currently being administered by the Federal Government: Contracting set-asides and bid preferences, grant programs targeted solely at women and minorities, and hiring and personnel systems that are driven by numerical goals and timetables. These are all preference programs that, on their face, discriminate on the basis of race and sex, and these are the programs that would be eliminated under the Equal Opportunity Act.

□ 2000

The heart of the Equal Opportunity Act is found in its definition of preference. The bill as recently passed by the Subcommittee on the Constitution defines the term preference as an advantage of any kind, including a quota, set-aside, numerical goal, timetable, or other numerical objective. This functional definition makes clear that it is not what we call a policy, a practice, or a program that determines its appropriateness.

The test is how that policy, practice, or program actually operates. If the policy, practice, or program gives an advantage of any kind to individuals because of their race or gender, it is unlawful. Those who oppose the Equal Opportunity Act have the burden of explaining why anyone should receive an advantage of any kind based on race or gender.

The supporters of preferences realize that this burden is indeed a heavy one. They understand that the American people are opposed to the system of preferential treatment that has been erected over the years since 1964. They know the power of the principles of equal treatment and nondiscrimination. They know that Americans have an instinctive respect for individual rights.

The defenders of the status quo of preferential treatment have chosen not to meet this challenge. They have decided that a principled defense of group rights and proportional representation would not be successful, since it is so clearly at odds with values that are central to the American experience. So rather than attempting such a principled defense of preferences, they have launched a campaign of confusion and distortion.

Mr. Speaker, the recent barrage against the Equal Opportunity Act is just the most recent phase of the long-standing effort to conceal the realities of the preferential system from the American people. I can cite many examples of the distortions used to defend the status quo and to attack the

Equal Opportunity Act. But the remarks delivered by President Clinton at the National Archives on July 19, 1995, the President's famous "mend it, don't end it" speech, stands as the epitome of distortions in defense of the status quo of preferences.

The President's speech is indeed a handy compendium of the rhetorical devices used to obscure the issues and to mislead the American people. The core of the President's speech is found in the four so-called standards of fairness for affirmative action programs. The President summarized these standards as follows, and I quote:

No quotas in theory or practice, no illegal discrimination of any kind, including reverse discrimination, no preference for people who are not qualified for any job or other opportunity.

And as soon as the program has succeeded, it must be retired. Any program that does not meet these four principles must be eliminated or reformed to meet them.

This statement by the President represents an attempt to redescribe and redefine reality. In it, words are stripped of their ordinary, commonly understood meaning and infused with a new meaning. When the President says he is against quotas, he signals his recognition that the American people are against quotas, and that some other terminology must be used to describe the system of preferences based on race and gender, a system which apportions benefits based on group membership. But when the President denounces quotas, he fails to explain how a quota is different from a set-aside under which contract opportunities are reserved for members of a particular race or gender group. And he does not explain how a system of goals and timetables under which race and gender determine who receives a job and who does not receive a job, is any less unjust than a system of quotas under which race and gender determine who receives a job and who does not receive a job.

When the President says no preferences for the unqualified, he conveniently glosses over the fact that individuals who are more qualified are systematically denied jobs and other opportunities solely because they belong to the wrong racial or gender group.

When the President says that, as soon as a program has succeeded, it must be retired, he fails to specify the standard of success and he fails to tell us when exactly when we can expect these supposedly temporary programs to end.

When the President says we should have no illegal discrimination of any kind, he fails to explain how the system of counting by race and gender can be reconciled with either the letter or the spirit of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The President and the other defenders of preferential policies have

constructed a fictitious world, a world where discrimination pure and simple is given another name and called just.

The Equal Opportunity Act rejects that fictitious world. It rejects the false descriptions of the programs, policies and practices of the Federal Government which have been foisted on the American people by the defenders of the status quo. The Equal Opportunity Act is based on an understanding of the flaws of the system of preferences based on race and gender. It is based on a realistic evaluation of the way that system operates and the injustice for which it is responsible.

It recognizes that the system of preferences unfairly places burdens on and denies opportunities to those who have been guilty of no wrongdoing. Simply because of their race or gender, while granting benefits to individuals who are not victims of discriminatory conduct, it recognizes that the system of preferences is by its very nature discriminatory and morally wrong.

The Equal Opportunity Act is based on an understanding that the existence of the system of race and gender preferences unfairly casts a cloud over the accomplishments of individuals who are members of favored groups and deprives those individuals, the individuals the system is supposed to benefit, of the full measure of respect they are due for their individual achievements.

Mr. Speaker, finally, and most importantly, the Equal Opportunity Act is based on the recognition that the system of race and gender preferences sends a message from government to the American people that we should think along racial and gender lines, a message which only reinforces prejudice and discrimination in our society.

As long as the Federal Government is engaged in the business of classifying and sorting the American people into racial and gender groups, can we really expect to reach the goal of a society free of prejudice and discrimination? It has been 100 years since Justice Harlan spoke so eloquently of the color-blind Constitution. Since that time, we have made much progress in reducing prejudice and discrimination in America. But we are far, far from the goal of a society in which individuals are treated as individuals and where irrelevant biological characteristics are treated as irrelevant.

As we mark the 100th anniversary of the shameful Plessy decision, we should turn our attention again to the principles so forcefully stated by Justice Harlan in his renowned dissent. Those principles find expression here in this Congress in the Equal Opportunity Act.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we reaffirm the principles of equality before the law and nondiscrimination. We can do so clearly and unequivocally by passing the Equal Opportunity Act and ending the odious system of race and

gender preferences established by the Federal Government. We can recognize once and for all that each American has the right to be treated by our government, not as a member of a particular race or gender group, but as an individual American citizen, equal in the eyes of the law.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MANZULLO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 3 p.m., on account of a family emergency.

#### 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. ABERCOMBIE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. DICKEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, on May 21.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BORSKI.  
Ms. PELOSI.  
Mr. MENENDEZ.  
Mr. MORAN.  
Mr. SERRANO.  
Mr. VENTO.  
Mr. BONIOR.  
Mr. TORRES in two instances.  
Mr. KANJORSKI.  
Mr. BARCIA in two instances.  
Ms. DELAURO.  
Mr. STOKES.  
Mrs. MALONEY in three instances.  
Mr. CLYBURN in two instances.  
Mr. TOWNS in three instances.  
Mr. VISCLOSKEY.  
Mr. UNDERWOOD in three instances.  
Mr. GORDON in 10 instances.  
Mr. KLECZKA.  
Mr. FAZIO of California in two instances.  
Mrs. THURMAN.

Ms. HARMAN.  
Ms. WOOLSEY.  
Mr. LANTOS.  
Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
Mr. WARD.  
Ms. NORTON.  
Mr. COLEMAN.  
Ms. ESHOO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON of Florida) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. QUINN.  
Mr. DAVIS.  
Mr. GREENWOOD.  
Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.  
Mr. LAZIO of New York.  
Mr. DORNAN.  
Mr. GEKAS.  
Mr. GINGRICH.  
Mr. WALSH.  
Mr. LAHOOD.  
Mr. HORN.  
Mr. SHUSTER.  
Mr. DIAZ-BALART.  
Mr. THOMAS.  
Mr. NETHERCUTT.  
Mrs. KELLY.  
Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CANADY of Florida) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
Mr. SHAW.  
Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.  
Ms. WOOLSEY.  
Mr. STEARNS.  
Mr. CONDIT.  
Mr. MCDADE.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1836. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire property in the town of East Hampton, Suffolk County, New York, for inclusion in the Amagansett National Wildlife Refuge; and

H.R. 1743. An act to amend the Water Resources Act of 1984 to extend the authorizations of appropriations through fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 20, 1996, at 2 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3036. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—RUS Specification for Aerial Service Wires (7 CFR Part 1755.700-704) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3037. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the fiscal year 1997 appropriations requests for the Department of Agriculture [USDA], pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1106(b) (H. Doc. No. 104-215); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3038. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Secretary's selected acquisition reports [SAR's] for the quarter ending March 31, 1996, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on National Security.

3039. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cargo Preference: Available U.S.-Flag Commercial Vessels (RIN: 2133-AB25) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

3040. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Workers Protection Act (RIN: 1215-AA93) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

3041. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of Section 273(d)(5) of the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996—Dispute Resolution Regarding Equipment Standards [GC Docket No. 96-42] received May 14, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3042. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of the Amateur Service Rules to Implement a Vanity Call Sign System [PR Docket No. 93-305] received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3043. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Trade Regulation Rule on Misbranding and Deception as to Leather Content of Waist Belts (16 CFR Part 405) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3044. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an update to the PLO Commitments Compliance Act report on March 1, 1996, pursuant to Public Law 104-107, section 604(b)(1) (110 Stat. 756); to the Committee on International Relations.

3045. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and Bosnian Serb-Controlled Areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina Sanctions Regulations: Suspension of Sanctions Against the Bosnian Serbs (31 CFR Part 585) received May 10, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

3046. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Affirmative Action Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors For Disabled

Veterans and Veterans of the Vietnam Era; Invitation to Self-Identify; Interim Rule with Request for Comments (RIN: 1251-AA62) received May 15, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3047. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors Regarding Individuals with Disabilities (RIN: 1215-AA76) received May 15, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3048. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Flaring or Venting Gas and Burning Liquid Hydrocarbons (Minerals Management Service) (RIN: 1010-AB96) received May 15, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3049. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp (Federal Duck Stamp) Contest (Fish and Wildlife Service) (RIN: 1018-AD71) received May 15, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3050. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Designation of Critical Habitat for the Marbled Murrelet (Fish and Wildlife Service) (RIN: 1018-AC33) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3051. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting the Attorney General's report entitled "Report on Federal Recordkeeping Relating to Domestic Violence," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 14015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3052. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting the Attorney General's report entitled "Domestic Violence, Stalking, and Antistalking Legislation," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 14039; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3053. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting the Attorney General's report entitled "The Violence Against Women Act of 1994: Evaluation of the STOP Block Grants to Combat Violence Against Women," pursuant to section 40291 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3054. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's 1995 annual report on the recommendations received from the National Transportation Board regarding transportation safety, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 1906(b); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3055. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. PA31, PA31P, and PA31T Series Airplanes; (Docket No. 9-CE-62-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3056. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc.

Models PA31, PA31-300, PA31-325, and PA31-350 Airplanes (Docket No. 90-CE-63-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3057. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus A320-111, -211, -212, and -231 Series Airplanes (Docket No. 95-NM-198-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3058. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and DC-9-80 Series Airplanes, Model MD-88 Airplanes, and C-9 (Military) Series Airplanes (Docket No. 94-NM-92-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3059. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 Series Airplanes (Docket No. 95-NM-191-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3060. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10-10, -15, and -30 Series Airplanes and KC-10 (Military) Airplanes (Docket No. 95-NM-108-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3061. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Aviat Aircraft Inc., Models S-1S, S-1T, S-2A, S-2S, and S-2B Airplanes (Docket No. 96-CE-20-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3062. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc., Models PA31T, PA31T1, PA31T2, and PA31T3 Airplanes (Docket No. 90-CE-61-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3063. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Capital Leases (RIN: 2132-AA55) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3064. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulation: Quonset Open House, North Kingston, RI (RIN: 2115-AE46) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3065. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Long Beach Harbor, CA (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3066. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Adoption of Industry Standards (RIN: 2115-AF09) received

May 16, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3067. A letter from the Under Secretary for Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Agency Guidance for the Acquisition of Modular Metric Construction Products (RIN: 0693-XX18) received May 15, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

3068. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Notice 96-31—Received May 10, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3069. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, United States Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Prohibited/Restricted Merchandise; Enforcement of Foreign Assets Control Regulations (RIN: 1515-AB91) received May 14, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3070. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Veterans Education: Increase in Rates Payable Under the Montgomery GI Bill—Active Duty, 1995-96 (RIN: 2900-AH79) received May 14, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly, to the Committees on National Security and Veterans' Affairs.

#### 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:

*[Omitted from the Record of May 15, 1996]*

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3415. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 4.3-cent increase in the transportation motor fuels excise tax rates enacted by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 and dedicated to the general fund of the Treasury (Rept. 104-576, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker: The Committee on Commerce discharged from further consideration; H.R. 3415 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

*[Submitted May 16, 1996]*

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2909. A bill to amend the Silvio O. Conte National Fish and Wildlife Refuge Act to provide that the Secretary of the Interior may acquire lands for purposes of that Act only by donation or exchange, or otherwise with the consent of the owner of the lands (Rept. 104-579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 436. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3415) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 4.3-cent increase in the transportation motor fuels tax rates enacted by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 and dedicated to the general fund of the Treasury

(Rept. 104-580). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 437. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3259) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-581). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 438. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3144) to establish a United States policy for the deployment of a national missile defense system, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-582). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on National Security. H.R. 3144. A bill to establish a United States policy for the deployment of a national missile defense system, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-583, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker: The Committee on International Relations discharged from further consideration; H.R. 3144 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The Committee on National Security discharged from further consideration; H.R. 3259 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3107. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than May 31, 1996.

H.R. 3144. Referral to the Committee on International Relations extended for a period ending not later than May 16, 1996.

#### 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. WATTS of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. TALENT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. NORWOOD, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOKE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. KING, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WAMP, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr.

DELAY, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina):

H.R. 3467. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the designation of renewal communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Banking and Financial Services, and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HOBSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BURR, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. BUYER, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. STENHOLM):

H.R. 3468. A bill to establish rules governing product liability actions against raw materials and bulk component suppliers to medical device manufacturers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BORSKI (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BREWSTER, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 3469. A bill to improve economic productivity and create thousands of jobs by establishing an infrastructure reinvestment fund which will provide immediate, upfront funding of intermodal surface transportation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 3470. A bill to enhance the conservation and protection of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and the Voyageurs National Park; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 3471. A bill to authorize the Corps of Engineers to enter into a cooperative agreement with the State of New York to fund one or more projects for habitat restoration in the Hudson River Basin, NY; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. HINGHEY, Mr. FALCOMA, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 3472. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to eliminate current Federal subsidies for alcoholic beverage promotions overseas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3473. A bill to establish advertising requirements for alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 3474. A bill to require health warnings to be included in alcoholic beverage advertisements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 3475. A bill to require an annual report by the Secretary of Health and Human Services on alcohol advertising practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 3476. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide incentives to colleges and universities to develop, implement, and improve alcohol abuse prevention and education programs on their campuses, to strengthen sanctions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3477. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to restrict employers in obtaining, disclosing, and using of genetic information; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FALCOMA, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 3478. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate tax deductions for advertising and goodwill expenditures relating to alcohol beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3479. A bill to carry out a comprehensive program dealing with alcohol and alcohol abuse; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Economic and Educational Opportunities, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota):

H.R. 3480. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure the ability of utility providers to establish, improve, operate, and maintain utility structures, facilities, and equipment for the benefit, safety, and well-being of consumers, by removing limitations on maximum driving and on-duty time pertaining to utility vehicle operators and drivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LIGHTFOOT (for himself, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BARR, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MICA, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. STEARNS):

H.R. 3481. A bill to repeal the minimum wage requirement of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 3482. A bill to protect the privacy of health information in the age of genetic and other new technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. MICA) (both by request):

H.R. 3483. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to enable Federal agencies to design personnel systems suited to their missions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consider-

ation of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself and Mr. WALKER):

H.R. 3484. A bill to authorize the Federal Aviation Administration's research, engineering, and development programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NETHERCUTT:

H.R. 3485. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct an adaptive forest management research program in Colville National Forest, WA, that will provide for a creditable, science-based approach to manage fire-generated, overstocked, small-diameter, stagnated forest stands for the purposes for improving forest health, providing wood fiber for manufacturing facilities in forest-dependent communities, and meeting current and future environmental needs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ORTON:

H.R. 3486. A bill to dispose of certain Federal properties at Dutch John, UT, assist local government in the interim delivery of basic services to the Dutch John community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SEXTON (for himself and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 3487. A bill to reauthorize the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 3488. A bill to prevent handgun violence and illegal commerce in handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRATT (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. McHALE, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 3489. A bill to protect the United States and its Armed Forces, wherever engaged, from ballistic missile attack, to state the policy and priorities of the United States for developing and deploying more effective defenses against ballistic missiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Security, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TATE:

H.R. 3490. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to reform Federal prisons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 3491. A bill to repeal the American Folklife Preservation Act; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. VOLKMER:

H.R. 3492. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure the ability of utility providers to establish, improve, operate, and maintain utility structures, facilities, and equipment for benefit, safety, and well-being of consumers, by removing limitations on maximum driving and on-duty time pertaining to utility vehicle operators and drivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BAKER of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. McCRERY, Mr. HAYES, Mr.

LIVINGSTON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution designating the Civil War Center at Louisiana State University as the U.S. Civil War Center, making the center the flagship institution for planning the sesquicentennial commemoration of the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that Buddhist monks and civilians and Roman Catholic monks and priests unlawfully detained by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam should be released; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. SMITH of Washington:

H. Res. 439. Resolution amending the rule XLIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit a Member, officer, or employee of the House from soliciting, distributing, or accepting campaign contributions in the Hall of the House, rooms leading thereto, or the cloakrooms; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 103: Mr. ANDREWS.  
 H.R. 127: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FARR, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.  
 H.R. 820: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. WARD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MARTINI, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. SKEEN.  
 H.R. 1005: Mrs. ROUKEMA.  
 H.R. 1386: Mr. CRANE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. ENSIGN.  
 H.R. 1462: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. KASICH, and Mr. HILLIARD.  
 H.R. 1618: Mr. JONES and Mr. HOKE.  
 H.R. 1711: Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. WAMP.  
 H.R. 1733: Mr. COOLEY.  
 H.R. 1776: Mr. VENTO, Mr. CAMP, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BUYER, Mr. FRISA, Mr. BONO, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. HAYWORTH.  
 H.R. 1791: Mr. MCCOLLUM.  
 H.R. 1797: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. MANTON.  
 H.R. 2143: Mr. GALLEGLY.  
 H.R. 2237: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TORRES, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. FLAKE.  
 H.R. 2338: Mr. DINGELL.  
 H.R. 2342: Mr. TAUZIN.  
 H.R. 2510: Mr. FUNDERBURK.  
 H.R. 2530: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.  
 H.R. 2682: Mr. WELLER.  
 H.R. 2749: Mr. EMERSON.  
 H.R. 2757: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. DICKS.  
 H.R. 2807: Mr. BARR and Mrs. ROUKEMA.  
 H.R. 2911: Mr. PETRI, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. NEY.  
 H.R. 2991: Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 3065: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.  
H.R. 3067: Mr. WAXMAN and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 3083: Mr. EMERSON and Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

H.R. 3107: Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, SCHAEFER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. TATE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. LINDER, Mr. NEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3114: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LEACH, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 3119: Mr. RAHALL and Ms. KAPTUR.  
H.R. 3182: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 3199: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. PRYCE, and Ms. MCCARTHY.

H.R. 3226: Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FLAKE, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 3265: Ms. MCKINNEY.  
H.R. 3267: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 3293: Mr. PORTER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 3296: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 3337: Mr. SABO.  
H.R. 3367: Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 3391: Mr. CAMP and Mr. SKEEN.  
H.R. 3392: Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STARK, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 3393: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3396: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. BONO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 3401: Mr. CALLAHAN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 3424: Mr. SKEEN.  
H.R. 3445: Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3447: Mr. COBLE.  
H.R. 3449: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 3463: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. JACKSON.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. FOLEY.  
H. Con. Res. 156: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. PALLONE.

H. Con. Res. 167: Mr. HOYER, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Con. Res. 175: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. PARKER.

H. Res. 381: Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.  
H. Res. 429: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 582: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1972: Ms. LOFGREN.

### DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 12 by Mrs. SMITH of Washington on House Resolution 373: Frank Mascara and Bob Franks.

### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2594

OFFERED BY: MR. SHUSTER

AMENDMENT NO. 1

#### SEC. 6. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) REFERENCES.—(1) Section 24307(c)(3) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "Interstate Commerce Commission" and inserting in lieu thereof "Surface Transportation Board".

(2) Section 24308 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking "Interstate Commerce Commission" in subsection (a)(2)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof "Surface Transportation Board"; and

(B) by striking "Commission" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Surface Transportation Board".

(3) Section 24311(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking "Interstate Commerce Commission" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "Surface Transportation Board"; and

(B) by striking "Commission" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Surface Transportation Board".

(b) CLARIFYING AMENDMENT.—(1) The first paragraph of section 1 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 151) is amended by inserting "The term 'carrier' includes any express company or sleeping car company subject to subtitle IV of title 49, United States Code, within the meaning of such terms under this section as in effect on December 31, 1995." after "in any of such activities."

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) is made for the purpose of clarifying the policy stated in section 10501(c)(3)(B) of title 49, United States Code, that the enactment of the ICC Termination Act of 1995 did not expand or contract coverage of employees and employers by the Railway Labor Act.

(c) TITLE 49.—Title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 13102(10)(A) by inserting after "her dwelling" the following: "and if the transportation is at the request of, and the transportation charges are paid to the carrier by, the householder";

(2) in chapter 151 by striking "CHAPTER 151—GENERAL PROVISIONS" the second place it appears;

(3) in chapter 153 by striking "CHAPTER 153—JURISDICTION" the second place it appears;

(4) in chapter 157 by striking "CHAPTER 157—OPERATIONS OF CARRIERS" the second place it appears;

(5) in chapter 159 by striking "CHAPTER 159—ENFORCEMENT: INVESTIGATIONS, RIGHTS, AND REMEDIES" the second place it appears;

(6) in the table of sections for chapter 159 by striking the item relating to section 15907;

(7) in chapter 161 by striking "CHAPTER 161—CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES" the second place it appears; and

(8) in section 41309(b)(2)(B) by striking "common".

(d) TITLE 28.—Section 2342(3)(A) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking "part B or (C)" and inserting "part B or C".

(e) ICC TERMINATION ACT.—Effective December 29, 1995—

(1) section 308(j) of the ICC Termination Act of 1995 (109 Stat. 947) is amended by striking "30106(d)" and inserting "30166(d)"; and

(2) section 327(3)(B) of such Act (109 Stat. 951) by inserting "each place it appears" before "and inserting in lieu thereof".

(f) ARMORED CAR INDUSTRY RECIPROcity ACT OF 1993 AMENDMENTS.—Section 5(2) of the Armored Car Industry Reciprocity Act of 1993 (15 U.S.C. 5904) is amended by striking "is" preceding "registered".

H.R. 3259

OFFERED BY: MR. COMBEST

AMENDMENT NO. 1: In the matter proposed to be inserted by section 401, strike "Make" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Subject to such amounts as may be provided in advance in appropriations Acts, make".

H.R. 3259

OFFERED BY: MR. COMBEST

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Amend section 402 to read as follows:

**SEC. 402. ELIMINATION OF DOUBLE SURCHARGE ON THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RELATING TO EMPLOYEES WHO RETIRE OR RESIGN IN FISCAL YEARS 1998 OR 1999 AND WHO RECEIVE VOLUNTARY SEPARATION INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.**

Section 2(i) of the Central Intelligence Agency Voluntary Separation Pay Act (50 U.S.C. 403-4 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "The remittance required by this subsection shall be in lieu of any remittance required by section 4(a) of the Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1994 (5 U.S.C. 8331 note)."

H.R. 3259

OFFERED BY: MR. CONYERS

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 306. ANNUAL STATEMENT OF THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF INTELLIGENCE EXPENDITURES FOR THE CURRENT AND SUCCEEDING FISCAL YEARS.**

At the time of submission of the budget of the United States Government submitted for fiscal year 1998 under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a separate, unclassified statement of the appropriations and proposed appropriations for the current fiscal year, and the amount of appropriations requested for the fiscal year for which the budget is submitted, for national and tactical intelligence activities, including activities carried out under the budget of the Department of Defense to collect, analyze, produce, disseminate, or support the collection of intelligence.

H.R. 3259

OFFERED BY: MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS  
AMENDMENT NO. 4: At the end of title I, insert the following:

**SEC. 105. REDUCTIONS IN AUTHORIZATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act, including

### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

the amounts specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102, is reduced by 4.9 percent.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 201 for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund.

(c) TRANSFER AND REPROGRAMMING AUTHORITY.—(1) The President, in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense, may apply the reduction required by subsection (a) by transferring amounts among the accounts or reprogramming amounts within an account, as specified in the classified Schedule of Au-

thorizations referred to in section 102, so long as the aggregate reduction in the amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act equals 4.9 percent.

(2) Before carrying out paragraph (1), the President shall submit a notification to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the senate, which notification shall include the reasons for each proposed transfer or reprogramming.

H.R. 3259

OFFERED BY: MR. MICA

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Amend section 402 to read as follows:

**SEC. 402. ELIMINATION OF DOUBLE SURCHARGE ON THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RELATING TO EMPLOYEES WHO RETIRE OR RESIGN IN FISCAL YEARS 1998 OR 1999 AND WHO RECEIVE VOLUNTARY SEPARATION INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.**

Subsection (i) of section 2 of the Central Intelligence Agency Voluntary Separation Pay Act (50 U.S.C. 403-4 note) is amended by adding at the end the following: "The remittance required by this subsection shall be in lieu of any remittance required by section 4(a) of the Federal Workforce restructuring Act of 1994 (5 U.S.C. 8331 note)."