United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 100th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, April 9, 1987*

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend John V. DiBacco, St. Theresa's Roman Catholic Church, Morgantown, WV, offered the following prayer:

Blessed are You, Lord God, King and Ruler of Heaven and Earth. You lead us to all truth.

In Your mercy and love help these women and men, our Representatives, work for the betterment of our Nation and world.

Give them Your blessing and help them to be women and men of faith, guided by Your Spirit and filled with Your love.

May their efforts in our House of Representatives lead the people of this Nation to serve You each day as did our ancestors who came to this land to live a life of freedom, justice, and peace.

We ask Your blessing upon our country.

Bless it and let the people of this country always be mindful of the principles that it stands for.

Help us to work together in peace, so that we may give You glory by our lives and our service.

We ask this grace and blessing through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

REV. JOHN V. DIBACCO

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to welcome our guest chaplain today, Rev. John V. DiBacco. Reverend DiBacco is the pastor of St. Theresa's Catholic Church is Morgantown, WV.

Father DiBacco is a native of the Second Congressional District. Born in Thomas, he is a graduate of Mountaineer High School, Wheeling College, St. Mary's Seminary and University, and he is a doctorial candidate at Drew University. Father DiBacco was ordained for the Diocese of Wheeling-Charleston in 1967. He has served in parishes in Clarksburg and Wheeling, WV, and he is presently chaplain of the Knights of Columbus of Morgantown.

Through his guidance, St. Theresa's Catholic Church continues to demonstrate a deep commitment to community service through Christian help. The Theresan Center Houses Christian Help, a nonprofit organization, which provides assistance with food, clothing, medicine, and other services for the needy.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to welcome Father DiBacco to the House of Representatives today.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 1987, TO FILE REPORTS ON H.R. 1748, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION, AND HOUSE RESOLUTION 132, RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY ON SDI REPORTS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight Wednesday, April 22, 1987, to file a report on H.R. 1748, the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal years 1988 and 1989 and a report on House Resolution 132, a resolution of inquiry regarding three overdue SDI reports required by statute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 1049

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw the names of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRUCE] as cosponsors of H.R. 1049.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM THURSDAY, APRIL 9, 1987, TO TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 1987, AND ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE FROM THURSDAY, APRIL 9, 1987, OR FRIDAY, APRIL 10, 1987, OR SATURDAY, APRIL 11, 1987, TO TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 1987

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 103) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 103

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 9, 1987, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Tuesday, April 21, 1987, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, April 9, 1987, or Friday, April 10, 1987, or Saturday, April 11, 1987, pursuant to a motion made by the majority leader, or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand adjourned until 10 o'clock ante meridian on Tuesday, April 21, 1987, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the minority leader of the House and the minority leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

☐ 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.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1988

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 139 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, H. Con. Res. 93.

□ 1010

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. 93) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

□ 1010

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, April 8, 1987, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 139, the concurrent resolution is considered as having been read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 93 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 93

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1988 is established and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1989 and 1990 are hereby set forth:

(a) The following levels and amounts are set forth for purposes of determining, in accordance with section 301(i) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, whether the maximum deficit amount for a fiscal year has been exceeded, and as set forth in this concurrent resolution shall be considered to be mathematically consistent with the other amounts and levels set forth in this concurrent resolution:

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

Fiscal year 1988: $900,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $962,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $1,051,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $1,083,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $1,150,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $1,213,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $1,008,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $1,034,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $1,082,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $108,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $72,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $31,100,000,000.

(b) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1987, October 1, 1988, and October 1, 1989:

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

Fiscal year 1988: $659,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $700,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $764,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $0.
Fiscal year 1989: $0.
Fiscal year 1990: $0.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $59,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $63,850,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $68,950,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $842,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $889,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $926,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $804,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $819,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $854,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $144,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $118,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $90,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $2,558,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $2,758,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $2,932,400,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1987, October 1, 1988, and October 1, 1989, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $29,400,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $131,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $24,600,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $107,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $20,800,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $86,900,000,000.

(c) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1988 through 1990 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $251,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $262,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $274,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $13,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,850,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $18,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,850,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $10,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,250,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $9,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $10,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $10,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $2,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $2,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,450,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $50,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $2,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,250,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $50,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $28,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $29,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $27,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,550,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $3,950,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $10,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $82,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $10,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $64,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,650,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $51,200,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $23,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $350,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $23,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $24,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $150,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $6,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $850,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $250,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $6,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $6,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $550,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $150,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $28,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,550,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $29,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $30,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,450,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,150,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $41,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $250,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $45,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $49,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $150,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $93,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $103,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $114,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $167,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $129,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $172,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $179,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $4,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $5,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $26,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $24,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $27,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,000,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $6,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $6,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(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.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $5,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $6,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (850):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $1,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $1,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $1,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $144,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $148,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $148,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $149,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $3,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $5,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, −$35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$35,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$40,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2. (a) Based upon the budget for fiscal year 1988 set forth in the first section of this concurrent resolution, the committees of the House of Representatives and Senate shall, subject to the same requirements, exemptions, exceptions, limitations, special rules, and definitions which apply to the President in the issuance of a final order for such fiscal year under section 252(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 eliminate the full amount of the deficit excess for such fiscal year.

(b) The committees of the House of Representatives and Senate shall report (1) changes in laws within their jurisdictions which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within their jurisdictions other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, in fiscal year 1988 sufficient to carry out subsection (a) and, not later than June 10, 1987, shall submit their recommendations to the Committees on the Budget of their respective Houses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committees on the Budget of the House and Senate shall report to the House and Senate a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out such recommendations without any substantive revision.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendments are in order except the following amendments printed in House Report 100-42, which shall be considered only in the following order, shall not be subject to amendment, shall be considered as having been read, shall be in order even if a previous amendment in the nature of a substitute has been adopted, and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed thereto:

First. The amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of House Concurrent Resolution 92 if offered by any Member.

Second. The amendment in the nature of a substitute by, and if offered by, Representative DANNEMEYER, or his designee.

Third. The amendment in the nature of a substitute by, and if offered by, Representative DYMALLY, or his designee.

Fourth. The amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of House Concurrent Resolution 95, by, and if offered by, Representative GRAY, of Pennsylvania, or his designee.

It shall also be in order to consider the amendment or amendments provided for in section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, necessary to achieve mathematical consistency.

The Chair at this time recognizes the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRAY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the rule, 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. GRAY of Pennsylvania: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Congress hereby determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1988 is established and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1989 and 1990 are hereby set forth:

(a) The following levels and amounts are set forth for purposes of determining, in accordance with section 301(i) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, whether the maximum deficit amount for a fiscal year has been exceeded, and as set forth in this concurrent resolution shall be considered to be mathematically consistent with the other amounts and levels set forth in this concurrent resolution:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:
Fiscal year 1988: $916,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $976,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $1,048,300,000,000.
(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:
Fiscal year 1988: $1,142,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $1,211,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $1,271,900,000,000.
(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:
Fiscal year 1988: $1,024,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $1,069,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $1,107,800,000,000.
(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:
Fiscal year 1988: $107,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $92,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $59,500,000,000.

(b) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1987, October 1, 1988, and October 1, 1989:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:
Fiscal year 1988: $674,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $712,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $761,650,000,000.
and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:
Fiscal year 1988: $6,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $8,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1990: $8,600,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $61,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $66,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $71,050,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $900,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $948,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $985,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $821,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $857,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $885,400,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $147,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $144,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $123,800,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $2,573,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $2,790,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $2,986,700,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1987, October 1, 1988, and October 1, 1989, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $27,150,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $128,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $23,150,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $129,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $22,100,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $130,450,000,000.

(c) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1988 through 1990 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $312,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $332,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $312,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $353,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $330,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,450,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $10,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $18,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,650,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $10,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $19,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,750,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $10,250,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $11,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $12,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $2,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $550,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $850,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $3,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $3,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $350,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,400,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $14,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $22,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $24,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,700,000,000
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $21,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,650,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,100,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $8,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $73,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $8,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $72,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $9,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,350,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $74,950,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $24,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $150,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $24,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $150,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $24,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $150,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $450,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $50,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $5,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $50,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $28,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $28,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $28,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $10,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $27,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,850,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $11,850,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $41,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $42,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $43,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $94,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $103,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $112,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $160,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $165,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $128,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $170,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $133,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $4,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $5,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,450,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $5,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,350,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $27,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $850,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $28,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $28,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $950,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $24,800,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $9,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $7,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $7,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $8,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (850):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $1,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $1,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $1,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $139,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $141,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $141,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $139,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, −$900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $2,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, −$45,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$45,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, −$45,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$45,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, −$48,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$48,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2. (a) Based upon the budget for fiscal year 1988 set forth in the first section of this concurrent resolution, the commit-

tees of the House of Representatives and Senate shall make recommendations for fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990 for programs within their jurisdictions to the extent necessary to carry out proposed reductions in the deficit as included in the budget submitted by the President to the Congress on January 5, 1987.

(b) The committees of the House of Representatives and Senate shall report (1) changes in laws within their jurisdictions which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within their jurisdictions other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, in fiscal year 1988 sufficient to carry out subsection (a) and, not later than June 10, 1987, shall submit their recommendations to the Committees on the Budget of their respective Houses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committees on the Budget of the House and Senate shall report to the House and Senate a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out such recommendations without any substantive revision.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment in the nature of a substitute is considered as having been read.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] will be recognized in opposition for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we have now before this legislative body the budget of the President of the United States, which was introduced to the American public in January. I have introduced this budget because I believe that this legislative body ought to have the opportunity to work its will on the President's budget.

The President has presented his economic vision, his set of priorities, and has on numerous occasions called upon the U.S. Congress to implement that vision and that budget. The budget that we have before us claims that it will reach the Gramm-Rudman target of $107.8 billion. It has revenues of $22.4 billion, including asset sales, user fees, and other offsetting receipts and taxes.

The taxes included in the President's budget include $1.6 billion of new taxes on State and local employees. It includes new taxes on coal production. It raises taxes on commercial fishing. It raises fees for Government student loans. It increases the premiums of the elderly for Medicare by $600 million. The total increased revenues come to $22.4 billion and are approximately 53 percent of the deficit reduction package of the President of the United States.

In the spending area, the President's budget proposes spending cuts that would come entirely from domestic programs. Those spending cuts include a 28-percent reduction in education, with a 45-percent reduction in higher education; a large reduction in health care including $5.1 billion in Medicare, and over $1 billion of cuts in Medicaid programs.

The President's budget calls for termination of programs. The President proposes to phase out and terminate more than 45 programs, ranging from EPA construction grants to section 202 housing for the elderly and handicapped, and college work study grants. The President's budget, as it affects the less fortunate, would cut most programs providing assistance to low income individuals, the elderly, the sick, and the homeless.

Also, with regard to urban programs, the President's budget calls for significant reduction or termination of programs such as community development block grant, UDAG, EDA, subsidized housing, and mass transit.

In the area of international affairs, the President's budget calls for a significant increase above the CBO baseline of $2 billion in budget authority and $1.4 billion in outlays.

With regard to the drug programs, the President's budget proposes $3.05 billion in budget authority in fiscal year 1988 for Federal antidrug programs and activities—approximately $950 million below current funding levels.

With regard to rural America, the President's budget proposes $35.1 billion for outlays for fiscal year 1988 for rural programs. His recommendation calls for the termination of rural electric and also the ASCS Conservation Program. It would call for the termination of rural housing loans, FmHA rural development loans and grants.

The President also calls for a sizeable reduction in agricultural assistance programs of over $4 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I introduced this budget because on numerous occasions the President has said that, if America would adopt his budget, it would put us on the best track for deficit reduction and at the same time provide for equity and balance. The President's budget, therefore, is being introduced so that we in this body, on both sides of the aisle, will have an opportunity to express our opinion.

Before closing, Mr. Chairman, I would also point out that the President's budget, as it was pointed out yesterday in general debate, includes a sizable increase in military spending. The President's budget calls for spending of $297,550 million by the Pentagon, and $311.95 billion in budget authority, which represents an increase above inflation of 3 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to express their will and vote on the President's budget, since he has requested that we act and have an opportunity to realize his vision.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] has consumed 6 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Rhode Island [Miss SCHNEIDER].

(By unanimous consent, Miss SCHNEIDER was allowed to proceed out of order.)

"CONGRESSBRIDGE"

Miss SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, for too long, technology has been used to heighten confrontation between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

For too long, we have seen each other only as rivals, barbarians, and warmongers. Decisionmakers and their constituents in both nations know little of each other.

The time is right for new ways of thinking. If there is, in fact, movement in the Soviet Union toward reform and openness, let us take this opportunity to initiate new ways of addressing mutual problems.

GEORGE BROWN and I are cosponsoring Congressbridge, an innovative series of television exchanges via satellite between Members of Congress and Deputies of the Supreme Soviet to capitalize on this period of change, to test the sincerity of reform efforts, and to build bridges rather than perpetuate barriers.

During 1987 dozens of legislators in both countries will discuss issues ranging from international security and human rights, to health and the environment in face-to-face, unrehearsed settings. Through these shows, broadcast to millions of viewers in both countries, crucial information can be exchanged with the whole world eavesdropping.

Let us make this historic effort to influence, in a grassroots manner, the direction of Soviet-American relations so as to alter the dangerous pattern of superpower confrontation.

□ 1020

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition both to the administration's budget and the budget resolution passed by the House Budget Committee. Both are fraught with loopholes, fudged economic assumptions, and unrealistic policy decisions.

Both have abdicated their responsibilities by proposals whose actual deficits will come nowhere near the $108 billion target mandated by the Gramm-Rudman law, despite their representations to the contrary.

I share the concern of those who want to see some restraint on defense

spending and who believe that vital nondefense programs like AIDS research and maternal health need not only protection but enhancement.

But I cannot in good conscience vote either for the committee's or for the administration's budget proposals. Their economic assumptions are spurious at best. It is significant that the Budget Committee's estimates have not been run through the CBO computers for confirmation. I cannot help but remember the debate 2 years ago over the Budget Committee's proposal which promised to reduce our deficit by about $55 billion. Its estimates were never confirmed by CBO and in the end it saved only $35 billion, a $20 billion gap.

Now I know that there are those who say, "Oh, it is all right for the House Budget Committee to do that kind of thing and to come up with those fudged economic estimates because the President has done it." I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is not all right for the House Budget Committee or the House to countenance a budget based on those false economic premises.

Particularly doing this 200th anniversary of the Constitution of the United States, I think it behooves Members of the House of Representatives to remember that, both under the Constitution and by long tradition, this House has a place of particular responsibility in the Federal budget process.

Under the Constitution, it is neither the President nor the Senate that is responsible for originating revenue measures. That is a responsibility that the Constitution gives to the House of Representatives. By long tradition, it is this House that originates appropriation bills as well.

Under those circumstances, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we have a singular constitutional responsibility when it comes to budget matters. For that reason, I think we have a particular responsibility to pass a budget resolution which is not based on estimates that we all know cannot stand the light of day.

Yes, the administration did wrong in sending us a budget that cannot be defended in terms of its economic assumptions, but it is on us, not on the administration, that the primary responsiblity falls under the Constitution of the United States for budget matters. Therefore, I think it is a particular shame that in the materials that are presented to us today, both in the administration's budget, which is now being offered by the Chairman of the Budget Committee, and in the Budget Committee's own resolution, we are not acting in a responsible way in fulfilling our constitutional and traditional function.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY].

Mr. DYMALLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have some technical amendments at the desk. They were designed to correct some clerical errors.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will suspend for just a moment, the Chair will state to the gentleman that after the gentleman from California presents his amendment, that a unanimous-consent request to modify that amendment, when pending, would be in order. If the gentleman will just suspend until that time, it will be in order after the gentleman offers his amendment, made in order by the rule.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT].

Mr. LOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I just take this time to point out the process that we are going through here this morning. It should be noted that the Member offering the amendment does not support the budget being offered, and that the gentleman on this side of the aisle is also opposed to the amendment. So the situation we have is that the people controlling the time are both opposed to the amendment.

We should not be surprised by that. Although it is not the normal procedure, it is just a part of the annual, "spring budget games" we are going through. This is confirmation at the beginning of the day that this is all a charade. This is all just positioning and that this budget resolution will be ignored, it will be waived, it will be exceeded in its expenditures for the rest of the year, and this is not the normal process. It should be condemned.

Hopefully, when this day is over, all of these budgets will in fact be defeated and we can get down to the serious business of dealing with the deficits of this country.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that I certainly agree with what the minority whip has just said. What we have going on out here is some fun and games on the House floor called the budget process. The fun and games in this particular instance is that everybody comes out opposed to the budget but we raise it just with hopes of kicking the President around a little bit out on the House floor today.

I would suggest that the real issue before us as we look to the budgets today is: What should someone who considers themself a fiscal conservative or at least has told their constituents that they are a fiscal conservative be doing about the budget proposals that are before us?

One of the ways of gauging that, it seems to me, is to go to the National Taxpayers Union, which is the one that has made the recommendations as to what we ought to be doing if we look at these budgets from a conservative viewpoint. Should we then be voting for the administration's budget? No, because the National Taxpayers Union tells us that the administration's budget is probably too high in its defense figures.

Should we be voting for the Budget Committee's recommendation? Well, let me tell you what NTU says about the Budget Committee's recommendation. It says:

> NTU urges rejection of the House Budget Committee's proposal because it does not sufficiently cut social programs and it relies too heavily on tax increases to meet the deficit targets.

In other words, the NTU will tell you if you are a fiscal conservative and if you have told your constituents that you are a fiscal conservative and that if you really want to do something about the deficits, that you ought to reject the administration's budget, you ought to reject the Budget Committee's budget as well.

A little later on we will have an opportunity to consider a really fiscally conservative budget. The gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] is going to offer a budget. I am going to ask him some questions at that time as to whether or not his budget meets the standards that NTU sets forward.

I think that we ought to be considering what it is we have told our constituents we are all about here, and if you have really told your constituents that you are all about doing something to reduce deficits, you cannot support what the Budget Committee has come up with; it is an atrocious budget. You cannot support what the administration sent up here; it is 6 months old in economic assumptions and goes too far in defense spending.

□ 1030

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, today we address an extremely important issue to this Nation and that is, which of the budgets, if any, will this body adopt as guides for the future of the Congress.

I have a particular interest in the defense budget because of my service on the Armed Services Committee. I thought that I would take just a moment this morning in addressing the administration's budget to tie that to the action of the Armed Services Committee as of yesterday when we finished the markup on our budget.

As you know, the administration requested $312 billion for the defense budget for this year. That is only a 3-percent real growth over last year's budget. As a matter of fact, of course, we are aware that the budget would still result in a negative growth over the last 3 years because of the fact that we have had a decrease in the last 2 budget years in the Armed Services budget. As a result, the Armed Services Committee looked very carefully at this administration's request for $312 billion and asked whether or not the goal of the Armed Services Committee should be to adopt a budget which would meet the defense needs of this country or would try to do something political and meet a much, much lower goal.

Well, when the Armed Services Committee finally met and considered the question on a very bipartisan basis, the committee decided to develop a budget which it felt was in the best interests of the United States of America from a defense perspective.

Now, it sounds strange that we should even be asking that question. Why should the Armed Services Committee consider any question but what is in the best interests of the United States from a defense perspective; but because of this political budget battle that we are involved in, the question arose.

When all was said and done and the Armed Services Committee on a very bipartisan basis finally developed its budget, it had reduced the administration's request by approximately $7 billion. We cut a lot out. We got it down to about $305 billion. That is going to be less than a 3-percent real growth, but we do believe as a committee that it will meet the defense needs of this country.

What, of course, we are concerned with is that this body will slash the defense budget even further in developing its own budget to the point that we will not be able to defend America. That is my concern and that is the concern I am sure of a majority of the members of that committee.

We know, Mr. Chairman, that our problem in this country has not been a lack of revenues, so we also know that a tax increase is not the right answer.

We also know we should not develop a budget which requires us to raise taxes, because tax collections have gone up every year by approximately $60 billion in recent years. We have been raising revenues in this country for the last 15 years at the rate of about 19 percent of our gross national product, so it is not a matter of lost tax revenues.

The problem in this country today is that we are spending too much. Spending, of course, now consumes almost 24 percent of our gross national product.

So the point of my remarks this morning, Mr. Chairman, is that we do not need a tax increase. We do not need a budget which slashes defense unnecessarily.

The Armed Services Committee which is responsible for the defense of this Nation has considered very carefully what is appropriate for the defense of the Nation and has concluded that $305 billion would be appropriate.

I will support the administration's budget because of its request, even though I will not agree with everything in it. I will agree to the $305 billion mark of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues in considering the budget of the administration which is before us now and the other budgets which have been and will be before us to please consider not parochial or political considerations, but the defense needs of this country, for it is that which we must be primarily concerned with in developing that part of our budget.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman for his tremendous effort in trying to forge a reasonable budget for America's future.

I would like to talk about a few things in the President's budget that I think are incongruent with some of the statements he made in the past. I think Americans become quite leery of statements such as, "You know, I work for the Government. I'm going to give you a helping hand, and I'm really not going to raise your taxes."

Mr. Chairman, the President's budget contains $23 billion in hidden taxes, user fees, and asset sales.

This is the same President who said when he was running against GEORGE BUSH, "Ladies and gentlemen," I'm going to balance the Federal budget by 1983." Then after he is elected he very honestly and very honorably looked in the eyes of television and told the American people, "I can't do it, ladies and gentlemen. It's too big a task. It will take me until the fall of 1984."

Now, let's get serious here. This President has brought forward a budget that continues to expand upon the military budget that has anywhere between $50 billion and $300 billion in some pipeline, money that was appropriated at a time when inflation was much higher, and I will give you that due. But where are we going now?

We have a President that would cut child nutrition, throw out completely vocational education in a country that is talking about competitiveness; seriously impact housing in a Nation where housing is very critical and this Congress had to appropriate money for the homeless of America sleeping on steel grates.

Now, I ask you, is this a budget for America? I say the President's budget is un-American and in my own little way there is a word from my community that would depict that vote that Congress should send, the message Congress should send to the President, that word is "mort." It means dead.

Mr. President, your budget is mort here in the House. We do not work for the railroad. The signal we send should be a strong vote.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN].

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have, of course, moment by moment missed the Budget Committee desperately now that I am off of it, but I have had that rare opportunity to continue following someone and the leadership of that committee, as so well epitomized by the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Because he does really I think a superb job with the press, I am able to follow what is happening in the committee and to follow those things which he says to all Americans, and I think it makes some sense for us to remember them as we talk about the budget he has introduced, the President's budget.

I would like to quote the chairman of the Budget Committee:

> If you think you're going to get there (the Gramm-Rudman target) by smoke and mirrors and unrealistic assumptions, you're sadly mistaken. Jan. 4, NBC's "Meet the Press."

These are his comments about the President's budget:

> I have questioned its realism in terms of economic assumption, primarily the 1988 current service deficit which is estimated at $150 billion, where CBO says $169 billion, and many private econometric forecasting agencies say it is larger than that. Committee hearing, Jan. 8.

Some of us actually brought this up with the President's own budget office and with the President himself.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I will tell you, you so convinced me that I thought the President's budget ill-served him because the assumptions were so badly flawed. I appreciated what you said and I look forward later on when we can look at the assumption base of your budget, because someone like the gentleman from Pennsylvania would never repeat the mistake he chastised our President on for 3 months.

I have actually heard rumors that the gentleman's budget has the same flaws.

"Say it ain't so, Joe; say it ain't so."

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would just simply say to my esteemed colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois, for whom I have the greatest respect, we miss her so desperately on the Budget Committee,

that she has her men confused. It's "Bill."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], a member of the committee.

□ 1040

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I know it is "Bill." We also know that it is politics.

You know, there are actually some members of the Democrat Party who wrote to the Armed Services Committee requesting the military funding levels in the President's budget, urging the members of the Armed Services Committee to fund those programs at the President's budget level.

Guess what they are going to do on the President's budget. They are going to vote "no." Guess what they are going to do on the Democrat budget. Do you wonder why they do that?

Let me share with you some additional quotes from the chairman. This was January 22, when he addressed the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Baker: "Let me just turn to the question of what I call realism, as we look at the budget," the chairman said, "that has been submitted to us and some of the comments that you have made with regard to that budget.

Does the administration know something that we don't know * * *?

Again, during that same hearing:

I am * * * saying that CBO and the econometric forecasting agencies, Mr. Secretary, are saying you are off, and you are off substantially.

It goes on, in which he castigates the President's basic assumptions, for example, in front of James Miller, Office of Management and Budget, on January 29:

I am concerned that your basic economic assumptions are flawed, and if your starting point is unrealistic * * *.

And we join him once again on February 4, when he says:

A major cause of the shortfall in the President's Budget is the use of an optimistic economic forecast.

Let us close again with: "And then, finally, I would * * * simply say," the chairman said, "that we, of course, have a disagreement, CBO has a disagreement with you"—the administration—"and the private econometric forecasting agencies apparently seem to have a disagreement * * *"

At one time Chairman GRAY had a disagreement with the President's economic assumptions. As we will find later on in this program, Mr. GRAY has seen the light. He has adopted the President's economic forecasts. Yet he will oppose this budget and praise his own. Why? It is the same reason Democrats will send letters to the Armed Services Committee asking for the President's numbers and rebuke the President's position.

I guess that is why we call it politics. Some of us are sick and tired of it.

Mr. GREEN. May I ask, Mr. Chairman, how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I spoke briefly on this yesterday, and I want to reiterate some of the things that I said yesterday, because I am afraid that with the scarcity of Members present here that some of the things that I said which I think are important might not have been heard.

Yesterday the committee finished its deliberations on its annual authorization bill, and we marked to a figure that we thought was reasonable. We reduced the President's budget from $312 billion requested down to approximately $305 billion.

We did this because we marked to what we perceived to be the threat. It is not our job on the committee to mark to what we would anticipate the budget to be or what we anticipate the Appropriations Committee would fund, but what we see as the threat.

Mr. Chairman, there is a threat. There is an ongoing threat, and the Soviets are continuing to build, and they outnumber us in troops, tanks, men, aircraft. They have just completed a new carrier which will soon be going through operational tests. It is as large or larger than any that we have. They have more submarines, they have deeper diving submarines, and they have quieter submarines.

The threat is real, and it is there. Now if we have to mark to the budget that is proposed by the Budget Committee, we will have to reduce some $25 billion over the President's request. We have reduced our bill, as I said, from $312 billion to $305 billion. If we are to meet the outlay figure, and do it in this year, the only way you can reach that figure of $281 billion is to cut people—people and training. We have to attack our readiness, we have to reduce our forces in Europe, we have to reduce the total manpower, and/or deny our servicemen a pay raise.

There is anticipated in the budget put out by the Budget Committee a pay raise for the civilian sector and a pay raise for the military sector. We have in our budget a 3-percent pay raise which should be comparable to what the civilian sector gets. If we have to mark to the figure that is given to us by the Budget Committee, there will be zero pay raise for our military, and I anticipate that if we treat the civilian sector the same way we are going to find that there will be no increase for retirees, no increase for civil servants, no increase for our military, no increase for our veterans.

I think that a 3-percent pay raise or increase in retirement benefits is reasonable, and it is anticipated in this budget. If we have to meet the figures that are being given to us, then you are going to find a reduction in people, you are going to find that we are going to deny them their cost-of-living increase, which they have learned to depend on, and I think that it is unrealistic to force on the military the burden of trying to balance the budget.

I voted against Gramm-Rudman originally, because under the formula it says even though less than 30 percent of the Federal budget is defense spending, 50 percent of the cuts have to come out of defense. I think that it is unfair and unrealistic, and that is what this budget presumes.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is too gracious a person and too fair and too strong a supporter of the military, but would it not be at least thinkable that those from any side of the aisle who would support the Democratic budget to a mark that would so hurt this Nation's security are actually agreeing that some of those cuts can occur in their district?

Mr. DICKINSON. Absolutely. It is going to take place nationwide. You are going to feel the impact. We are talking about cutting training, we are talking about cutting readiness, if we are going to have to meet the targets that are being given to us by the Budget Committee. We are going to have to talk about eliminating people at a time when we are trying to get our NATO allies to even come up to their 3 percent that they agreed to in the past.

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

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. The gentleman is talking about people. The gentleman is talking about troops, is he not?

Mr. DICKINSON. That is exactly what I am talking about, military personnel.

Mr. LATTA. And if they went to that low figure that the Democrats have in their budget, you are talking between 200,000 and 400,000 troops.

Mr. DICKINSON. It would impact that many. I do not know that that many would have to be let our of the service, because if you discharge them, with the cost of transporting them and their material home, their goods and services, it will not all show up in the same year that we have to reach this target. So in addition to reducing

the size of our armed services, we are going to have to impact training, flight time, steaming time.

Mr. Chairman, I am saying that it is unrealistic. This will be the third year in a row when we have had a negative growth if we live up to the budget that is being given to us, and we cannot stand that.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, the figures that I used on troops were used by the Democrats themselves in the committee. So we are talking about across-the-board reductions that are going to affect troops.

Mr. DICKINSON. Perhaps that is what they want to do, and there are some in this Chamber who would like to see a reduction of our military. There are some who would like to see a crippling of our military. But I am not one of those, and I think at least we ought to put the monkey on the back where it belongs, and when we vote, let us find out who is for defending the country and the freedoms that we hold so dear, or who is going to cut the legs out from under us so we cannot defend and protect the things that we say that we espouse.

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

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure that I understand, did the distinguished vice chairman of the Armed Services Committee say that if this budget is adopted in defense that the majority will be responsible for no pay increase for the active military?

Mr. DICKINSON. If we are to meet our target, that is exactly what it means. If we are to meet the outlay figure of $281 billion, the only way that we can reach that figure in the coming year is by the reduction of personnel, taking people out of our service, and reduction of training, steaming time, flying time, the things that go into operation and maintenance and readiness, and that is the only way we can reach the target they laid to us.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. So the only blame that can be laid if this is adopted is at the feet of the majority for immediate readiness.

Mr. DICKINSON. That is exactly right.

□ 1050

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, thank you for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I just heard my friend from Pennsylvania ask the rhetorical question: What is a conservative to do here? Well, there really are not any conservatives here on the floor of the House. I can tell you that. Everybody here seems to want to spend, it is just for different things.

We see folks stand up who say I am conservative, but they say we want more things that explode, or we want more money as long as it is sent overseas. Well, they are not conservatives. Let us not fool ourselves.

Now, the reason I take the floor on the President's budget is I just finished reading David Stockman's book, "The Triumph of Politics." This budget we're debating today is the grandson of David Stockman, and every year we get another one, filled with deception, completed by a hoax perpetrated on this Chamber and the other body and he ought to be embarrassed by the budgets that this administration sends to the Congress. The President is responsible, in my judgment, to put together a budget that has correct numbers, reasonable estimates and reasonable expectations, and he should then work together with us to try and move through it.

That does not happen because the White House keeps playing a political game with us, and it's a real shame.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS].

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, all of us could say a lot about the problems with this budget. I would quickly like to express my concern with the deterioration of the budget process, the overly rosy projections of both the administration and the House Budget Committee and the abandonment of the committee process by the Budget Committee.

I was very disappointed to learn that the House Budget Committee opted to use the administration's economic assumptions—particularly after the Congressional Budget Office informed us that such a "rosy scenario" wasn't warranted. In the past, the House Budget Committee felt it incumbent upon the House, as the body empowered by the Constitution with primary responsibility for formulating spending policy, to use the most realistic economic assumptions available. This practice should not be altered now simply for political advantage.

I am increasingly concerned by the Budget Committee's abandonment of the committee process and its abrogation of responsibility to guide the budget process. By including only sketchy reconciliation requirements, the committee is effectively handing over its power to the Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee. If this deterioration of the process is allowed to continue, the authorizing committees will soon have little role in the spending process.

Similarly, I have become increasingly distressed to witness how the manipulations of the congressional budget process are distorting the appropriations process. Every time we accede to and pass one of those humongous catchall continuing resolutions, we in effect have turned over the crafting of the Federal budget to the Appropriations Committee.

I would like to focus specifically on one area of the budget that will probably escape the attention of most Members but is critically important to our Nation's pension programs. We have a serious problem with the funding shortfall in the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation that must be addressed.

From the end of fiscal 1984 until the end of 1986, PBGC's deficit has increased more than eightfold—to almost $4 billion. These deficits are a consequence of a series of pension plan terminations by major American companies, primarily in the trade-impacted steel industry. LTV Steel pension plans and other trade-impacted steel companies make up 75 percent of this shortfall.

Ironically, the increased premium payments recommended by the House Budget Committee would end up forcing companies whose pension plans are healthy to shoulder the burden of the steel companies' inability to compete with imports. In order to erase the PBGC deficit on a self-supported basis, the necessary flat single-employer premiums would have to more than triple—to some $30 per capita. Such a steep premium increase is obviously going to jeopardize the health of all of the Nation's pension programs.

As part of its amendments to the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, the Ways and Means Committee established an adjustment assistance trust fund, to be composed partly of revenues generated by an import fee negotiated by the USTR. Recognizing that the precipitious increases in the PBGC deficit have resulted, in substantial part, from our trade imbalance, I urge the Ways and Means Committee to take a look at utilizing that trust fund in order to relieve this serious burden from the rest of the country's pension programs.

It is my understanding that a surcharge of less than 1 percent would not violate GATT. And, for example, a surcharge of 0.9 percent would raise $3 to $3.5 billion. This revenue could be used to retire the PBGC trade-related deficit—about $3 billion, or the committee could choose to earmark somewhat over $200 million of this fund to PBGC in order to amortize the shortfall over 30 years. By using this mechanism to solve the PBGC funding dilemma, we would be tying the funding source to the source of the problem—imported goods. In other words, we would be letting "the problem pay for the solution." I urge the Ways and Means Committee to consider this option.

Our trade deficit has already caused serious economic problems. It has meant the loss of thousands of jobs. It has resulted in the shutdowns of factories and plants. We must not let it sink our pension system, too.

Let me just remind my colleagues that in our efforts to solve the problems of the PBGC, we must address the root cause of those problems as well as the immediate funding needs. The administration, in legislation transmitted to the House, proposes to address those root causes—insufficient minimum funding standards and present incentives to terminate rather than maintain plans. It is important that we amortize the PBGC deficit. It's just as important that we prevent it from increasing as a result of future terminations. This is a critical problem and I urge my colleagues to take note of it.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM].

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

Mr. Chairman, I am not particularly happy with either the President's budget or the Democrats' budget, because I do not think that we really are setting the kinds of priorities in this budgeting process necessary if we are going to get this Government running right, if we are really going to get things going.

The Democrat budget though bothers me the most of all because it has these huge tax increases built into it to fund not only existing programs, but in some cases expansions of programs that we do not have any business doing.

A few years ago, President Reagan submitted a plan which contained some 44 programs for elimination, for termination, to get rid of them. I think this Congress perhaps has eliminated one, maybe two of those programs. I have not heard anybody on the other side of the aisle coming forward this year saying, gee, we would like to get rid of some programs and maybe we will accept 10 or 20 of those, even though we cannot buy all 40 or 44 of them. They have not even come forward and suggested 10 of their own. In fact, they have not suggested two or three for elimination.

The botton line is we need to cut spending, we need to do it by setting priorities, and in some cases we need to protect an increase in spending in specific programs. That is what the people elected us to do.

I am the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime and I am concerned that the moneys that we would need, and need to have in the Department of Justice, and in fighting the drug war are not going to be there when all is said and done. Under function 750 of the Democrats' budget proposal, we see that they have on paper appeared to increase the total amount from the President's request, but in fact they have added in a lot of other things that they want the moneys to go toward. So when you subtract those out, you have a $530 million net that is not there, and we very badly need to have a budget that rectifies the drug war problem.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, am I correct that the other side is simply reserving time to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] has 1 minute remaining and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, we have one remaining speaker who will close, and we would ask the other side to please proceed with their time.

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

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would agree with the Budget Committee and its distinguished chairman that it was unfortunate that in this budget process the President started us off with a budget that was unrealistic. But after they and he properly criticized the President for that, I think it was very sad for this House and for the people of this country that they then proceed to offer this House a budget premised on exactly the same incorrect assumptions for which they blame the President.

I do not think that served this House. I do not think that served the American people. While I hope that the House will vote against the President's budget now before it in this amendment, I also hope that when the time comes the House will vote against the House Budget Committee proposal.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUSSO].

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Chairman, this debate on the budget must surprise the American people who are watching. This was to be the debate on the President's budget, but how many Republicans on that side of the aisle have you heard talk about the President's budget or the great virtues of that budget? Not one.

I have been sitting here listening to this debate, and I have not heard anyone characterize the President's budget as the great salvation for this great country. The President said when he took this well in his State of the Union Address that his future vision of America would be sent to the Capitol. Well, it arrived and nobody is supporting it. Nobody here on the Republican side is talking about it or extolling the virtues of the President's great blueprint for America. So I want to point them out for you.

I am not for the President's budget, but I want to go through it for you. Here is what the President's budget does: It raises revenues. Surprise. It does—$22.4 billion in revenues. Let us not be mistaken about this fact, because you are going to hear in later debate that the Democrats raised revenues and that the Democrats raised taxes. Remember that there are $22.4 billion of revenues in the President's budget.

□ 1100

No matter how you characterize it, no matter how you try to gloss over it, that is in his budget. Let us look at some other parts of this great, great blueprint for America's future.

Cuts in Medicare—$5.1 billion cuts in Medicare, to be exact. The President wants to increase premiums for Medicare beneficiaries. The President wants to delay Medicare beneficiaries' eligibility. That is his blueprint for America, for the elderly on Medicare.

Let us look at education. We are in a competitive struggle worldwide. We realize the trade problems that we face in this Nation. We realize that our people need a better education, for example. We understand that and we need to advocate it. So what does the President do? His blueprint for America, his vision of the future revolution, eliminates or reduce numerous education programs, including math and science teacher, training grant programs, vocational education, handicapped education, college student financial assistance.

Now is that a blueprint for America's future in education? What about drug abuse programs; one of the most heralded events that took place here last year was our fight against drugs with the successful passage of major antidrug legislation.

We ought to continue that fight, but what does the President do? He cuts almost a billion dollars in the drug problem. That is his blueprint for America. It's no wonder that we have not heard many individuals come out here and extol the great virtues of the President's budget.

Let us look at low-income programs. He cuts most programs providing assistance to low-income individuals, the elderly, the sick, and the homeless. He wants to terminate housing for the elderly and the handicapped. The President proposes to reduce the low income home energy assistance by 33 percent, which would remove nearly 3 million people off the program. He wants to propose increases in VA housing loan fees and proposes to cut numerous other programs in the veterans' function. Is this a blueprint for America's future?

Now, I think that the reason we do not hear a tremendous amount of support for the President's budget in this

discussion today is, because responsible Members on both sides of the aisle do not want this blueprint for America and its people. They do not want it because they feel there is a responsibility here that we as a government have to the American people.

Where does the President increase spending? He increases spending in defense, he increases expenditures in foreign aid, and in other areas.

Let's talk about defense spending. I want to deal with some of the problems that were raised by my colleagues during debate on this issue. You know, we have heard individuals come to the well and say that if we adopt the outlay numbers in the House Democratic proposal, we will have to cut troops, we will have to cut personnel, we will have to cut operation and maintenance. That is true, if that is where you want to make the cuts.

It was a $276 billion budget last year and you can cut almost anywhere you want. You do not have to cut personnel, you do not have to cut operation and maintenance. You can cut some of the sophisticated weaponry that we have discovered doesn't work anyway.

I'll say it again, this is an area where you can cut. But what we have heard in the Budget Committee over the last 3 years is, "If you don't reach this specific, magic wish list number of the Pentagon's, we cannot continue." Now here's an interesting fact in light of that repetitive Pentagon theme. In the 3 years that I have been on the Budget Committee not one program has been terminated that the Pentagon had on its wish list, and not one event has occurred that the Pentagon did not want to occur. They have done everything they wanted to do. Yet, they continue to come in and tell us the horror stories of things that are not going to happen if they don't get their money figure, but somehow the dire predictions never come true. In fact, under the House Budget Committee proposal we are only $900 million less than the President on budget authority, which is three-tenths of 1 percent.

I cannot imagine that the Pentagon cannot take a three-tenths of 1-percent cut when we are cutting the elderly, education, low-income assistance, and everything else. They cannot take a three-tenths of 1-percent cut? I do not think the American people buy that arrangement and the polls show that they do not buy it.

Let me deal a little with economic assumptions. You know, when you sit on the Budget Committee you wait to see what the President proposes, because under the law that is how the budget process works. We always hope that we get a responsible, intelligent, and honest budget from the President.

If his current budget is so responsible, why are the members of his own party not extolling its virtues? I think I've explained the reasons why. Also the President would not work with us on the budget. When we worked with the President on tax reform, and the President involved himself in the process of tax reform, and we were able to produce an excellent document for America. We worked with Jim Baker, we worked with his people and we tried to deal with the differences that we had. Now, obviously he did not get everything he wanted and we did not get everything we wanted. But the bottom line was that we were both involved in the process. And everyone benefited from it.

But the budget process has been a different matter. Out comes his document off the press sometime in February. "Here it is, Congress, here is my budget, here are my assumptions, here is what I want to do and goodbye, I am no longer a player."

That is not responsible government. The President and Congress must work together. The President owes us the same responsibility on the budget process, as he gave us on tax reform. We have proven in the past that we can work with them. And when we have worked together, we have produced an excellent document.

But he is no longer a part of it. He does not want to be part of it. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle did not want to be part of it. They don't even want to debate his budget document.

When you deal with economic assumptions, if you want to compare apples to apples, you have to have the same apples in the basket. I do not like the President's economic assumptions. I do not like where he starts with his base line. But you cannot compare our budget to his unless we adopt those assumptions. So if they are overly optimistic, if they understate what we think is going to happen or if they overstate it, we have to at least adopt it so that you can see what we do in our budget. As compared to his.

I think we are going to have a long debate on economic assumptions in the budget, but the important thing here is when the President's own budget is on the floor of the House of Representatives, it is kind of insulting to see very few members of his party supporting his budget.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSO. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall that the Secretary of the Treasury came to the Committee on Ways and Means on the trade issue and said that the way to deal with the trade issue is massive new investments in education. Now I think I heard the gentleman say that the President's budget in fact does not comport with that at all. In fact, it exacts massive cuts in education.

I guess I do not understand how the Treasury Secretary says, "We in this administration want to boost education," and then they submit a budget that says, "We ought to cut the heck out of education by almost 80 percent." Is that what you had said is in the President's budget?

Mr. RUSSO. Well, there is no question that those massive cuts in education are in the President's budget. And I think what has happened here, is that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have looked at his budget, they do not like it either. But it is tough to oppose their own President, although I respect the gentleman from New York for doing that. But there are very few Members who are in strong support of all the things the President has done in his budget.

I think to come to the floor of the House and say this is "political rhetoric, it is fun and games, the Democrats are kicking the President's budget around," trivializes this important debate. At least the Democrats have come up with an alternative. We have an alternative. You may not like it, but we do have an alternative.

Obviously, the President's blueprint is not well liked either. Not many Members here support it and I think we will eventually find out exactly who in this Congress supports the kind of priorities that this President wants. Do you want to cut education, do you want to cut funds for the handicapped, do you want to cut the elderly, do you want to weaken the vital structures, the infrastructures of this country that need to be rebuilt? There are other items in this budget that I did not mention that make additional cuts on the domestic side of the budget.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RUSSO. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. My point earlier was that this budget seems to be a game because it does not even comport with what the President himself says. He says one thing and then offers a budget that games the very things he talks about. And in fact it would exact massive cuts in areas that no one on the floor of this House thinks makes any sense for this country. That is why you see no support at all for this budget. It is such an incredible lack of leadership. You know, I think all of us wish it were different. I wish we were working with the President. I wish he would become a partner, as the gentleman so well said, in this process, so we could sit down on a bipartisan basis and develop a budget that makes sense for this country and stop playing the games.

Mr. RUSSO. If the budget process is to succeed in the future, we need more participation from the President regardless of which party occupies the White House.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, 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 pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 48]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—417

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Badham
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Bartlett
Barton
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boulter
Boxer
Brennan
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Bruce
Bryant
Buechner
Bunning
Burton
Bustamante
Callahan
Campbell
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Cheney
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Combest
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Craig
Crane
Crockett
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daub
Davis (IL)
Davis (MI)
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Dowdy
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Flake
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Frenzel
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Grandy
Grant
Gray (PA)
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hiler
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hopkins
Horton
Houghton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Konnyu
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken, Thomas
Lukens, Donald
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKinney
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickett
Porter
Price (IL)
Price (NC)
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Saiki
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shumway
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 1120

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred seventeen Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] for a recorded vote.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] insist upon his demand for a vote?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. I insist on my demand for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind Members that this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 27, noes 394, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

AYES—27

Armey
Badham
Bartlett
Cheney
Crane
DeLay
Dickinson
Dornan (CA)
Hansen
Herger
Hunter
Inhofe
Kyl
Latta
Lott
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
McEwen
Michel
Nielson
Packard
Schaefer
Shumway
Smith (TX)
Stump
Vander Jagt

NOES—394

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barton
Bateman
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boulter
Boxer
Brennan
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Bruce
Bryant
Buechner
Bunning
Burton
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Combest
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Craig
Crockett
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daub
Davis (IL)
Davis (MI)
de la Garza
DeFazio
Dellums
DeWine
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Flake
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Frenzel
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Garcia
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Grandy
Grant
Gray (PA)
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Harris
Hastert

Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Hertel
Hiler
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hopkins
Horton
Houghton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Konnyu
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Luken, Thomas
Lukens, Donald
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McGrath
McHugh
McKinney
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickett
Porter
Price (IL)
Price (NC)
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Saiki
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Upton
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Annunzio
Daniel
Derrick
Downey
Gaydos
Gray (IL)
Kemp
Livingston
Lloyd
Pickle
Tauzin
Wilson

Mr. NATCHER and Mr. SKEEN changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. PACKARD and Mr. INHOFE changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

Mr. DANNEMEYER changed his vote from "present" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1140

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

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

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

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

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. DANNEMEYER: Strike everything after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Congress hereby determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1988 is hereby established and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1989 and 1990 are hereby set forth:

(a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1987, October 1, 1988, and October 1, 1989:

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

Fiscal year 1988: $677,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $722,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $792,900,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $18,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $24,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $28,500,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $883,159,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $904,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $940,359,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $811,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $822,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $855,870,000,000.

(4)(A) The amounts of the deficits in the budget which are appropriate in the light of economic conditions and all other relevant factors are as follows:

Fiscal year 1988: $133,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $100,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $62,970,000,000.

(B) For purposes of the maximum deficit amount mandated by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and section 301(i) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 only, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority, budget outlays, Federal revenues, and deficits, including receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Trust Fund, are as follows:

New budget authority:
Fiscal year 1988: $1,135,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $1,181,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $1,245,560,000,000.
Outlays:
Fiscal year 1988: $1,027,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $1,053,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $1,102,720,000,000.
Revenues:
Fiscal year 1988: $929,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $986,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $1,079,500,000,000.
Deficit:
Fiscal year 1988: $107,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $67,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $23,220,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $2,565,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $2,776,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $2,966,300,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1987, October 1, 1988, and October 1, 1989, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1988

(A) New direct loan obligations, $29,650,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $129,360,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $27,780,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $129,760,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $26,910,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $130,430,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(b) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations and new loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1988 through 1989 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $304,280,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $291,910,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, $319,520,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $306,690,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, $335,860,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $322,220,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $15,260,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,790,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,120,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $10,250,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, $15,870,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $14,340,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,640,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $10,250,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, $16,480,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $14,890,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,740,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $10,250,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $10,570,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,680,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, $11,050,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,470,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, $11,570,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,890,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $3,170,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $4,030,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,580,000,000.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, $3,540,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $2,670,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,640,000,000.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, $3,420,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $2,380,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,650,000,000.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $15,550,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $14,950,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $30,000,000.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, $16,360,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,220,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $20,000,000.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, $16,990,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,610,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $20,000,000.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $28,720,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $27,820,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligation, $16,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,000,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, $27,990,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $24,090,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,300,000,000.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, $24,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $21,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $10,870,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $6,120,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,920,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $75,210,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1989:

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

(B) Outlays, $2,840,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,820,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $73,900,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, $13,030,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $4,280,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,860,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $76,280,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $28,690,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $27,580,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $150,000,000.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, $29,280,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $27,980,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $150,000,000.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, $30,330,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $28,610,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $150,000,000.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $6,970,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $6,730,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $480,000,000.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, $7,090,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $6,330,000,000.

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

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, $7,230,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $6,340,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $40,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $32,940,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $31,910,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,400,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, $34,660,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $33,460,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,810,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $10,710,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, $35,880,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $34,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,840,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,860,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $42,620,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $42,250,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $30,000,000.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $46,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,870,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $40,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $50,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,540,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $40,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medical Insurance (570):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $93,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $79,650,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $103,170,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,440,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $114,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,570,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $165,980,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $130,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $173,880,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,370,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $180,390,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,880,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $4,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,740,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $5,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,305,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $5,376,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,376,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $27,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,380,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $830,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $28,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,610,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $920,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $28,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,050,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $970,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $24,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $8,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $9,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,050,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $9,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,220,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $7,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,780,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $7,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,780,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $7,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,070,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (850):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $1,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,860,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $1,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $1,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,970,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $121,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $121,410,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $99,650,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,650,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $90,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,420,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,950,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, −$180,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $3,620,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $4,010,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, −$44,960,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$44,960,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, −$45,210,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$45,210,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, −$46,760,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$46,760,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2. (a) Not later than June 5, 1987, the committees named in subsections (b) through (cc) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committees on the Budget of their respective Houses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committees on the Budget shall report to the House and Senate a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

HOUSE COMMITTEES

(b) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in law within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $2,447,000,000 and outlays by $2,435,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $4,326,000,000 and outlays by $4,346,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $4,424,000,000 and outlays by $4,494,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(c) The House Committee on Armed Services shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $4,170,000,000 and outlays by $5,009,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $5,900,000,000 and outlays by $6,568,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $7,460,000,000 and outlays by $8,265,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(d) The House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in law within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $4,031,000,000 and outlays by $1,836,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $4,605,000,000 and outlays by $2,675,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $4,915,000,000 and outlays by $3,375,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(e) The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $1,712,000,000 and outlays by $1,085,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $1,799,000,000 and outlays by $2,224,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $1,817,000,000 and outlays by $2,422,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(f) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $4,631,000,000 and outlays by $3,444,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $5,390,000,000 and outlays by $5,098,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $5,951,000,000 and outlays by $5,941,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(g) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $2,246,000,000 and outlays by $2,977,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $7,378,000,000 and outlays by $2,014,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $3,532,000,000 and outlays by $1,624,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(h) The House Committee on Government Operations shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $8,461,000,000 and outlays by $8,445,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $5,697,000,000 and outlays by $5,673,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $3,225,000,000 and outlays by $3,205,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(i) The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $175,000,000 and outlays by $172,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $195,000,000 and outlays by $195,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $205,000,000 and outlays by $205,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(j) The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) and combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $420,000,000 and outlays by $420,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $440,000,000 and outlays by $440,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $460,000,000 and outlays by $460,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(k) The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $806,000,000 and outlays by $1,016,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $963,000,000 and outlays by $1,223,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $970,000,000 and outlays by $1,240,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(l) The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined

in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $88,000,000 and outlays by $88,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $338,000,000 and outlays by $338,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $353,000,000 and outlays by $353,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(m) The House Committee on Public Works and Transportation shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by 442,000,000 and outlays by $332,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $464,000,000 and outlays by $439,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $472,000,000 and outlays by $472,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(n) The House Committee on Science, Space and Technology shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $2,000,000 and outlays by $2,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $11,000,000 and outlays by $11,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $18,000,000 and outlays by $18,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(o) The House Committee on Small Business shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $83,000,000 and outlays by $83,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $125,000,000 and outlays by $125,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $122,000,000 and outlays by $122,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(p) The House Committee on Veterans Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $5,000,000 and outlays by $18,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $60,000,000 and outlays by $55,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $90,000,000 and outlays by $85,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(q) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $374,000,000 and outlays by $3,859,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $389,000,000 and outlays by $4,509,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $399,000,000 and outlays by $5,189,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

SENATE COMMITTEES

(r) The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $2,515,000,000 and outlays by $2,503,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $4,397,000,000 and outlays by $4,417,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $4,497,000,000 and outlays by $4,567,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(s) The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $4,170,000,000 and outlays by $5,009,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $5,900,000,000 and outlays by $6,568,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $7,460,000,000 and outlays by $8,265,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(t) The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $4,483,000,000 and outlays by $2,178,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $5,059,000,000 and outlays by $3,104,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $5,373,000,000 and outlays by $3,833,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(u) The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $2,288,000,000 and outlays by $1,485,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $2,745,000,000 and outlays by $2,610,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $2,908,000,000 and outlays by $3,033,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(v) The Senate Committee on Environmental and Public Works shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $286,000,000 and outlays by $29,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $407,000,000 and outlays by $60,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $628,000,000 and outlays by $153,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(w) The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $1,091,000,000 and outlays by $1,201,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $1,320,000,000 and outlays by $1,534,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $1,334,000,000 and outlays by $1,604,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(x) The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $7,349,000,000 and outlays by $7,333,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $4,835,000,000 and outlays by $4,811,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $2,378,000,000 and outlays by $2,358,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(y) The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget

Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $3,910,000,000 and outlays by $3,253,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $4,155,000,000 and outlays by $4,820,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $4,365,000,000 and outlays by $5,310,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(z) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report (1) changes in laws within its juridiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $81,000,000 and outlays by $3,566,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $85,000,000 and outlays by $4,205,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $85,000,000 and outlays by $4,875,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(aa) The Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its juridiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $5,000,000 and outlays by $18,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $60,000,000 and outlays by $55,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $90,000,000 and outlays by $85,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(bb) The Senate Committee on the Judiciary shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $420,000,000 and outlays by $420,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $440,000,000 and outlays by $440,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $460,000,000 and outlays by $460,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(cc) The Senate Committee on Small Business shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $83,000,000 and outlays by $83,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $125,000,000 and outlays by $125,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $122,000,000 and outlays by $122,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

TAX AMNESTY

SEC. 3. (a) The Congress shall report legislation establishing a Federal tax amnesty program, that—

(1) authorizes a one-time amnesty from criminal and civil tax penalties for taxpayers who notify the Internal Revenue Service of previous underpayments of Federal tax and pay such underpayments in full;

(2) shall be in effect for a three month period beginning July 1, 1988;

(3) applies to all payments relating to tax years ending on or before December 31, 1986.

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

GOLD BONDS

SEC. 4. (a) The Congress shall report legislation authorizing the issuance of Treasury obligations redeemable in gold, that—

(1) are known as Eagle bonds;

(2) have an annual investment yield not exceeding 1.75%;

(3) have an initial maturity of forty years, and may not be issued for less than twenty-five years;

(4) have principal and interest redeemable at maturity in gold;

(5) are intended to replace high-interest, short-term debt.

(b) The issuance of gold bonds is intended to achieve—

(1) a permament reduction in the rate of interest on the public debt;

(2) a permanent reduction of the rate of interest on the private debt;

(3) a significant reduction of the Federal budget deficit;

(4) the elimination of the U.S. trade deficit.

FEDERAL DEBT COLLECTION REFORM

SEC. 5. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal government is a major lender and allocator of capital through direct loan and loan guarantee programs. By the end of 1986, the Federal government was directly and indirectly involved in $1.2 trillion in lending activity;

(2) the Federal Financing Bank serves in a major capacity to coordinate the financing of these programs;

(3) despite improvements in funding achieved by the Federal Financing Bank, serious shortcomings still exist in allocating and managing Federal credit programs, and current Federal credit program controls provide little incentive for sound management practices and timely debt collection;

(4) since 1981, delinquent debt owed the Federal government has increased from $29.8 billion to $68.3 billion, or 129 percent, and needed reforms in credit management and debt collection deserve immediate consideration by Congress and the Administration.

(b) It is therefore the sense of Congress that the appropriate committees of the Congress should review programs to improvoe the processes of granting credit assistance and timely collection of delinquent debt, including such proposals as—

(1) the appointment of a "debt czar" who would be ultimately responsible for credit management and debt collection throughout the Federal government;

(2) mandating all Federal agencies to establish specific management systems to ensure proper and timely administration of credit assistance and debt collection;

(3) require the use of private collection agencies to collect delinquent accounts and private credit bureaus to assist in maintaining accurate records of recipients of Federal credit assistance;

(4) providing the Department of Justice and other Federal agencies with additional means to enhance debt collection through appropriate litigation efforts;

(5) enacting statutes that prohibit delinquent debtors from continuing to receive additional Federal credit assistance;

(6) providing budgetary incentives for Federal agencies to improve debt collection; and

(7) facilitating the sharing of debt-related information among Federal agencies to ensure proper credit management and timely debt collection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 139, the amendment in the nature of a substitute is considered as having been read.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] will be recognized for 30 minutes and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, there are four features of the budget proposal that I have been privileged by the rule to present to the House today that I want to give some attention to.

No. 1, it picks up reductions from spending totally $10.2 billion from the Congressional Budget Office. It picks up recommendations of the Grace Commission totally some $11.9 billion. It has a tax amnesty provision in it of some $15 billion.

The National Bureau of Economic Research has estimated that we can realize between $7 billion and $47 billion additional revenue if we grant a 3-month period of amnesty. There are other estimates that range from $10 to $20 billion and for this budget resolution there are reconciliation instructions to the Banking Committee to adopt an amnesty provision that will realize a net increase in the existing tax system of $15 billion.

Then I think probably the most innovative approach of this budget resolution relates to refinancing our national debt. Members will recall that the existing debt as of the end of this fiscal year will total some $2.3 trillion.

Some of us on the Republican side believe that you cannot beat something with nothing and in that spirit this budget resolution is being offered, because it reaches the Gramm-Rudman goal of a deficit of $108 billion for the fiscal year 1988 and it

reaches that goal through a reduction of spending, rather than raising taxes.

I will repeat, there are no adjustments of rates in the budget proposal that I am talking about.

The most innovative approach relates to reducing the interest cost of maintaining our national debt.

Members will recall that the gross interest expense of the existing national debt is close to $200 billion, almost 20 percent of Federal spending projected for fiscal year 1988.

Under this budget proposal, we would realize a reduction of the interest cost expense of $19 billion. We realize this through the sale of gold-backed bonds. We will do this by saying to the world, "You send us your gold."

There is today in the world about 100,000 tons of gold. About 40,000 tons is in the hands of governments. The U.S. Government holds about 8,200 tons. About 60,000 tons of gold in the world is in private hands. The owners of that gold have to spend about half a point a year to have it stored just for the privilege of holding their resource in gold, which over time has been the best protection against the ravages of inflation.

Under this proposal, the U.S. Government would say to the holders of gold worldwide who hold this 60,000 tons of gold, "Bring us your gold and we will issue a gold-backed bond whereby the interest will be payable in gold. It will be a long-term bond of 40 years. You bring 100 ounces of gold, for instance, you will get a gold bond or a bond backed by gold from the U.S. Treasury saying that in 40 years we will give you 100 ounces of gold back."

The interest expense on this bond will be, we believe, between 1 and 2 percent annually. The gold that is brought to the Treasury will be placed or refined into gold coins and these gold coins will be sold in the world market. The cash will be used to retire our short-term debt.

There is a yearning among the people of the world for specie gold and silver coins because the people of the world are becoming more suspect of the paper dollar and the other paper currencies that populate our world.

We believe there will be an excellent market for this and from the sale of the gold coins we will retire the short-term debt.

It is estimated that about $600 billion of debt will become due in 1 year; that is the portion in private hands. There is an additional half a trillion dollars in the hands of public sector trust funds that will come due in 1 year. The average cost of this portion of the debt is 7 percent. By reducing the average interest cost of maintaining the national debt we can drive down the annual interest expense that is today the third highest item in the Federal budget.

To give you an idea how this number is climbing alarmingly, today we spend roughly 43 percent of our general fund revenue in interest expense on the national debt. Back in 1980, that figure was 23 percent. It is going up markedly. If we continue the course we are going today, we will reach the point where literally sometime in the mid-1990's it will take almost the entire income of the general fund to pay the interest cost on the outstanding debt.

□ 1150

We are going to add close to two-thirds of $1 trillion to our national debt in this fiscal year, the last fiscal year, and the next fiscal year, unless we make a significant modification in the monetary system of our world.

This is what it does. It permits the gold of the world to be used, to be moved into the flow of commerce to back the gold-backed bond of the U.S. Government, and for that reason it results in a significantly lower rate of interest.

I might say to my colleagues that this budget proposal assumes a full COLA increase for all retirement programs, and assumes a 3-percent civilian and 4-percent military pay increase in 1988. It does this, as I say, by a $19 billion reduction in interest cost expense, a $15 billion increase of revenue through the amnesty program that I have described, and $22.1 billion reduction in implementation of recommendations of the Grace Commission and the Congressional Budget Office.

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

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER], that we only have two speakers, so I would like to reserve the balance of my time and allow him to move forward. Then we will have two speakers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BADHAM].

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the budget of the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER]. It is probably the least unrealistic budget that we have before us. But one thing strikes me, and that will be the area to which I would speak, and that is the area of defense, where Congressman DANNEMEYER recognizes that fact that we have a country, we have a Constitution, and the Constitution mandates the Congress of the United States to provide for the national defense, for the common defense.

I can recall during the years of 1977 to 1980 when we were all bashing President Carter for being soft on defense, we were stretching out programs, making uneconomical buys, the procurement horror stories had not even been heard yet. But in 1980, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Carter's 5-year defense budget projections were above what my friends on this side of the aisle refer to as the Reagan hemorrhage over defense. The Carter 5-year plan was ahead of that of Mr. Reagan, despite the fact that up to 1984 the defense budgets were such that even with a lower than expected by President Carter defense budget we got to the place where our young people were better trained, they were more ready, our pilots had more flying hours per month, our ships had more steaming hours per month, and we were spending less money.

How did we do it? This administration was the one that found the waste and started to do something about it in the Defense Department. I would say that today, of all the Departments of the Government, it may be talked about more, but there is probably less waste now.

That brings us to this year. For the last 3 years we have had real cuts, real negative growth in defense, and we have started cutting back on programs, we have started stretching some out, we have had fewer new buys, and now we are at the place where we talk about fun and games and we talk about politics, but we are at the place now where the smoke is gone, the mirrors are drawn aside, we are into real cuts into muscle and sinew of the defense of this country.

So we are going to cut troop strength if this budget is passed, as suggested by the Budget Committee, we are going to stretch out programs and make inefficient buys, and the waste will be of the defense of this country and the free world.

I implore Members to adopt a budget—and Mr. DANNEMEYER's budget has it—that at least looks realistically at the defense of the free world.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a couple of questions from the standpoint of where conservatives ought to be in the budget process. The National Taxpayers has made it very clear that there are some tests that ought to be made of budgets if in fact you are a real conservative on this business of budgeting, on the business of deficits, and on the business of spending.

A lot of the Members of this body have gone home and told their constituents that they are in fact a conservative, that they are in fact against Government spending, that they are for getting the deficits in order, and

they have repeated that over and over again in their districts, and yet their voting record in Congress does not match what they are saying back home.

There is a pretty good test here today. The one group that monitors all of the spending and monitors the taxing and monitors what goes on around here is the National Taxpayers Union. They look at it pretty carefully. They have come up with some criteria for budgets, and they sent it to each Member of the House and told us what we ought to look at in terms of the budget process.

They said these things: First of all, that Congress should follow the law and comply with the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings 1988 deficit limit of $108 billion.

They said second, that Congress should cut Federal spending throughout the entire budget in order to meet the deficit limit target.

They said if new programs are approved, they should be deficit-neutral.

They said there should be no changes in the basic tax rate provisions, and they oppose tax increases or new taxes.

Now the problem is that we have budgets on the floor that simply do not meet those standards. I would like to ask the gentleman from California with regard to these budget standards how his particular proposal meets these budget tests:

No. 1, does the gentleman's budget meet and comply with the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings 1988 deficit limit of $108 billion?

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

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Yes, it does. The deficit total projected is $108 billion.

Mr. WALKER. And does the gentleman's budget cut Federal spending throughout the entire budget in order to meet the deficit-limit target?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. It does precisely that. It implements recommendations of the Grace Commission by cutting $11.9 billion and recommendations of the Congressional Budget Office by some $10.2 billion. These are across almost every aspect of Federal spending.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. If new programs are approved within the gentleman's budget, are they deficit-neutral?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. The only new programs are two, and one of them cuts interests costs on the national debt. The other is an amnesty program that I described that brings in an additional $15 billion which is from the existing tax system. So the answer is that there are no new programs beyond what I have described.

Mr. WALKER. Do you in any way change the basic tax rates of last year's tax reform bill?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. We do not touch the tax rates at all.

Mr. WALKER. Are there tax increases or new taxes in the gentleman's bill?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. There are no tax increases or new taxes in this measure at all.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman in fact does raise revenues in his bill. Could he explain how we have increased revenues without new taxes in the bill?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. There have been numerous research efforts as to how we can bring some of the underground economy that exists in this country. One of the organizations that have studied this problem is the National Bureau of Economic Research. They are not the only one, but it has estimated that the uncollected revenue under the existing tax system is $17 to $47 billion a year, and some estimates are between $10 and $20 billion a year. The proposal that is contained in the reconciliation construction to the Banking Committee is that we adopt a 3-month amnesty period, say from July through September of this calendar year, and say to the taxpayers of the country, "We will remove you from civil and criminal penalties if you will come into the tax system and pay up what you owe."

State governments have done this. We have estimated $15 billion could be realized; it is a reasonable, conservative estimate.

□ 1200

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman, and I say again to the House that the gentleman from California should be congratulated for bringing to us a document that is truly a conservative document. If you are opposed to spending, if you are opposed to deficits, there is only one budget that you will have a chance to vote on today that in fact meets the tests outlined by the National Taxpayers Union, that in fact meets the tests of reducing the deficit, doing so within the law, and doing so in a way that is responsible and responsive to the needs of this Nation.

I would hope that the Members of this House will in fact vote to support the Dannemeyer budget that he has brought before us, because I think that what we have before us meets the test that conservatives can take to the country and adopt as our own.

Again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by our colleague from California, Mr. DANNEMEYER. The one component of his proposal that has me most intrigued, and I think should command the attention of this body, is the idea of reducing our debt service though the issuance of gold backed bonds. Anything that moves this Nation back in the direction of a gold backed currency is a sound, positive policy. I do not think we will ever be able properly, through whatever mechanisms we put in place, whether it is Gramm-Rudman, or even a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, to achieve the kind of discipline that historically was imposed upon all legislative bodies when we had a convertible currency.

So I would urge my colleagues to recognize that one of the most important ingredients of the proposal offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] is the provision providing for the issuance of gold backed bonds. We can end up financing our debt at a fraction of the current cost.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to praise my colleague from California, Mr. DANNEMEYER, for offering this body a substitute budget which does not further decimate the defense budget or call for massive tax increases, as does the Democrat budget proposal being offered by Mr. GRAY. Mr. DANNEMEYER's guarantee of 1 percent in real growth on defense spending in each year, fiscal year 1988 to fiscal year 1992, along with his acceptance of the President's request for a fiscal year 1987 supplemental appropriation for defense is far more reasonable than the House Democrat's call for further cuts in defense spending. In addition, the Dannemeyer budget's exclusion of any major tax increases except for the increase in revenues due to the tax amnesty provision continues the spirit of tax reform and conforms to the President's and the Republican Party's pledge not to raise taxes. Mr. GRAY and all those who support his budget, on the other hand, seem to think that the American people are undertaxed, and thus are willing to endure an $18 billion tax increase in fiscal year 1988. I reject this notion.

I would like to point out to my colleagues the massive reductions in spending on national defense, one of the few legitimate functions of a national government, that the Democrat-controlled Congress has forced this country to endure over the last 2 years. In 1986 and 1987, Congress cut $65 billion from the adminstration's requests for national defense. It is alarming to discover that the 1987 appropriated amount is now 6 percent below that for 1985! Now, the House Democrat budget offered by Mr. GRAY will again call for drastic reductions in the spending on the defense of our Nation. It requires a $23.3 billion reduction from the President's modest request for 3 percent real growth in defense spending. Mr. GRAY's mark of $288.7 billion in budget authority for defense spending is even lower than $304 billion for which the majority of the House Democrats on the Armed Services

Committee had recently called. In Mr. GRAY's fiscal year 1988 budget, defense makes up 27.7 percent of Federal budget outlays and nondefense spending makes up the remaining 72.3 percent. However, half of the spending reductions in Mr. GRAY's budget comes from defense spending!

Mr. DANNEMEYER's call for 1 percent real growth in defense outlays in each of the next 5 fiscal years is a reasonable—and much needed—increase in spending to ensure the security of this great Nation. Most important, it does not betray promises made to the American soldiers that this Nation will maintain a strong defense.

I also urge my colleagues to reject the Gray budget substitute because it calls for an $18 billion tax increase. In 1984, the American people made it clear that they will not accept a tax increase to reduce the deficit by rejecting the Democrat nominee for the presidency of the United States. Now, less than 2½ years later, Mr. GRAY and the Democrats are calling for $18 billion in unspecified increases in taxes.

From whom will this $18 billion be raised? While it is not specified in Mr. GRAY's budget, are those who vote for this tax increase ready to justify why they voted for the bill which allowed for such unnecessary increases?

If this $18 billion comes in the form of excise taxes, are my colleagues ready to defend their vote for a regressive tax to reduce the deficit?

If the $18 billion comes in the form of an oil import fee, are my colleagues ready to defend their vote for reduced jobs and productivity caused by the increase in the costs of energy?

If the $18 billion comes in the form of increased taxes on business, are my colleagues ready to defend their vote for an increase in the trade deficit caused by $18 billion decrease in the competitiveness of U.S. firms?

One might argue, as the Speaker, Mr. WRIGHT, we can raise taxes on the wealthy by a delay of the effective date of the tax rate reductions to 15 percent, 28 percent, and 33 percent promised by Congress in the Tax Reform Act of 1986. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that a 1-year freeze in the transitional rate structure until 1989 will raise $16.8 billion in revenues. However, an analysis of this delay I have received from the Joint Committee on Taxation clearly shows that, should this be the avenue for a tax increase, the increase will not be solely on the wealthy. This increase will also be felt by income classes of $40,000 a year and more:

DISTRIBUTIONAL EFFECTS RESULTING FROM APPLYING 1987 TAX RATES IN TAX YEAR 1988

Income class (thousands of 1986 dollars)	Change in average income tax liability (dollars)	Percentage change in average income tax liability
0 to 10	−$42	−51.2
10 to 20	−71	−8.9
20 to 30	−86	−4.1
30 to 40	−80	−2.4
40 to 50	10	.2
50 to 75	194	2.3
75 to 100	974	6.7
100 to 200	2,264	8.3
200+	17,953	13.2
Total	149	3.5

Clearly, if the $18 billion tax increase called for by the Gray budget comes in the form of a rate freeze, the American middle class will have to bear a significant portion of this tax increase. Are my colleagues who vote for the Gray budget ready to justify such a tax increase, should it be ultimately accepted?

Whatever form this $18 billion tax increase takes, those who accept Mr. GRAY's budget proposal better be able to justify to their constituents each of the above-mentioned options. By blindly accepting $18 billion in unspecified taxes, a vote for the Gray budget is a vote for whatever form this $18 billion takes.

I urge my colleagues to reject Mr. GRAY's substitute and accept the Dannemeyer budget, thus ensuring no massive tax increases will occur and the security of the Nation will be safeguarded.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the Dannemeyer budget for the same reason I supported the President's budget, and that is because it goes a long way toward meeting the No. 1 constitutional duty that this body has, and that is to protect America.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] several months ago convened a special policy panel, on Armed Services and the obligation and duty of that panel was to derive, a defense budget, based not on what the President recommended, but based on the requirements and on the threats and on the needs of American fighting men and women. In that panel we had discussions with experts on strategic systems, experts on the situation in the Middle East, experts on the requirements for sealift, for airlift. It was the majority opinion of that policy panel after deriving this information and this evidence from our experts in national defense, people that the Democrat chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] called, that we needed to spend at least as much money as was requested in the President's budget; that is, approximately a 3-percent real increase.

We have marked up the Armed Services Committee budget. The Dannemeyer budget is very, very close to the budget that we have marked up. If we do not go with this budget, and if we go with the Democrat budget, we are going to see a massive erosion in our personnel capability and our personnel and strengths. We are going to lose between 100,000 and 300,000 people. Probably more importantly, though, we are going to lose a great many of our very skilled people, we are going to have an erosion of morale, and we are going to go back to the Jimmy Carter days when we had approximately 1,000 chief petty officers a month leaving the U.S. Navy, the people who drive the Navy, who know how to operate the machinery, the people who know how to make those ships operate. Those people will be leaving.

After we came back and rebuilt defense in 1981, 1982, and 1983, we reversed that trend. We had a thousand senior petty officers a month coming back into the Navy and bringing back all of that expertise that was garnered over many years, back to America's fighting forces. So we are going to have a major problem in the personnel area; in fact, a disaster in the personnel area if we adopt the Democrat budget.

Let me go to readiness. In the days of Jimmy Carter, we had planes that could not fly, we had ships that could not sail. Since the President started rebuilding national defense in 1981, we increased the full mission-capable rate of our carrier aircraft to in excess of 60 percent over what it had been in the days of Jimmy Carter, and that meant in the incident of the *Achille Lauro* where we had an intercept of an aircraft bearing a terrorist in midair that all of our equipment works, and we were able to, because we had outstanding personnel and because we had equipment that was fully mission capable, we were able to accomplish that very difficult mission.

We are going back to the days and to the times of Jimmy Carter in which the majority of our carrier aircraft were not fully mission capable.

The last area I want to talk about is equipment. Instead of going through the broad spectrum of all of the military equipment that is touched on in the armed services markup, I want to go to one specialized area, and that is submarines. In my opinion, the United States of America is losing its superiority in submarines. We all agree, even those people that think we are still vastly superior, we all agree that the qualitative gap is closing very rapidly. The Soviet Union has now placed the *Akula*-class submarine, their attack submarine, in the water. This is their newest version. Many of us think that it may, in fact, be superior to the 688 that we have right now, our 688 *Los Angeles*-class submarine. But it is also superior in some ways to the SSN-21, the submarine that we will not have in the water until 1994.

Let me just tell you, Mr. Chairman, that we have about 100 attack submarines. The Soviets outnumber us 3 to 1 in attack submarines. They have approximately 300.

Our maritime strategy is based on our submarine force being able to locate the enemy submarine force in times of war and sinking that force very rapidly.

I guess what I am telling my colleagues is that, even in this budget that was marked up in the Armed Services Committee, we only call for three attack submarines. The Soviets

are putting a submarine in the water every 38 days. American national security experts are very worried that our capability and our margin of superiority over the Soviets is eroding very rapidly in the area of submarines.

The budget that the Democrat-controlled Budget Committee has put forward accelerates that loss of superiority. The Dannemeyer budget at least holds the line, and for that reason I would like to second the commendations that were offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BADHAM], another member of the Armed Services Committee, commending the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] for his budget, and urge those colleagues who are concerned about national security and think that national security is the No. 1 priority for this Congress to adopt the Dannemeyer budget.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the opposition party's budget advocates raising taxes. This is something the American people simply do not want nor will they accept. In addition to that, they tell us they cannot meet the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings target of $108 billion in deficit for this next fiscal year.

I think that is a real cave-in to the big spending pressure in this Congress which is traditional, and it is something we cannot tolerate.

My colleague from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER], has some real innovative ideas in his budget proposal, and I think we should listen to him. He has indicated in his budget that we can attain the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings target of $108 billion in deficit this next fiscal year, and we can do it for 1989 and 1990 as well.

It allows for COLA's and scheduled pay increases to take effect.

□ 1210

It assumes 1 percent real growth for defense each year, and we need that, makes some program changes in targeted waste reduction. It does not sell off Amtrak, the Power Marketing Administration, or the REA's, and there are no changes, no major changes in education or in entitlements. It does, however, freeze foreign aid at fiscal year 1987 levels. This is a good budget. I think every Member of this body ought to take a close look at it and be fiscally responsible and vote for the Dannemeyer amendment.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. First, I guess, I wish to offer some congratulations to the gentleman from California for at least trying or attempting to develop a budget. However, as I review his budget along with reviewing all the other budgets, I find that I cannot support his budget. Nor can I support, as I have not, the President's budget, nor the budget for the Black Caucus, but I plan to support the committee budget even though I find disagreements also, personally, with that. But I find that it is the better of all the other budgets.

My main concern with the gentleman from California's budget is what it does to rural America, what it does to my farmers, what he does to the cotton, rice, wheat, feed grains, dairy producers of this Nation. At the present time under the present 1985 farm bill we are seeing a loss of 6 percent of our farmers today rather than in the past a 1.7-loss per year. That is a devastation on our communities. But in 3 years under the Dannemeyer budget we would lose almost all of our family farmers. There would be a mass exodus of almost all the people from rural America who would have to leave and go to our cities. The cities have no jobs for them. Where are these people going to be displaced to, where are our family farms going to be? There are going to be no family farms in rural America under the Dannemeyer budget.

Severe reductions in entitlement programs, target prices as proposed even by the President in his budget, a 10-percent-per-year reduction, that is devastation. Even those on the minority side in the Agriculture Committee when we had the Secretary of Agriculture up, could not support that. They recognize that that is severe devastation. It means not only loss of farmers but loss of whole communities. and small businesses. The Dannemeyer budget is the worst thing that a small business could endure in rural America. There would not be any small businesses out there.

I disagree with the statement of the gentleman from California when he, in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in using the National Taxpayers Union criteria, where the gentleman said there was reduction, cuts across the board basically on all programs. I do not see the cut below this year in national defense. I see an increase in national defense above this year. Therefore, there are not those cuts.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If the gentlemen will look closely at the budget, he will find out that the gentleman from California has included defense cuts. He has a 1-percent defense waste cut that is included in his budget. So that there is a direct line item within the gentleman's budget for the Defense Department to cut out wasteful practices there and thereby save 1 percent. So there are in fact defense cuts included in the line items of the budget of the gentleman from California. And that is the standard to which the National Taxpayer Union wants to hold us and that is that there be cuts in all areas of the budget.

Mr. VOLKMER. What the gentleman is telling me then is that the Defense Department, without this proposal from the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] is not going to cut waste in defense spending, they are going to continue on the road as they have in the last few years with all these huge amounts of dollars that they do not know how to spend properly, continue to have fraud, waste, and abuse unless we have a proposal in there requiring them to do it. They should be doing that anyway, so you do not have a saving by requiring them to do what they should do anyway.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes; I yield to gentleman from California.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The President proposed for fiscal year 1988, $297.6 billion outlays for defense. The budget proposal that I am presenting contains $291.9 billion for defense, a significantly lower figure. It is about $8 billion or $9 billion higher than the defense budget outlay coming from the side of the gentleman from Missouri, the Democratic side.

I mention this because there is a significant reduction from what the President asked for. Maybe the gentleman from Missouri did not hear my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]; I have advocated in this budget $2.5 billion.

Mr. VOLKMER. Let me reclaim my time and say that is as against this year's spending; not as against what the President proposes, not as against anything anybody else proposes. You have an increase in defense spending above this year.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. To put it in perspective, in 1987 we are projected to spend in outlays $282.2 billion, my budget proposal is $291.9 billion, and that is frankly nothing more than a recognition of inflation.

Mr. VOLKMER. I do not care what it is, it is an increase. The gentleman tells me it is not an increase, that 291 is not more than 282? I know better than that.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Depending on what you want to call it. You can call it a freeze, when you just allow for inflation what else can you call it?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, that argument that the gentleman is making, the gentleman from California, is similar to what I see as nothing but huge smoke and mirrors and big

puff as far as amnesty, the gold, and everything else in his budget; it is just not a realistic budget.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think we have to make absolutely clear what the National Taxpayers Union said because it has been badly distorted by the gentleman from Missouri. The National Taxpayers Union said Congress should cut Federal spending throughout the entire budget in order to meet the deficit limit target. Let us make it very clear that the Dannemeyer budget meets the deficit limit target and it does so by cutting spending in all areas of the budget, including defense. And that is precisely the standard to which we are being held here. It does not say that you have to cut it below last year's figures. It does not say that at all. It simply says throughout the budget you have to make cuts in order to meet the deficit limit target. That is precisely what the Dannemeyer budget does, that is precisely what it accomplishes. It is the only budget that does that. So therefore I think that anybody who wants to go home and call themselves fiscal conservatives had better vote for this budget because the test of your fiscal conservatism is going to be whether or not you vote for the Dannemeyer budget.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would allow the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] to move forward now. Of course, it is his prerogative to close debate. Then we will have our final speaker before he closes debate.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. BATEMAN. I thank the gentleman from California for the time.

I commend the gentleman from California for his budget proposal. There is no budget proposal pending before the House today in any form that any and all Members of this Congress can approve and agree with in toto. We are at the point of making very, very difficult choices and biting some very tough bullets.

I do commend the gentleman for his version of the budget, in most particular regard to its treatment of our national defense.

The security and freedom of the United States of America and of the free world is dependent upon adequacy of our defenses, without which there will be neither peace nor security.

We must maintain America's strength. The last several budgets for the Department of Defense have been actually negative growth budgets. We are faced with a committee-proposed budget resolution that again would be negative growth in defense, when all those who have studied our national security requirements concede that there is indeed a need for real growth if we are going to maintain our defenses in an adequate posture.

Any budget that we have dealt with in the Committee on Armed Services, including that which we marked up in our authorization bill yesterday, is marginally adequate at best. It comes to a level of some $305 billion already reflecting cuts that many of us feel ill advised. To be forced by a budget resolution to make further reductions in weapons systems is going to invite that very waste of money that we all decry so frequently when we stand on the floor and address ourselves to spending in the Department of Defense.

□ 1220

We will be spending considerably more over time to procure less because of the rollercoaster pattern of our defense spending that does not let us take advantage of the economies of scale and of multiyear procurement that are vital to compressing the cost of providing what is essential for national defense.

It is imperative that the budget we ultimately adopt genuinely reflect the legitimate, recognizable and clear requirements of our national defense.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, under the rules of the House, which side has the closing argument relating to the budget proposal that this gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] has been privileged to present?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from California that the manager from the Budget Committee has the right to close.

By agreement between the sides, if there is an agreement, the gentleman from California could close.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to let the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will close.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank the Chair, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER], for his talents and his industry. While his Republican colleagues have been carping and whining about their inability to write a budget, the gentleman has written one.

While the Republican members of the Committee on the Budget have been spending their days manufacturing excuses for their inability to even submit a budget for the House to consider, the gentleman from California charges forward in full battle dress to slay the deficit dragon.

The gentleman is truly a bulldog in a room full of Republican cocker spaniels. He deserves our salute and our commendation for his fine work.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania said earlier that the gentleman from California's budget is the only truly conservative budget. Quite frankly, I think there are some questions that liberals and conservatives should ask of the gentleman's budget.

It is conservative in that it hearkens back to the good old days, because if the gentleman's budget is accepted, it might return the United States to those thrilling days of yesteryear, those days of the gold standard, and oh, what a hectic and fun time we had in America then.

What was the business cycle like in the good old days of the gold standard? In the heyday of the gold standard, we saw prices and output in America fluctuate wildly, significantly different than they have been since World War II. We had those good old days of double-digit unemployment for the entire 6 years, from 1893 to 1898 under the gold standard. That is how the gold standard ensured low prices and interest rates. It put people out of work.

There is one element of the gold standard which really puzzles me when I hear my conservative and Republican colleagues come forward for the Dannemeyer amendment. Under the gold standard, what happens to the United States if South Africa or the Soviet Union decide to withhold their gold production and stocks from the market? Could they not cause a recession in the United States and the rest of the world, just as OPEC has held us hostage by withholding their oil?

If the gentleman from California shares my concern about bugs in the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, he should realize that his budget scheme is dealing the Soviet Union in as a major player in the future of America's economy. That is hardly a plan that I would expect from one of the House of Representatives' peerless warriors against Communist influence, but that is the Dannemeyer budget resolution.

If you look at his suggestion about America's ability to pay off its debt with gold, I would say to the gentleman from California that he should go and evaluate what America's gold holdings are worth today. The most accurate estimates suggest that they are worth $110 billion, and yet our Nation is compelled to pay $600 billion

per year on debt. We cannot cover the debt which we have based on our gold stocks.

Furthermore, to suggest that our creditors will accept a 1-percent interest rate is unrealistic. They are not about to accept that when the real interest rate which we are dealing with today is around 2½ to 3½ percent.

Going to a specific area of the gentleman's budget from California, in the area of agriculture, the gentleman suggests in one of his items that we eliminate the excise tax exemption for ethanol. I would have to join my colleague from Missouri who said earlier that this would be devastating, not only to the Midwest and the farm economy, but to America's budget process.

What the gentleman from California would do would throw 300 million bushels of corn back on the shoulders of the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy and to store, driving the price of corn down 10 or 15 cents a bushel, pushing the farm crisis even deeper in the Midwest, making it impossible for us to recover.

Is that a conservative budget? It strikes me as one that will increase America's budget deficit in the years ahead.

Again, let me salute my colleague for his offering. I do stand in respect for the position that he has held consistently and the position that he now holds today that America should return to those thrilling days of the gold standard, but I might say to the gentleman that the Republican Party would have been better off had it not only considered your proposal, but had it dealt itself in as a real player in this budget process. Unfortunately, yours is the only offering coming from the House of Representatives on the Republican side of the aisle.

We should commend you for that effort, but frankly, as you look at the details of your budget resolution, it is not in the best interests of meeting the budget challenges facing America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] for 4 minutes to close debate.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], for his observations and his constructive criticisms, but one of the things that perhaps is the problem with the gentleman's presentation is that he does not really understand the proposal that I have made.

With respect to the allocation for agriculture that my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], talked about, the proposal that I am talking about would allocate $27.8 billion in outlays in fiscal year 1988 and the Democratic version of the budget was $28.6 billion, very close. There is no significant reduction in agriculture outlays. It is mostly relating to the implementation of various organizations that have talked about reducing spending where we can through increased efficiency.

The truth of the matter is America did not have the gold standard, even during the thirties. We have had what is called a gold exchange standard, which started in 1922. If you really want to understand what the gold exchange standard did to the monetary system of the West, there is a French author by the name of Jacques Rueff, who wrote a book published in 1971 titled just that, "The Monetary Sin of the West," in which he related that, with the gold exchange standard, we laid the foundation for a gradual rise in prices based on inflation, and that is the reason that in 1971, our President, Mr. Nixon, was compelled to close the gold window.

I am not suggesting to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], in any way that the gold standard is perfect. There is no perfect system in this world, but when you examine the imperfections of the paper dollar system that has taken place in this Nation since we severed the link between the dollar and gold in 1968, these fluctuations, inflation peaking in 1979, and deflation in some sectors since, the increase in the prime rate, the destruction of a large portion of the savings and loan industry in this country, high rates of interest that still prevail today, and what is even more important is that this paper dollar that we are using today is responsible for many Americans not to be able to participate in the American dream.

□ 1230

Did anybody ever wonder why today it costs a 9-percent fixed rate mortgage rate to own you own home or a condominium, when your parents in their generation had that same privilege at 4 or 5 percent? The answer is that it is the paper dollar system that we have today that is costing every consumer in this country roughly 4 points on their mortgage rate. That translates on an average $100,000 mortgage for most American citizens to about $300 a month that you and the rest of us are paying as the price for maintaining this paper dollar system.

I do not know about others, but I can think of lot better ways to spend that $300 a month that is going for interest to maintain my share of the paper dollar system which is sent to the bankers of New York City.

It is time that we talk about fundamental reform. This Nation, for a lot of what were perceived to be good reasons in 1968, went down the road with this paper dollar system, and right now it is choking not only the economy of the U.S. Government, it has exacerbated our foreign trade deficit with other nations. We literally have the economies of Mexico, Argentina, and Brazil on their knees because of these high interest rates.

The debt bubble is growing bigger all the time, and we had better grow up and recognize that we should take action to deflate the debt level that exists in this world before the debt bubble bursts and brings the whole monetary system of the Western World down on its knees. I hope that thought does not happen. The responsible thing for us to do is to begin to use the gold of the world in the flow of international commerce so we can once again secure for the lender of capital, the assurance that when they get their money back, it will buy what it bought when it was lent.

That is the definition of honest money. That is what this budget proposal would do. It would result in an interest cost reduction of some $19 billion below what we otherwise will spend in fiscal year 1988.

I think it is an honest proposal. I have a letter here from the former Ambassador to France, in the Reagan administration, Mr. Galbraith, who believes that the Treasury of the United States can sell these gold-backed bonds at 1 to 2 percent a year. The British Government is selling an indexed bond whereby the principal is guaranteed against inflation for a similar rate of interest.

It is time that we realistically think about reforming the monetary system of our world so as to decrease the interest cost increment of our national budget problem and, in so doing, lay the foundation for achieving the Gramm-Rudman targets by cutting spending, not by raising taxes.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 47, noes, 369, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

AYES—47

Armey	Davis (IL)	Hyde
Badham	DeLay	Inhofe
Bartlett	Dornan (CA)	Kasich
Bilirakis	Dreier	Kyl
Bliley	Gingrich	Lott
Burton	Hansen	Lungren
Cheney	Herger	Mack
Craig	Hiler	Michel
Crane	Holloway	Moorhead
Dannemeyer	Hunter	Nielson

Packard
Ravenel
Roth
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Shumway
Shuster
Skeen
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Solomon
Stenholm
Stump
Swindall
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber

NOES—369

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barton
Bateman
Bates
Bellenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilbray
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boulter
Boxer
Brennan
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Bruce
Bryant
Buechner
Bunning
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Combest
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Crockett
Darden
Daub
Davis (MI)
de la Garza
DeFazio
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Flake
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Frenzel
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Grandy
Grant
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Harris
Hastert
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Hertel
Hochbrueckner
Hopkins
Horton
Houghton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Konnyu
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken, Thomas
Lukens, Donald
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKinney
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Morella
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickett
Porter
Price (IL)
Price (NC)
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Saiki
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Sharp
Shaw
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Annunzio
Brown (CA)
Clarke
Daniel
Downey
Edwards (OK)
Fascell
Gephardt
Kemp
Livingston
Lloyd
Madigan
Martin (NY)
Pickle
Tauzin
Weldon
Young (AK)

□ 1250

Mr. RODINO changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CRAIG and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I was unavoidably detained while meeting with a group of my constituents from the transportation workers union and missed the vote on the Dannemeyer amendment to the budget. If I had been present I would have voted against this amendment. In voting against this amendment and all the other amendments that have been proposed today, I am casting my vote, not against cutting the deficit, but against the sham that we call a budget process. The effort by the majority to produce a bipartisian, realistic budget was nonexistent. To vote in favor of continuing this badly flawed process and charade on the American people would serve no useful purpose.

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

Mr. DYMALLY. 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. DYMALLY: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Congress hereby determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1988 is established and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1989 and 1990 are hereby set forth:

(a) The following levels and amounts are set forth for purposes of determining, in accordance with section 301(i) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, whether the maximum deficit amount for a fiscal year has been exceeded, and as set forth in this concurrent resolution shall be considered to be mathematically consistent with the other amounts and levels set forth in this concurrent resolution:

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

Fiscal year 1988: $964,121,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $1,026,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $1,115,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $1,197,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $1,261,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $1,327,640,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $1,094,480,500,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $1,144,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $1,200,457,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $130,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $124,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $116,700,000,000.

(b) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1987, October 1, 1988, and October 1, 1989:

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

Fiscal year 1988: $743,135,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $790,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $862,873,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $19,850,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $21,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $23,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $59,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $63,850,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $68,950,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $941,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $980,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $1,017,063,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $863,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $909,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $948,230,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $150,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $146,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $139,800,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 1988: $2,565,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $2,996,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $2,996,300,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1987, October 1, 1988, and October 1, 1989, are as follows:
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $34,500,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $148,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $33,800,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $150,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $33,100,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $158,000,000,000.

(c) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1988 through 1990 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $291,971,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,126,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $279,969,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $275,411,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $289,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $282,546,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $16,436,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,696,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,850,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $21,720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,192,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,150,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $18,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,090,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,350,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,900,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $11,493,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,179,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $12,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,754,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $13,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,685,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $5,364,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,431,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $50,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $6,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,334,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $50,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $6,415,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,547,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $50,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $16,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,486,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $17,460,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,920,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $18,324,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,470,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $30,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,962,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $17,350,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $31,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,965,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $16,150,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $28,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,329,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,500,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $14,758,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,630,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,950,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $91,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $13,273,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,037,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $94,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $16,493,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,394,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,350,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $99,000,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $32,879,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,922,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $33,639,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,580,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $250,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $34,702,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,257,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $8,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,630,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $350,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $8,331,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,037,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $350.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $8,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,394,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,150,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $350,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $40,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,976,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,650,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $42,040,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,315,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,650,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $43,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,205,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,150,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $44,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,117,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $48,361,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,155,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $52,597,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,104,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $350,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $110,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $110,140,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $130,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,558,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $141,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $131,136,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $170,631,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $134,008,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $178,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $141,424,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $185,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $147,028,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $256,791,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,986,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $281,475,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $235,623,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $310,577,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,227,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $27,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,401,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $30,400,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $28,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,664,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $28,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $28,524,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,133,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $30,100,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $10,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,016,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $10,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,545,000,000
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $11,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,015,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $7,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,873,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $7,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,892,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $7,735,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,197,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (850):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $1,869,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,862,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $1,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,903,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $1,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,969,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $139,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,110,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $146,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,653,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $151,422,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $151,422,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $889,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $926,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $3,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,316,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $5,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,746,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, −$40,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$40,360,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, −$42,860,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$42,860,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, −$45,351,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$45,351,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 139, the amendment in the nature of a substitute is considered as having been read.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

MODIFICATIONS TO AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. DYMALLY

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the pending amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modifications.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modifications to amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. DYMALLY:

Page 2, line 1, strike $964,121,000 and insert $989,121,000; line 21, strike $1,197,987,000,000 and insert $1,178,540,000,000; line 22, strike $1,261,510,000,000 and insert $1,304,370,000,000; line 23, strike $1,327,640,000,000 and insert $1,372,991,000,000.

Page 3, line 5, strike $130,684,000,000 and insert $105,680,000,000; line 13, strike $743,135,000,000 and insert $768,135,000,000.

Page 4, line 4, strike $941,196,000 and insert $921,000,000; line 5, strike $980,035,000 and insert $1,023,895,000,000; line 6, strike $1,017,063,000,000 and insert $1,062,414,000,000.

Page 5, line 22, strike $291,971,000,000 and insert $272,524,000,000.

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

Mr. LATTA. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I shall not object, I take this reservation to ask the gentleman a couple questions.

What actually is being done, they are changing the numbers, is more than just a technical correction. We are not going to object to that, but I think it is important to point out that they are changing the BA on 050 from 292. to 272.5; is that correct?

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. LATTA. The gentleman is changing the revenue figure about $25 billion?

Mr. DYMALLY. That is correct.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, it is with a deep sense of pride that I rise to introduce the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget for fiscal year 1988, which is an amendment in the nature of a substitute for House Concurrent Resolution 93.

To our colleagues and to the administration, we are making a statement and we are responding to a challenge of the President, who asked us in 1981 to come up with something better if we did not like his budget. This is a budget that represents the aspirations of people across our 50 States. We believe we have answered the challenge and set a new standard of fiscal policy for this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, this alternative budget is not a mere symbolic gesture. It is a progressive, far-reaching plan, for the economic future of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I call on my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus Task Force on the Budget, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Mr. FAUNTROY].

□ 1300

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to present for careful consideration by the House a budget that will provide Members an opportunity to vote to meet the most keenly felt needs of their constituents.

If you want to vote for a budget that goes farthest in reducing the deficit than any budget before us, then you'll need to vote for the CBC alternative budget. If you want to vote for a budget that provides the Nation with a secure national defense at responsible funding levels and without sacrificing personnel benefits and readiness, then you will vote for the CBC alternative budget.

If you want to vote for a budget that restores cuts to student loan programs, provides health care for the elderly, makes a major commitment to catastrophic health care, and establishes welfare reform that reduces long-term welfare dependency by providing training and skills development, then you'll want to vote for the CBC alternative budget.

If you want to vote for a budget that provides for strong public and private sector partnership; to provide housing for low- and moderate-income families, community and economic development for our cities and both housing and financial assistance to small- and mid-sized farmers while increasing food assistance and nutrition education to low-income persons, then you will want to vote for the CBC alternative budget.

If you want to vote for a budget that will develop hundreds of millions of customers for the goods and services produced by American workers, then you will vote for a foreign assistance budget like ours that fully funds our commitment to the multilateral development banks, southern Africa development, and that sustains funding for "base rights" countries and countries moving toward democracy such as Haiti and the Philippines. If you are genuinely concerned for the American worker, you will vote for a budget calculated to reduce unemployment in the civilian labor force to 4 percent through fiscal year 1990, you'll vote for the CBC alternative budget.

If you want these things for the American people and the constituents who elected you to represent them in this House, you'll want to listen carefully to highlights of this budget that will be outlined for you over the next 30 minutes.

We offer this budget because with the passage of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, the politics of budget negotiating entered a new era. Progressives and moderates forged coalitions focusing on the development of strategies to realign national priorities and merge domestic and international agendas.

The Congressional Black Caucus continues to challenge the fiscal priorities and programmatic policies of the Reagan administration. As part of the fiscal year 1988 budget debate, members of the CBC, for the sixth consecutive year have come together to fill the void in developing a responsible fiscal policy which conforms to deficit reduction goals. Urban and rural interests have been addressed, resolutions of diverse constituent needs and issues unique to specific geographic regions were structured into this document. The culmination of these discussions was the creation of the CBC fiscal year 1988 alternative budget.

The basic premise of the alternative is the formation of a fiscal policy that will assure a decent quality of life for all Americans. It calls for leadership; and a sound monetary policy which would put Americans to work in meeting our enormous challenges in education, health, housing, transportation, reindustrialization, agriculture, public works, research, and development.

Let me touch upon the major economic assumptions of our budget and then various of my colleagues will highlight salient features of the budget. The Congressional Budget Office and the Reagan administration have advanced optimistic forecasts of economic growth through fiscal year 1990. Nonetheless, many proponents of the fiscal year 1988 alternative budget have expressed concern that the potential for a recession in the outyears has not been factored into these assumptions.

Because, however, baseline figures reflect the economic forecasts presented by the CBO, the fiscal year 1988 alternative is calculated against those projections as noted:

First, real GNP growth averages approximately 3.1 percent a year between 1986 and 1991. Normal GNP growth averages in the 7.2 percent after adjustment for inflation.

Second, inflation, as measured by the GNP deflator, averages 4.2 percent a year.

Third, the 3-month Treasury bill rate declines from 6.4 percent in 1986 to 5.4 percent in 1991 or from 3.1 percent for 1.3 percent after adjustment for inflation.

Fourth, aggregate forecasts project:

The world price of oil will remain close to $15 per barrel through the end of 1988;

The exchange rate—as measured by the Federal Reserve Board index—will continue to decline, reaching by the end of 1988 a level approximately 10 percent below its level at the end of 1986; and

Food prices will increase to 4 percent throughout the forecast period.

Fifth, unemployment rate exceptions—the CBC alternative budget rejects CBO projections for a slow decline in the unemployment rate to a 6-percent level by 1991. It adopts instead a Hawkins-Humphrey target in compliance with the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978 of a level of 4 percent unemployment in the civilian labor force through fiscal year 1990.

The Congressional Budget Office reports that lost revenues and increased outlays from unemployment yield an unemployment deficit of $40 billion of every 1 percent of unemployment. By meeting the alternative budget/Hawkins-Humphrey target of 4 percent, additional revenues and outlay reductions for the projected 3 years would yield: $40 billion in the first year, $80 billion in the second year, and $120 billion for fiscal year 1990—figures from the "Economic Budget Outlook: Fiscal Years 1987-1991, a Report to the Senate and House Committees on the Budget"—part L: table 11-6, page 72.

The growth forecast by CBO for the next 2 years falls within the range of 2 to 3.5 percent. Forecasts however, are subject to an unusual number of variables, notably:

The effects on the economy of the restrictive shift in fiscal policy mandated by the Balanced Budget Act;

The economic impact of the Tax Reform Act passed at the end of 1986, which changes the composition and sources of Federal receipts and alters economic activity;

The actions of OPEC oil producers;

The future course of the dollar and the speed with which the recent decline in the value of the dollar will work to improve the real trade balance; and

The effects of relatively high household and business debt, which could cause a sudden retrenchment of spending.

In short, the fiscal year 1988 CBC budget offers you a vote on a renewed commitment to health, education, housing, welfare reform, unemployment reduction, and the homeless. The caucus proposes $1,094,805 trillion in outlays for 1987, with general revenues totaling $964 billion and an additional $225 billion in savings through lowered unemployment. The deficit for 1988 under the caucus measure would be $105.68 billion.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, we find ourselves once again about perhaps the most important business that this Congress will address, and that is the matter of the budget.

The budget is a place where this Nation comes together to embrace and communicate a certain set of values, those values in turn reflected by our priorities, and those priorities stated on a piece of paper labeled a budget.

Over previous years we have come here to talk about policy and programs and ideas, but in recent years, given the extraordinary level of the deficit, our budget debate and discussion have tended to be devoid of values, devoid of any significant discussion of what our priorities ought to be, and we have simply talked about dollars. Ultimately that is the function of the budget, and we have done it within the context of deficit reduction and most recently Gramm-Rudman.

Now step back for a moment, Mr. Chairman, and ask the question: How do you bring down the deficits in this country when you are spending too much money?

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there are four ways.

The first and most obvious it seems to me is to develop an economic policy in this country that moves us aggressively and progressively toward full employment and reindustrialization. The result of that is that spending goes down and revenues go up, because significant numbers of American people are employed. But I would dare say that no budget, even the budget of the Congressional Black Caucus, adequately addresses the issue of economic policy, although I would hasten to argue that the Congressional Black Caucus budget goes further in this respect in attempting to trigger employment, move toward reindustrialization, and embrace the concept of reconversion away from a heavy reliance on militarism and military might as a way of propping up the nature of our economic system.

□ 1310

The second way, Mr. Chairman, is to revise revenues. But a great number of my colleagues have marched into the well of the House and taken pledges that they would not raise revenues.

The third way is to reduce spending, just do not spend as much.

Finally, some combination of those two, cuts and revenues.

Now let me bring this problem even more sharply into focus, because for a moment I want to share with my colleagues my conception, perception that we are caught in an extraordinary restraint here, creating great problems for us in terms of how we proceed to address the problems of millions of human beings in this country, and to carry out a responsible role in the world as a great nation.

If, for example, Mr. Chairman, no revenues were raised, no revenues were raised, and all entitlements were frozen, and we continued to pay interest on the national debt, and you froze the military budget at last year's outlay figures, that would consume 83 percent of the entire budget, 83 percent. So if you were to address the deficit with 83 percent of the budget off the table, all the remaining cuts would come in 17 percent of the remaining budget discretionary programs.

Let us bring that even more sharply into focus. We are playing numbers games here on the floor with this assumption and the President's assumption and what have you. But the Congressional Budget Office states clearly and without equivocation, that the budget deficit level for fiscal 1988 will indeed be $171 billion. Gramm-Rudman requires in fiscal 1988 that we bring the deficit down to $108 billion.

If you accept CBO's analysis, that means, Mr. Chairman, that we would have to cut $63 billion from the budget. As I stated, if you have no new revenues, a freeze in entitlements and a freeze in the military budget, and you pay the interest, you would bring that $63 billion down by about $11 billion. You would still be left, Mr. Chairman, with well over $50 billion that would have to be cut from 17 percent of the budget left, if you did not go further into the military budget.

The Congressional Black Caucus said we will not play numbers games. We will not accept the President's assumptions because we know that those assumptions would, with all due respect to the high office of the Presidency, at best be wishful thinking, and what we euphemistically refer to on the floor as smoke and mirrors. So we said, no, we will not play games; we will take the Congressional Budget Office figures, and we will march forward responsibly.

Now we have come with a military budget of $279 billion in outlays, because if you are going to reduce the deficit you are thinking about outlays, actual moneys spent in a calendar year. This is a very moderate level on the part of the Congressional Black Caucus, because we all believe that if you took a more aggressive and urgent approach to the military budget you could cut substantial tens of billions of dollars below the proposal we have here on the floor. But we understand the reality of the political environment within which we come together. So we said if you cannot get Members to even look at the proposal because they are caught up in the politics of the numbers rather than the politics of budget analysis and policy statements and priority establishment, that that would not be an intelligent approach. So we said we will come now with a slightly above an outlay freeze figure in order to make the point.

91-059 O-89-2 (Pt. 7)

We are not here juggling figures, 3-percent real growth, 5-percent real growth. Some of you have heard me say that we should not allow ourselves to be reduced to auctioneers slinging numbers. There is nothing inherently valuable about a number. Those numbers, those dollars, ought to speak to something, and our military budget approach says we will not play numbers. We realize that the politics of deficit reduction and Gramm-Rudman require that we do something for budgetary reasons that you and I ought to be doing every day, and that is establishing programs based upon their need, based upon careful analysis, based upon what we perceive to be our role. With respect to the military budget we should not be throwing numbers up and whoever grabs the highest number is the greater American. What I would suggest is that the greater American, the true patriots of this country on the floor of this Congress, are the ones who are prepared to come into this debate and argue intelligently and rationally on the basis of what our foreign policy and our military objectives really and truly are and fashion a budget on that basis.

We in the caucus take this position, we say spend whatever is necessary for a rational, responsible national defense. But let us debate upon what is necessary, and the only way you can get to that debate, in my humble opinion, Mr. Chairman, is to have a debate on the policy matters.

So we did that in our military budget. We said how did the President develop this massive military budget increase over the past 6 years, and we found that the President established his budget on the basis of three principles, three policies that we challenge.

His first policy with respect to nuclear weapons was to move beyond the concept of nuclear deterrent to the development of a nuclear war-fighting capability. In our humble opinion that is frightening, dangerous, and extremely expensive.

The second policy was that we should increase our capacity to intervene in the Third World. We say the problems in the Third World are not military problems, they are political and economic and social. People are dying of hunger and malnutrition, death squads, corporate oligarchies, and military juntas. We should be solving problems in the Third World not militarily, so we do not need to expand our military capacity to intervene in the Third World. There are no more Grenadas to invade without risking of human life extraordinarily, and ultimately at some point risking the potential of escalation into a nuclear military confrontation which could then evolve to a level of miseries beyond our comprehension.

Third, Mr. Chairman, is this President basing this military budget upon the assumption that one-third to one-half of our budget should be directed at fighting a World War II type of land war in Europe. In my humble opinion, that is an absurd assumption. The United States and the Soviet Union both agree that if we ever start down that road, even in conventional war, within a matter of days to weeks we would escalate steadily and aggressively to global nuclear war.

So we said we challenge these policies. And in turn, Mr. Chairman, we inserted the following: That our military budget ought to reduce the risk of nuclear war. We ought to increase readiness while cutting forces committed to Third World intervention, reducing the number of troops stationed in Europe and Asia. They are not necessary, and they increase our risk for nuclear war.

Eliminating overlapping and unnecessary weapons systems. There is redundancy beyond our comprehension, and all of us in this body know and understand that.

Reforming our procurement process so that we move away from waste, fraud, and abuse.

Fully funding programs for military families, establishing new programs for economic conversion and military types of waste, and we say move toward nuclear war fighting capability. We should take out those weapons that are time urgent, hard silo killers where we will wind up then having to fight a nuclear war. Rational minds must understand that to make nuclear war thinkable or possible or acceptable, Mr. Chairman, makes it ultimately inevitable, so we say do not cross that threshold. We say embrace a foreign policy based upon a commitment to peace and human rights and nonintervention in the Third World, and understanding of the economic problems.

Finally we say it is a flight into fantasy to spend one-third to one-half of your money talking about waging a land war in Europe, a land war that we all know will not happen and would escalate and create deaths beyond comprehension.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have offered this modest proposal in an effort to bring our colleagues to a significant policy debate.

□ 1320

It is my hope that this Congress in its wisdom would embrace the magnificent effort of my distinguished colleagues, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has consumed 12 minutes.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. We are going to spend just a little bit of time I think painting the issues in very, very clear terms, not just on this budget but the budget that is yet to come up. I pointed out yesterday and there have been a number of Members who have pointed out in the last couple of days that when it comes to the defense experts in this country, Senator SAM NUNN from Georgia over in the Senate and, of course, LES ASPIN here in the House, that both of those distinguished defense experts have recommended a minimum of a 3-percent increase for our defense. You know, defense is a little bit like an insurance policy. If we are smart, you realize, you recognize that you must have adequate insurance on your automobile and adequate insurance on your house, that when times get tough and you are trying to figure out a way to manage your budget, you do not move to reduce or eliminate your insurance policy because your insurance policy is your ultimate protection.

In terms of the defense of this country, our insurance policy is our guarantee against having to get ourselves into any kind of conflict, and it has become abundantly clear since the President has taken office, particularly in light of the talk now on intermediate range missiles, our commitment to defense is not only an insurance policy but it is also necessary if we are ever going to enter into successful negotiations with the Soviet Union. The men and women who are watching this debate, let us make it clear: the Gray budget and this budget are simply unacceptable when it comes to an adequate level of defense spending.

Now, what is that going to mean? It means some very basic things. It may mean we have to literally cut the total number of people in our Armed Forces. It clearly means there will be no pay raise. It will mean the flying hours programs in the Army, the flying hour program in the Air Force, the flying hour programs—the programs by which our servicemen have to have training so that they can carry out their mission—the number of hours that are dedicated to them being able to be trained will be cut. If it was cut under this budget proposal, it would be cut dramatically. So what we really do is we put our people in the position where they are not very ready, where they do not get the kind of training that they need and where, if we ever had to use them in a difficult or a critical situation, for example, Libya, there would be some question as to their ability to carry out the missions because they simply did not have the training.

Now, that is an ultimate tragedy to go year after year after year, 3 years in a row of significant cuts in our de-

fense budget, significant cuts in our insurance policy.

The Democratic Party is spending all of their time trying to figure out a way to run for national office, trying to dismiss the argument that they are weak on national defense. This budget once again underscores the simple fact of the matter that they are willing to short-shrift defense for other areas of the budget. Nobody argues that they do not have a tough choice when it comes to making priorities. But what I would maintain is just a simple 25 years ago when John Kennedy was President we committed 50 percent of our budget pie for defense. We are now committing about 26 percent of our budget pie for defense. All I am trying to say is that those numbers ought to be bumped up. We ought to be up to 27, 28 percent of our budget for our defense, for our insurance policy, for the leader of the free world. What we are really doing is, we are being puny again. Nobody is debating that the other domestic priorities are critical, but we need to squeeze the waste out of all the programs including the defense budget and make sure that defense gets its adequate share.

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the gentleman has hit the nail right on the head. We are talking about people, about tens of thousands of people who are going to be dismissed from the service because of this. Not only will it reduce national defense, but I think we are going to go back to the Carter days when we had a thousand chief petty officers per month leaving the Navy, and when we had our enlisted people on food stamps.

I want to ask the gentleman because he is an individual on the Armed Services Committee who has really worked the people dimension on national defense, and just laying out this baseline that today we have our aircraft on carriers now 60 percent more fully mission capable than they were in the Carter years, that we have the highest number ever of high school graduates now in the Armed Forces, particularly in the infantry branches where it has been tough to recruit them. What do you think will happen under these budget cuts that are presently proposed to the people side of national defense?

Mr. KASICH. Well, you start reducing the pay raises that our servicemen are expecting to get as a result of the service they give and what you do is you start destroying the ability to attract quality people to serve in our Armed Forces. I do not want to go back to the draft. I do not like the draft. I lived when we had to see the names put in a barrel and chosen out in a lottery system.

We have a system now that works. We do have better quality people today in our services than we ever had. And if we continue to deny them not just the pay but also the benefits that surround that, the kinds of things that they ought to get when they are out performing service to their country, we are going to lose the quality people. It is a great tragedy. What we are doing, I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], is we are going to go back to the period of the 1970's. We spent a trillion dollars, Republicans and Democrats alike spent a trillion dollars trying to boost defense in this country because we recognized that the 1970's were absolutely devastating to the status of our military forces. So we spent a trillion dollars. Now we are going 3 years in a row to cuts. What we are going to do is we are going to push ourselves back to where we were in the 1970's and essentially what we will have to do is, we will have to play catchup again. And part of that trillion dollars will be wasted as a result of not having some consistency in our defense budget. It is a tragedy. The Democratic candidates for President are going to run around the country trying to say, "We are not wimps on defense, we are not weak on defense, we are not puny on defense." They cannot do it. They simply cannot do it with this defense budget which gives us 3 years in a row of significant cuts.

One other area I would like to turn to, aside from the military for just a second, and that is the area of delinquent debt collection.

People on both sides of the aisle should be aware of this. We are now at the point where about $68 billion in money is owed to this Federal Government by individuals and corporations. That amount has grown $10 billion in the last year alone. And the reason that it has is because the bureaucracy, frankly, has been more interested in passing out dollars than worrying about how to manage them one they get out. I want to tell the leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus and the leadership of the Republican side of the Budget Committee that this is an area where we have to tighten up.

In our services alone we have been able to collect millions of dollars with one simple, single element, and that was to say that if a person, for example, got paid a giant reenlistment and they did not serve their time, and they left the service for one reason or another and they did not pay the money back. They made a commitment they were going to serve x amount of years for x amount of dollars. If they leave the service, we were not able to collect that money. For the first time in a long time, last year they instituted a process whereby if you got a rebate on your income tax and you owed money to the services, there would be a checkoff. That has brought in millions of dollars. That system has been effective. But there are so many other systems that we need to put in place, the use of collection agencies, the use of credit bureau referrals. We need to have management when it comes to correcting these delinquent debts. We do not have it in the Federal Government.

The administration is trying to make an effort to do that. The Dannemeyer budget included it in the last session. BILL GRAY included it in his in the last session.

We need to do more to tighten up in this overall area. This is over a trillion dollars in potential Federal Government liability that stands out there that is going to start coming due. When Reagan took office it was about $30 billion, maybe $35 billion in delinquent debt. It is up to $68 billion now. And when we have a meeting again, it is going to be another 10. And in another 3 or 4 years it is going to be $100 billion of delinquent debt unless we tighten up the system. This is money that is walking out the door that we need to collect in order to use for the priorities that we want to establish on both sides of the aisle.

I am going to be approaching authorization bills for putting some mechanism in the law to make sure that our bureaucracy is going to follow the law and actually try to track down that money that is owed to all of us in this country.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, with respect to the gentleman's latter comments, I think he makes an excellent point. This gentleman would like very much to work with him in that particular respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to state that the gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY] has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] has 21 minutes remaining.

□ 1330

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise to defend the Black Caucus budget. I am not going to support it because I do not agree with it but I recognize not only the hard work that went into it, but the significant decisions that it makes.

I want to point out to the body and the public that there is more detail, more explanation, more clear policy

directives in this budget than there are in the committee budget.

That should not go unnoticed or unrecognized.

One of the problems with this debate today, with the votes we are going to take today, is that the committee budget fails to provide this kind of guidance and fails so seriously that our own Congressional Budget Office cannot gather enough information from the Democratic budget to be able to cost it out. That is a very serious problem with the committee budget that comes before us today, and the reason why I am urging that we all vote no, send it back to the committee, let us all work until we can come up with a document that has the validity to be costed out by CBO.

I want to congratulate the Black Caucus on a number of aspects of their budget, only two of which I will mention at this time. They recognize that space development and space technology is a matter of jobs; is a matter of America's technological future; is a matter of the strength of our economy, and they fully support the President's request. This is a very interesting matter to me because I know that they have made hard decisions in this budget. I commend that and believe their decision in supporting the President's funding level for our space program is forwardlooking and wise.

I am also very impressed and sobered by the fact that they put 1 billion more into law enforcement than does the President or than does the Democrat budget. I think we ought to reconsider our priorities in that area, should we have the opportunity to go back to the committee, because I think it is very significant that law enforcement is so high on their list of priorities.

Let me say that their recommendation in the area of Medicare is more courageous and more honorable than any that has been on the floor to this point. It is a comprehensive reform of services; it is also very expensive; it would impose a $50 a month increase on constituents protecting those for whom that would represent more than 10 percent of income. I think that is honorable and commendable.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, having given such high praise of the budget, do we expect that the gentlewoman will vote for it?

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I said at the beginning that I will not vote for it, and I want to be sure to come back to that because the gentleman certainly has the right to ask that question.

But I think it is significant that you have not only proposed a health-care reform, but you have been willing to raise the dollars to fund it, to address specifically the $27 billion burden that it would place on the American public. I do not believe that this is a cost-effective approach to what is a very real problem. But I do commend you on having made the hard choice to raise the dollars, as well as the choice to provide the service.

I would contrast that to what is being said in the committee budget that has come to this House floor. In that budget, it is truly unbelievable but true, that the budget is promising American seniors catastrophic care and is saying at the same time that the budget will be revenue-neutral, and that seniors will be protected from any cost increases. It is incredible to me that such contradiction could be so boldly offered to this House.

So what we have is a Democratic budget coming from the committee saying, yes, we are going to improve catastrophic care, but, not having the courage of their convictions, nor even the courage of the President's conviction because he does say what it will cost and who will pay for this catastrophic care proposal. The Democrats claim new services can be provided without the seniors or public paying.

While I do not agree with the Black Caucus' budget proposal on Medicare, it is an honest, forthright, respectable proposal, in contrast to the committee's budget that is dishonest, promises all things to all people, and provides no funding to accomplish its laudable goals.

This smoke-and-mirrors approach in Medicare characterizes its approach in other areas. We heard it said earlier in the debate that the Democrat budget does not recommend cuts in military personnel, and yet, right there in their budget, if you look at the budget authority figures, there is no way you can get to those numbers without cutting personnel, as well as cutting in all the other accounts, training, equipment, and procurement.

So we have before us a committee budget from the Democratic majority of the House Committee on the Budget that is simply rife with vagueness and contradictory interpretations.

But at least the Black Caucus budget, while I think it is simply too expensive for us right now and disagree with some of its major policy decisions, is an honest proposal and contrasts to the committee proposal which says we are going to do one thing for the seniors but makes none of the hard decisions to make the delivery of that service possible.

Shocking. We all know how desperately we need to expand Medicare, and Medicare coverage for home health-care services, but the Democrats' committee budget approaches that problem in a shortsighted, disastrous manner. It cuts the money for the fiscal intermediaries.

I have some health care agencies in Connecticut that are on the verge of bankruptcy because they are not receiving their payments from the Government because we have short-funded the executive branch in certain functions. Yet, my colleagues on the Committee on the Budget would save money by cutting yet further the funding for fiscal intermediaries and indirectly bankrupting home health agencies in my district and further eroding the health care system that means so much in people's lives.

Then further the Democrat budget talks about income security, but it proposes saving $200 million from the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, and ironically, only reconciles $100 million of the $200 million. All this at a time when America, not just America as a nation, but men and women, children, families are feeling the effects of underfunded pension programs. What it means in people's lives is no income, losing households, not being able to buy health care. It is disastrous in the real world for people, but the committee budget would say we are going to save $200 million in that function, but we are not going to tell you how we are going to get $100 million. Fiscally irresponsible and heartless policy.

Mr. Chairman, I do not support the Black Caucus' budget, but I respect it and I have learned from reading it. It stands in stark contrast to the committee budget, which is smoke and mirrors well beyond anything we have ever seen on this floor. I would say that members of the Committee on the Budget, Democrats, told us at our first closed-door meeting if we could not get together, they were going to come up with not just smoke and mirrors, but with a majestic sham. And that is what the Committee on the Budget's proposal is. It is a majestic sham and the tragedy is that we have been told that not only is the domestic deficit a problem, but without solving the domestic deficit, we do not have a prayer of solving the trade deficit. Yet unless we address these twin deficits in jobs, in my district, critical services, and the quality of life we value are endangered.

□ 1340

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I support this budget.

Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus quality of life budget for fiscal year 1988 is a budget that distributes this Nation's enormous Federal resources in a way that is

reasonable, equitable, and economically responsible. The CBC budget proposes $1.094 trillion in outlays, $964 billion in revenues, a deficit of $105.6 billion, and provides for an additional $25 billion in savings as a result of lowered unemployment.

Six years ago, the Reagan administration decided that reducing taxes and expanding the defense budget were more critical than protecting our most vulnerable citizens. As a result of this choice, from 1981 to 1986, Federal spending for all families, adjusted for inflation, decreased by approximately 28 percent—33.1 million Americans now live below the poverty level. Thirteen and a half million of these are children, and 50 percent of all children that are poor are black.

The CBC fiscal year 1988 function 550-health recommendations focus on on restoring a high priority on those programs which will expand health services to the poor and disadvantaged, improve the health status of the population as a whole, and enhance the safety of workers in their places of employment. The CBC alternative budget recommends $44.5 billion in budget authority, and $44.1 billion in outlays for health care programs in fiscal year 1988. These figures represent $4.99 billion in budget authority and $3.2 billion more in outlays than the amounts requested by President Reagan. With regard to Medicaid, the CBC budget recommends that the program be continued with the enactment of expanded Medicaid services to pregnant women, children, and two-parent low-income families.

The CBC budget alternative will expand Medicaid eligibility to include all mothers and children in families with incomes below the poverty line, as well as establishing a minimum national eligibility standard to expand medical care to include an additional 700,000 children, and 100,000 pregnant women. The CBC will also support legislation that will give States new options in financing the delivery of health services to high-risk, low-income pregnant women and infants.

The CBC budget firmly rejects the President's proposed cuts in Medicare programs, and seeks to limit future increases in the Medicare part A deductible, and part B premiums. To reinforce its budgetary agenda which is highly favorable to the Nation's elderly, the CBC will support legislation to limit catastrophic health care expenditures for the elderly. Of the 28 million elderly on Medicare throughout the Nation, approximately 800,000 pay more than $2,000 per year out of their own pockets for major hospital and doctor's expenses.

The CBC budget will support new authorizations and appropriations to increase by two the number of federally subsidized community health centers in every State, and will support the expansion of the maternal and child health block grant. Finally, the budget includes net resources for health education, risk reduction, outreach and support services for victims of acquired immune deficiency syndrome [AIDS]—where one out of every four victims is black.

In closing, let me say that the CBC budget alternative speaks to the hopes and aspirations of millions of Americans. The CBC budget will move this Nation forward on a path of economic prosperity, without sacrificing a sense of compassion and caring in our Federal policies. It is our choice and our burden to decide whether we will go down a bleak and desolate path of retreat and retrenchment in health care, or support the CBC quality of life budget, which puts America on the road toward a responsible and compassionate Federal health policy. I urge you to adopt the CBC alternative. It is the right choice for our Nation.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the CBC alternative budget for 1988. This budget offers a very balanced approach to meeting the diverse needs of our Nation. It provides for a strong and sensible defense, without abandoning our necessary and just commitment to the Nation's neediest citizens.

Our plan for defense spending is focused on several goals, primarily reducing the risk of nuclear war, increased readiness capabilities, and eliminating waste and unnecessary spending. We maintain our commitment to domestic services by fully funding education, community development, health, employment and income security programs.

We have taken a strong stance in providing for the Nation's "human needs," rejecting the notion that feeding the poor, caring for the elderly, and educating young minds are the root causes of our deficit.

In addition to equitably providing for our domestic needs, the CBC budget returns America's focus abroad to the humanitarian needs of our global neighbors. We provide desperately needed dollars for food and development assistance, and reaffirm our commitment to the multilateral development banks.

We continue our commitment to southern Africa by reobligating urgent supplemental funds already approved for the region. These funds will help build a viable regional network for economic growth in southern Africa, one of the poorest regions in the world.

Americans are sympathetic to ending hunger, malnutrition, poverty and disease throughout the world. The CBC alternative budget shifts our limited available resources to address these critical needs.

Mr. Chairman, we have presented a budget today that heeds the economic restraints deficit reduction has placed on Federal spending without proposing actions so drastic that basic human needs, national security, or American taxpayers are jeopardized.

It is a sound budget. It is a fair budget. It is a budget that deserves our support.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

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

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], speaking on the budget, has raised a question that I would like to present to Members on both sides of the aisle because I appreciate, like all of us, her comments supporting the Congressional Black Caucus budget, and I understand she is genuinely disenchanted with the House budget. The question is, though, what is there in between? I would like to know what her remedy is.

She rejects the House budget, she likes the CBC budget, but we did not give her quite enough time to explain where we are going.

I appreciate those comments coming from the other side of the aisle, but it seems to me. Mr. Chairman, that some of our colleagues on this side of the aisle could join in with some analysis. We do not need all the praise in the world, but we do need someone here suggesting, after 6 years of presenting the most popular budget to the American people, that if there is something that is shortsighted or if we have missed something, I for one, as one who has been working on this with the gentleman from the District of Columbia, would like to know what it is.

This deafening silence about the budget, which most members of the Congressional Black Caucus compare to the House budget, it seems to me, is a little bit embarrassing. I am hoping that members of the Budget Committee, perhaps even the chairman and leaders on our side of the aisle, would join in with us for some analysis.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus not only recognizes our commitment to our military defense but believes that in order to have a secure America there has to be an investment in Americans. That is the reason why we have no problem with increasing some $35 billion as an investment in our young people and in our unemployed to receive an education and job retraining, and in making certain that we improve access to health care in order to have a stronger America and provide shelter to Americans so that whoever attempts to threaten our way of life, we will not only have arms but we will have people who are strong and prepared to defend our country.

But in addition to that, we have followed what the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has suggested, and that is to recognize that in a civilized society one of the measures of that society is, how do we treat our old folks? So we provide for an unlimited period of time to have their pain eased, for prescriptions, for eyeglasses, for hearing aids, and for nursing homes, and we do not put a cap on the types of services we believe are necessary for our older people in the winter of their lives when they become ill and unable

to take care of themselves. As the gentlewoman from Connecticut has said, we also make certain that those who are able to pay for this type of service will do this through increased premiums, with a minimum cost to those who cannot afford to pay for it.

Another thing that we have also done is to restore the immoral and traumatic cuts that were included in the House- and Senate-passed antinarcotics bill. It shocked most of us in the Congress how the President of the United States could join with Members of the Congress in the Rose Garden on the eve of the election and sign the omnibus antidrug bill and then come back just a few weeks later and ask that $225 million be cut from State and local law enforcement and another $150 milion be cut from the educational and drug prevention aspect of this bill, freezing the rehabilitation and treatment money for those who have been afflicted with drug abuse, and, of course, he cut back on assistance for those countries that are anxiously trying to eradicate drugs to give them the technological and financial assistance in order to have cash crops so that their people can survive.

We in the Congressional Black Caucus not only restored all of the money that was in the original House- and Senate-passed bill, but we are prepared to come back to our colleagues and say that all of these things have to be paid for, and we provide for a $27 billion tax increase to be worked out at the time when we have to report back to the Congress with a revenue-producing bill.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the priorities expressed in the Black Caucus budget but in great admiration of their honesty.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL], and I wrote a budget last month, too, but we did not bring it to the floor. Why? Because the committee bill is going to be rammed through by reason of a diabolical rule written for this resolution and because, compared to the committee bill, it would have been like comparing apples to oranges.

Our budget had real proposals and honest numbers. There was no fudging and no rosy scenarios in its foundation. It contained real proposals for housing reforms, farm program reforms, a pay freeze, reforms in health care, and a general freeze on discretionary spending, including defense, with only a handful of specified revenues and few asset sales or user fees.

By contrast, the Budget Committee's budget uses phony numbers, accounting gimmicks, and assumptions on spending cuts that everyone knows will never occur, and, frankly, it never even explains what it does.

The Budget Committee's budget looks like it ignores the highway bill override, ignores the Clean Water Act override, and ignores the $12 billion supplemental appropriation bill that is coming down the pike. It does not pay for the pay raise, and it renames what are actually receipts and calls them spending cuts.

In addition, it includes an unspecified $20 billion tax hike instead of the President's mere $6 billion.

But I admire the Black Caucus for putting the real numbers in. The Black Caucus says it is for a $65 billion tax increase. I am not, but they say they are. The Black Caucus is candidly for a lot of new spending. I am not, Mr. Chairman. They are, and at least they said so.

They hit the $108 billion target for Gramm-Rudman by raising taxes and spending. They say it honestly.

Mr. Chairman, the Budget Committee does exactly the same thing, but they hide it. They make a phony budget, but they really do exactly the same thing that the Black Caucus budget honestly says they stand for.

Mr. Chairman, the Black Caucus has been honest. The Budget Committee has presented to the American people a pack of lies.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state that the gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY] has 5 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] has 8 minutes remaining.

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

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 1988 Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget. This is our sixth alternative substitute. In crafting this package, we have again accepted, and met, the challenge to provide a fair, balanced, and effective blueprint for federal spending.

The alternative budget, crafted under the leadership of Congressman MERVYN DYMALLY, chairman of the CBC, offers a sane and rationale approach to our Nation's economic and fiscal needs.

As chairwoman of the Government Activities and Transportation Subcommittee, I have responsibility for the transportation function of the CBC alternative budget. We have developed a "common sense" approach to meeting the public's demand for a safe and reliable transportation system.

In particular, there are three areas which are addressed in our budget proposal—motor carrier safety, air traffic controller funding, and aid to mass transit. I know from firsthand experience the critical need we have to provide adequate financial resources to meet these demands.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY

The administration's budget would roll back the important gains made last year in funding the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program. During fiscal year 1987, funding for this program was set at $50 million, $10 million more than the previous year. This provided needed grants for State enforcement of truck safety regulations, and a vast improvement in the quality and level of services. Truck accidents and fatalities were showing disturbing increases because of the low funding levels for this program.

Since we have just recently raised the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit, and are now allowing heavier trucks on our highways, we need to redouble our effort to enforce truck safety enforcement.

Similarly, the administration has allowed the Federal motor carrier enforcement force to dwindle to under 150 inspectors, clearly, this number needs to be beefed up—and our budget does that. New funds were provided last year; but did not begin to match funding levels in 1980. We must not allow the Federal truck inspection effort to lag again, as the administration's budget proposes. The motoring public expects a Federal presence in the area of truck enforcement. The CBC alternative budget ensures this will occur.

I also would like to add that proposed rules mandating drug testing of truck drivers will require additional enforcement resources. We will need more manpower, more testing, and more research. If we emasculate our highway safety programs for short-term budget gains, we will pay for it in a reduction in the public's safety.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Just yesterday, the Federal Aviation Administration released its latest quarterly analysis of air traffic controller operational errors. The FAA analysis shows an 18-percent increase in reported operational errors over the past 4 months, notwithstanding the agency's stated goal to reduce those errors by a minimum of 2 percent.

Based on my subcommittee's investigations, including oversight of the FAA's operations, I can personally attest to the critical need to increase the number of air traffic controllers. More controllers are needed, not only for safety reasons, but to reduce the record number of flight delays plaguing the traveling public.

With more flights than ever before, common sense tells us that it is the "height of folly" to meet that traffic demand with fewer controllers than we had 10 years ago. Based on a General Accounting Office study I request-

ed, I estimate conservatively, we need an additional 1,000 controllers!

If we are going to hire these controllers, then we have to provide adequate funds in the FAA's budget. We need money to recruit, properly train, test, and pay for their services. For that reason, the CBC alternative budget includes additional money for air traffic controllers to ensure, again, a safe and reliable air transportation system.

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

The final area I would like to address is the need to ensure adequate funds for public transportation. My subcommittee has conducted extensive oversight over both urban and intercity public transit.

Finally, urban mass transit is a solid national investment. It contributes to a basic infrastructure that will yield dividends for many years to come. Public transit matches skilled and unskilled jobs with Americans who want to work. Public transit links families to schools, churches, markets and to each other. It is, without question, an essential element in the makeup of our society, and makes a vast, incalculable contribution to our society, environment, and economy.

Nevertheless, the administration continues to place road blocks in the way of providing adequate funds for this essential service. Worse, this is in direct violation of congressionally established policy. The administration's budget would eliminate capital grants for new rail starts, and modernization and operating funds for small and rural transportation programs.

As for intercity transportation, Amtrak accomplishes similar social goals. Like mass transit, it serves people of all income levels and connects our Nation's great cities, as well as small communities with each other.

As we have recommended in the areas of truck and air transportation, a key component of our budget is to improve safety on our Nation's rail systems. Specifically, we endorse licensing and registration of railroad engineers and provide the necessary funds to establish such an administrative procedure. In the wake of January's tragic Amtrak-Conrail crash in Maryland, I have introduced legislation providing for such licensing, and also providing the Federal Railroad Administration access to the national driver register to ensure engineers are not getting behind the throttle under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

CONCLUSION

Once again, Mr. Chairman, we have an administration budget which is penny wise and pound foolish. We cannot afford this approach, especially if we are going to ensure the traveling public that they can get from one point to another safely and reliably, regardless of what transportation mode they use.

The CBC budget is a common sense alternative which ensures that adequate funds will be available for the Government to maintain proper enforcement over our roads, skies, and rails at the very time demands on these systems are being stretched to their limit!

I urge my colleagues to support the CBC alternative budget.

□ 1350

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Black Caucus substitute as well as the committee substitute.

On yesterday, we had one speech that attracted my attention and it certainly should have attracted the attention of people who are interested in the space program and are interested in jobs. That speech was made by the chairman of the Science, Space and Technology Committee, Mr. ROE.

I just want to read some of his comments. These are not comments from DEL LATTA, these are Chairman ROE's words.

He said, speaking about the committee budget:

It is a budget that asks us to accept a future of second best for American leadership in space. It is a budget that asks us to dismember our civilian space program. It is a budget that asks us to deny energy security for our future. And it is a budget that asks us to vote "no" to a more competitive America in world markets.

The budget slash cuts $1.1 billion below the President's request and makes America's future in space read like an obituary.

These are the words of the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Mr. ROE, on yesterday. He went on to say:

We are saying to the great State of California, "Be prepared to lay off 60,000 people. We are saying to Texas lay off another 60,000 people. We are saying to Florida cut down on your base; lay off another 60,000 people because we are retreating from the opportunity of leadership to create new wealth."

He went on to say:

That is what space and technology and competitiveness is all about; is to put our resources to create new wealth and new job opportunities, to say nothing of keeping our leadership as we are going.

He went on to say, and I quote the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Mr. ROE, further. He says:

The budget slash in function 250 of $1.1 billion below the President's request makes America's future in space read like an orbituary. For NASA and our future in space, we will be voting to keep the shuttle on schedule but we will vote to cancel building structural spares for the orbiter which is our insurance policy for a safe and reliable shuttle program.

We will vote to wipe out space science projects in progress and paralyze NASA's capacity to generate new science ideas and new payloads. We will vote to cancel the hiring of 600 new graduates to provide new blood to an aging NASA.

We will vote to indefinitely delay building our space station while the Russians continue to expand their already functioning space station. Mr. speaker, these are just examples in the long list of cancellations and delays in NASA programs.

This is a speech made yesterday by the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Mr. ROE; not DEL LATTA's words.

He went on to say:

Mr. Chairman, we are being asked to cut a half billion dollars below the President's request from function 270 which holds the promise of an energy secure future for this Nation.

In 1973, the Arab oil embargo caught America with all its eggs in one basket, the one labeled "oil." World oil did not run out, we just became puppets of Middle East politics. We promised ourselves that this would never again be allowed to happen. The only true insurance against this vulnerability is to have alternatives to oil. Our Department of Energy R&D budget funds the programs for developing these alternatives. Cutting energy R&D funds means canceling America's insurance policy.

So said the chairman of that great committee on yesterday.

Further:

The Nation sits on one-fourth of the world's supply of coal. We need to develop and demonstrate the most economical methods to make liquid fuel from our coal. We need to develop and demonstrate inherently safe nuclear reactors. We need to continue research in fusion to ensure alternative energy for further generations. None of these programs can move ahead with continuous and predictable progress if we do not have the resolve to hold firm on funding them to fruition. A vote to cut a half-billion dollars from DOE energy research is a vote for the powerbrokers and the politics of oil.

Who said that? The chairman, the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Mr. ROE, on this floor on yesterday.

He said:

Mr. Chairman, I want to finish with a comment directed at my fellow Democrats. I yield to no one in my concern about the deficit. But I want my party to think also about the nation's future. I ask you to consider what policies we must have as a party in order to go to the American public to ask for their support and votes.

We must have a program for progress and the promise of the future. It must encompass a strong, courageous thrust in space, in energy self-sufficiency and in technological competitiveness.

Our priorities are wrong, meaning that budget that will be voted on later, when we put off having a space station a decade from now while the Russians already have two in orbit.

Our priorities are wrong when we allow ourselves to become vulnerable to energy blackmail.

Who said that? The chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Com-

mittee on yesterday right here in the well of this House.

Let me say to my friends from the Northeast who are relying on oil for heat: Look out for an oil import fee; look out for an oil import fee if we get this budget that we are going to be voting on after the Black Caucus vote.

I read you yesterday a letter from the Independent Petroleum Association of America dated April 8, when they said to Mr. GRAY:

We urge you, Mr. Chairman, to recall this budget resolution to your committee to correct this mistake.

Mistakes are being made, and they are not being admitted on this floor. I urge my Members from the Northeast who represent areas that heat with oil to proceed with caution when they vote on this proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to include the full letter from the Independent Petroleum Association of America at this point:

INDPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, April 8, 1987.

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY,
Chairman, House Budget Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRAY: It has come to our attention that the House Budget Committee proposal for fiscal 1988 contains some rather "creative" ideas on how to increase the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) fill rate at no cost to taxpayers.

As we understand the proposal, a percentage of all oil purchased by domestic refiners would be diverted by law to the SPR at refiners' expense. That oil would be added to and considered a part of the SPR and refiners would carry the burden of its full costs. In the event a draw-down of the SPR was ordered, refiners would be given back their oil in proportion to what they had been required to donate.

Were this not in writing, we would not have believed it. But since a majority of the Budget Committee has accepted it as legitimate national policy, we have no choice but to comment on it.

The Independent Petroleum Association of America is the national association representing the nation's independent crude oil and natural gas producers. By definition, our members are producers, with little or no interest in refining, transportation or marketing. Therefore, we will not beg the question or whether or not this proposal is confiscation of refiners' property without compensation. They are capable of addressing that issue.

What we want to bring to your attention is the adverse impact this would have on the U.S. petroleum producing industry—an industry already in steep decline.

Apparently the Committee believes refiners would simply pass costs associated with their contribution to the SPR through to consumers. That argument may be partially true as to the gasoline portion of the crude oil barrel, since gasoline has very little competition as a fuel. But much of the remainder of the barrel—heating oil and industrial fuels—compete head-to-head with natural gas, coal and electricity in a very price-sensitive market. In addition, imported products—especially gasoline—would limit further the ability of domestic refiners to increase their prices. Thus, we think our fears are well founded that pressure on refiner margins would lead to lower net-backs to producers in the form of lower wellhead prices. In fact, if refiner costs could not be passed through to consumers and because they are powerless to lower net-backs to foreign producers, the full cost of this proposal would fall on domestic producers, especially independents.

At a time when the domestic petroleum industry is in one of its most serious economic declines in history, this is a most inappropriate action which most surely will further that decline.

We argue you, Mr. Chairman, to recall this budget resolution to your Committee to correct this mistake. Absent that, we will be urging Members of the House to vote no.

Sincerely,

H.B. SCOGGINS, Jr.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have always voted for the Black Caucus budget. I think it is a question of priorities. It reaches the Gramm-Rudman target. It is humane; it is compassionate, and it deals with national security.

There is $280 billion in this budget for the Pentagon spending. They are concerned about the overruns. I think taxpayers are, too. It has an adequate defense budget. It also believes that our national security relates to the education of our young people and the retraining of our workers who are displaced in vocational training for those who need vocational training.

It is humane to the elderly. It says that the older people in this country deserve to have Medicare without their Medicare rates raised. They do believe that older people should get a cost-of-living adjustment in Social Security and Federal employees and railroad retirees. Yes, it is humane to the families of this country. It is humane to the traditional families of our country, the two-earner couples, the women who are head of households.

In short, really, ultimately is a fair budget.

□ 1400

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have heard so much in this debate. I want to compliment the members of the caucus for coming forward and putting a budget together and offering an alternative. However, I must admit, I could not believe the faint praise that I heard coming from the other side, which has yet to put forth a budget here in this body or to offer to America something of their own. I just want to join with my colleagues and commend the caucus as an organization within the body for offering a budget.

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

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join the chairman of the Budget Committee and compliment the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus on this budget. They have worked hard and produced a detailed budget which meets the responsibilities of the Budget Act, which meets the challenge of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, which puts forth the priorities of the Congressional Black Caucus clearly and forcefully before the Congress, and unlike our colleagues on the other side, they have had the courage, and the willingness to undertake this very difficult task.

I cannot say that I agree with every aspect of the Congressional Black Caucus budget. I strongly support the committee's budget and I intend to vote for it even if this amendment should pass. But I will vote for this budget at this time because I believe that this sincere effort by the Congressional Black Caucus to address the budget deficit is worthy of commendation.

I am very sorry that, except for the budget offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER], there is not an alternative budget offered by the Republican side.

The complaints by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] seem to me to be misplaced. He complains that Republicans had no opportunity to have their ideas considered. On the contrary, every opportunity was given them for an alternative budget, both in committee and on this floor. If they do not like the budgets offered on this side, they should offer one of their own.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, we are here today to express our strong support for the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget. The alternative conforms to deficit reduction goals and was designed to meet challenges in education, health, housing, transportation, public works, and agriculture.

I, specifically want to call attention to the CBC budget in regard to antidrug funding. The Reagan administration proposes major reductions in the antidrug funding level authorized by the Anti-Drug Abuse Act. The alternative, however, rejects this approach to drug funding. It is no secret that drug abuse and trafficking are grave national problems. A strong commitment is essential if we are to reduce the adverse consequences of drug abuse, which affect black Americans and other majority groups in our society on a large scale.

The CBC alternative budget includes sufficient funding in an effort to maintain Federal drug enforcement initiatives authorized in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act. Also, the alternative in-

creases funding for State and local antidrug programs from $255 million in 1987 to $675 million in 1988.

As elected officials we share in the moral obligation to balance our Nation's budget and reduce our deficit. However, this must be accomplished in a rational, thoughtful, and even-handed manner and not through reactionary, knee-jerk budget cutting. The CBC alternative budget will work not only to reduce our deficit, but is responsible enough to protect much needed programs such as those concerning drug abuse.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the gentleman from Ohio has given me his 1 minute, so I have 3½ minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of our time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] to wrap up the debate for the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, the question is often asked, how real or rational is the Congressional Black Caucus budget. I think we have heard today that we have a budget which is more real and more rational than any that has been presented.

We have a budget which is also honest. A nation's budget should be a statement of the priorities of that nation and we have clearly stated the priorities as we think they should be in this Congressional Black Caucus budget.

In the statement of this priority, we have placed a great deal of emphasis on education because we realize that only Neanderthals see the national security merely in terms of immediate defense and our weapons, or troop strength. Our long-term security, our long-term national survival, is definitely tied in with our education, our brain power.

The President's budget savages education. About one-third of the total deficit reduction in the President's budget would come from cuts in education. Student financial assistance and guaranteed student loans would be reduced by 45 percent. Under the President's budget, Pell grants would be greatly reduced. Work study, which is not funded at $413 million would also be eliminated.

The President's budget would cut in half the TRIO programs for disadvantaged students and reduce by two-thirds the title III assistance for historically black colleges.

By not recognizing education for those who are most in need of educational assistance, the President also shows a disdain for education in general.

We have a long-term survival, a long-term struggle to worry about, whether we are considering competition in the commercial area with our allies in the Free world or whether we are considering competition in the struggle for survival with the Soviet Union, education is the key to our survival. Whether we are considering high technology or are considering maneuvers in diplomacy, education is the key. Military brain power also is needed. Our space program suffers mostly from the lack of brain power. Education becomes the key.

Only a Neanderthal set of thinking would savage the budget in education as the President has.

This Congressional Black Caucus budget restores balance. It focuses on the priorities that should be focused on. Therefore, not only do we want the praise of our colleagues, we would like their votes also. This is a budget which is real. It is honest. It is not smoke and mirrors and we need your votes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield to me?

Mr. OWENS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman on his concluding remarks. I want to join with the gentleman in saying that this budget represents the best hope for our country, our communities and our people. We are hoping that we will get a decent and respectable vote based on that offering that we made today.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Vote for the long-term security of the Nation by voting for the one budget which looks out for that long-term security, the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 56, noes 362, answered "present" 2, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

AYES—56

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Boggs
Bonior (MI)
Boxer
Brown (CA)
Bryant
Clay
Coelho
Collins
Conyers
Coyne
Crockett
Dellums
Dixon
Dymally
Edwards (CA)
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (TN)
Frank
Frost
Gonzalez
Gray (IL)
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hoyer
Kennedy
Kildee
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lewis (GA)
Lowry (WA)
Markey
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Moody
Oakar
Owens (NY)
Perkins
Price (IL)
Rangel
Rodino
Roybal
Savage
Schroeder
Stark
Stokes
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Weiss
Wheat

NOES—362

Anderson
Andrews
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Badham
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boulter
Brennan
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Bruce
Buechner
Bunning
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Cheney
Clarke
Clinger
Coats
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Conte
Cooper
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daub
Davis (IL)
Davis (MI)
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLay
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
DioGuardi
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Ford (MI)
Frenzel
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Grandy
Grant
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hatcher
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hiler
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hopkins
Horton
Houghton
Howard
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Konnyu
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Luken, Thomas
Lukens, Donald
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Manton
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKinney
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Petri
Pickett
Porter
Price (NC)
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ravenel
Ray
Regula
Rhodes

Richardson	Skeen	Tauke
Ridge	Skelton	Taylor
Rinaldo	Slattery	Thomas (CA)
Ritter	Slaughter (NY)	Thomas (GA)
Roberts	Slaughter (VA)	Torricelli
Robinson	Smith (FL)	Traxler
Roe	Smith (IA)	Udall
Roemer	Smith (NE)	Upton
Rogers	Smith (NJ)	Valentine
Rose	Smith (TX)	Vander Jagt
Rostenkowski	Smith, Denny (OR)	Vento
Roth	Smith, Robert (NH)	Visclosky
Roukema	Smith, Robert (OR)	Volkmer
Rowland (CT)	Snowe	Vucanovich
Rowland (GA)	Solarz	Walgren
Russo	Solomon	Walker
Sabo	Spence	Watkins
Saiki	Spratt	Waxman
Sawyer	St Germain	Weber
Saxton	Staggers	Weldon
Schaefer	Stallings	Whittaker
Scheuer	Stenholm	Whitten
Schneider	Stratton	Wilson
Schuette	Studds	Wise
Schulze	Stump	Wolf
Schumer	Sundquist	Wolpe
Sensenbrenner	Sweeney	Wortley
Sharp	Swift	Wyden
Shaw	Swindall	Wylie
Shumway	Synar	Yates
Shuster	Tallon	Yatron
Sikorski		Young (AK)
Sisisky		Young (FL)
Skaggs		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Espy Gray (PA)

NOT VOTING—13

Annunzio	Kemp	Stangeland
Burton	Livingston	Tauzin
Daniel	Lloyd	Williams
Dingell	Madigan	
Garcia	Pickle	

□ 1420

Messrs. WAXMAN, SIKORSKI, BERMAN, and SCHEUER changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRAY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the rule, 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. GRAY of Pennsylvania: Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Congress hereby determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1988 is established and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1989 and 1990 are hereby set forth:

(a) The following levels and amounts are set forth for purposes of determining, in accordance with section 301(i) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, whether the maximum deficit amount for a fiscal year has been exceeded, and as set forth in this concurrent resolution shall be considered to be mathematically consistent with the other amounts and levels set forth in this concurrent resolution:

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

Fiscal year 1988: $930,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $990,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $1,062,950,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $1,142,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $1,210,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $1,260,050,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $1,038,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $1,079,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $1,115,350,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $107,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $89,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $52,400,000,000.

(b) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1987, October 1, 1988, and October 1, 1989:

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

Fiscal year 1988: $690,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $728,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $776,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $19,850,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $21,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $23,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $59,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $63,850,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $68,950,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $901,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $949,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $973,050,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $833,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $863,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $886,750,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $143,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $135,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $110,750,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988: $2,565,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989: $2,776,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990: $2,996,300,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1987, October 1, 1988, and October 1, 1989, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $34,500,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $148,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $33,800,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $150,150,000,000.

Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $33,000,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $158,000,000,000.

(c) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1988 through 1990 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $288,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $281,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $299,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $289,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $310,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $298,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $16,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,850,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $22,050,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,550,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,150,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,450,000,000.

Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $18,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,450,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,350,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,900,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $10,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,450,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $10,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $11,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $3,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $50,000,000.

Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $4,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $50,000,000.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, $4,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,250,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $50,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $13,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $14,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,550,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $15,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,750,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $29,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,650,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $17,350,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $7,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $30,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $16,150,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $26,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,500,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,950,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $91,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,550,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $94,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $15,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,350,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $99,000,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $28,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,950,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $29,050,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,950,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $250,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $30,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,350,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $7,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $350,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $7,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $350,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $7,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,150,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $350,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $36,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,950,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,650,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $38,050,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,650,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $39,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,650,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,150,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $45,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $49,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,450,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $54,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $50,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $350,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $93,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $102,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,250,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $113,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,750,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $168,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $131,350,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $176,650,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $183,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,750,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $4,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $5,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $27,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $30,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1989:
(A) New budget authority, $28,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,650,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $28,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1990:
(A) New budget authority, $28,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,150,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $30,700,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $9,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, $9,350,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $9,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1990:

(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.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $7,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $7,150,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1989:

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

(B) Outlays, $7,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, $8,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $7,650,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(18) General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (850):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $1,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, $1,850,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,850,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, $1,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(19) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $145,350,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $145,350,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, $151,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $151,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, $155,150,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $155,150,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(20) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1988:

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

(B) Outlays, −$200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, $1,950,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $2,050,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, $3,150,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, −$49,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$49,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, −$53,850,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$53,850,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, −$69,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$69,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

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

RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2. (a) Not later than June 10, 1987, the House committees named in subsections (b) through (h) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the House Budget Committee. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $1,000,000,000 and decrease outlays by $1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $1,500,000,000 and decrease outlays by $1,500,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $2,000,000,000 and decrease outlays by $2,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(c) The House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $76,000,000 and decrease outlays by $80,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $80,000,000 and decrease outlays by $87,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $84,000,000 and decrease outlays by $93,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(d) The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $0 and decrease outlays by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $0 and increase outlays by $33,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $0 and increase outlays by $33,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(e) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $656,000,000 and decrease outlays by $2,397,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $659,000,000 and decrease outlays by $3,436,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $662,000,000 and decrease outlays by $4,792,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(f) The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $0 and decrease outlays by $213,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $0 and decrease outlays by $79,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $0 and decrease outlays by $134,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(g) The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $250,000,000 and decrease outlays by $250,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $250,000,000 and decrease outlays by $250,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $250,000,000 and decrease outlays by $250,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(h)(1) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to increase revenues as follows: $18,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1988,

$19,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1989, and $20,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(2) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by $0 and decrease outlays by $1,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by $0 and decrease outlays by $2,667,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by $0 and decrease outlays by $3,967,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(i) It would be appropriate for the House Committee on Ways and Means to increase outlays in fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990 for programs within the jurisdiction of that committee and not assumed in section 1 of this resolution if that committee reports changes in laws within its jurisdiction which increase revenues or reduce outlays in such fiscal years by amounts sufficient to ensure that the increased outlays for such programs would not increase the deficits set forth in such section.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DEFICIT REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 3. (a) Revenues increased through legislation by $19,850,000,000 in fiscal year 1988, by $21,950,000,000 in fiscal year 1989, and by $23,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1990 shall be used solely for the purpose of reducing the Federal deficit.

(b) The President shall immediately take such steps as are necessary to establish a separate account in the Treasury into which revenues referred to in subsection (a) shall be deposited. The account shall be administered in such a way as to insure that moneys deposited in the fund are available solely for the purpose of deficit reduction. The President shall report on an annual basis to the Congress on the financial condition of the fund and the extent to which the fund has reduced the Federal deficit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. LATTA. I am, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

□ 1430

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to ponder for a moment a little sign that I have in my office that a constituent needle-pointed for me. She said, "I know you believe you understand what you think I said, but I am not sure you realize that what you heard is not what I meant."

As we have discussed this budget for the last several hours and the last couple of days, I cannot believe some of my colleagues, particularly those on this side of the aisle, have said some of the things that they have said about this Democratic budget over the last several hours. When we remember 2 years ago there were 56 of us on both sides of the aisle who voted for the Leath budget, that had we passed it we would not even be here today; and 3 years ago 59 of us voted for the Roemer budget and had we supported that one that cut everything straight across the board, no exceptions, we would not be here today.

Now, then, I have letters from my colleagues saying, "If I vote for this budget, we are going to do irreparable harm to the defense of this country." That is not true.

I have another letter here from a colleague saying that if we vote for this budget, we are going to do irreparable harm to the oil and gas industry, and that is not true. But then I have a letter here from the National Taxpayers Union and they say that what we should do, what we should do is follow Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. What we should do is take the Democratic defense numbers, the President's other spending cut numbers, live up to Gramm-Rudman, that is what we should do. And I suggest to all of us if that is what you think we should do, then you must vote for this budget before us because it is the only way we can get there. It is the only way we can do that which I have heard Members on both sides of the aisle say that that is what we need to do. The only thing wrong with the National Taxpayers Union is they say, do not raise taxes. Now, folks, "You can't get there from here." If we could get there from here by not raising taxes, there would have been an alternative budget offered, there would have been an effort made in the committee where we are supposed to act; to those who criticize this budget who did not even bother to participate in the debate in the committee when we are supposed to put these matters together, who refused to participate, you only forget that the only way our forefathers meant for this country to function is through compromise. If those 55 men 200 years ago would have adopted the same strategy that we are using today in decrying this budget, if they would have done that, we would never have had the Constitution of the United States.

I ask you to support this budget because it is the only way we can deal with the fiscal matters of this country in a fiscally responsible manner.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, this budget does some good things. It makes generally fair cuts in defense and nondefense. Important programs in education, health, community development, the environment, and other areas are protected. It even assumes my beloved Coast Guard user fee. In fact, under ordinary circumstances, I would probably rise in support of this budget. But these, my friends, are not ordinary times. For this budget also contains an oil import tax, and I rise to oppose the budget for that reason.

As everyone in the House knows, I've led the fight against an oil import tax because it is regressive. It falls most heavily on our poor and middle-income citizens, and on the Northeast-Midwest region particularly. Today's tax comes under the disguise of in-kind contributions to the strategic petroleum reserve.

But don't be fooled. This is a wolf in sheep's clothing. We're told not to worry, that all the details of this ill-defined scam will be worked out. But I ask the chairman—how big of a bureaucracy are you going to need to monitor these contributions? We're told not to worry—that as a fee on refiners these costs will not be passed on to consumers. But I ask the Chairman—how can he ensure that Houdini act without price controls or reregulation, or are those part of the hidden package too?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I would be glad to yield to my good friend.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to ask, would the gentleman, since he has asked me a question, I would just simply like to know on what page does he find in the budget proposal submitted by the committee the so-called import oil tax that he is talking about? Because in the budget that was written by the committee, there is no such mention of any such oil import fee.

Mr. CONTE. As I said, it is hidden in there. We have read it in there. And I would not be up here speaking if it were not.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Is this just like the Republican alternative budget, it is hidden, too?

Mr. CONTE. I am not—I am against the President. If the Republicans had an alternative here, most likely I would be opposed to that. I have supported the gentleman in the past, but the gentleman is not going to do this to my people. You are not going to do this to my people.

We're told not to worry, that refiners can handle this modest tax. But I

ask the chairman—how does that square with the Department of Energy's recent report that domestic refining capacity is at an all-time low?

We're told not to worry—that this can be taken care of in reconciliation, and we might even get a separate vote. But I ask the chairman—how are we gonna rope this horse once it's out of the barn?

Best of all, we're told not to worry, that this isn't even an oil import tax.

With a wink and a nod, the chairman tells supporters of an oil import fee that we're gonna call this something else, and make it look like something else.

But when all is said and done, we won't have something else—we'll have an oil import tax of about 30 cents on the barrel. I don't care what you call it, Mr. Chairman.

Shakespeare once said that "a rose by any other name would smell as sweet." Well, to paraphrase the old bard, call it what you want, but an oil import fee still stinks! I urge Members to stand up and be counted.

Vote down this scam. Let's put this bad boy to bed and bring a budget to this floor that meets our responsibilities.

I wonder if the chairman would accept, and everyone else would, unanimous consent for my saying there will never be an oil import fee as a result of this budget resolution.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Would the gentleman tell me his alternative to this horrible animal that is being brought out on the floor?

Mr. CONTE. Wait a minute. I have commended the chairman and the Budget Committee for their resolution, all except this one little part. You take this out or he can ask unanimous consent or you can that no oil import fee will come about as a result of this budget resolution or the one that the Senator from Texas is going to amend over there in reconciliation and I will go along with you.

Mr. CONYERS. Where is it, sir?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ATKINS].

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Chairman, there's been a lot of talk about the various merits of different budget proposals, and some of the speeches are beginning to sound like advertisements. I keep expecting to hear from the administration that the President's budget will help build strong bodies 12 ways. The President's economic policy since 1981 has had a "who says you can't have it all" quality to it. But the deficits caused by his tax giveaway and military buildup prove that the Federal budget is a little more complicated than a lite beer commercial, and it makes me wonder what if budget claims were subject to truth in advertising laws?

The President has almost $22.4 billion in revenue increases in his budget. Over $10 billion are loan asset sales and another $6 billion from shifting spending from 1988 to 1989. Those are great ways to reduce a deficit if you also believe in selling your furniture to pay your monthly utility bills and that pushing your mortgage payment into August means you're a richer person in July. Those claims don't meet the Federal standards for false claims or representations, and I wonder about the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act.

The Budget Committee, on the other hand, has produced a real budget—a straight, honest budget. We've eliminated the smoke and mirrors. We've made the tough choices, and some politically unpopular ones. This isn't a perfect budget, but it makes real deficit reductions, protecting vital programs for the future.

The Republicans criticize this document, but they have offered no vision of their own. Our budget is a blueprint of our party's beliefs and priorities for this Nation. The Republicans in this body ceded responsibility for producing their beliefs. They wouldn't even offer their own President's budget.

The resolution produced by the committee is far more realistic than the one the President sent to us. Gone are the bookkeeping gimmicks and trick solutions of last year's budget. What we have is responsible deficit reduction, keeping military spending at reasonable levels, and increasing domestic spending for key priorities like AIDS research. With all of this, we meet the Gramm-Rudman goal, and even come in a little lower than the President.

□ 1440

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, as we debate the merits of the House Budget Committee's budget resolution, I want to share with my colleagues my concern about the mysterious $18 billion in revenues to be raised by the Ways and Means Committee.

Just previously, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] spoke, and spoke quite eloquently, about some of the things that are in this budget that he supports. I support many of the things that are in the budget. I would like to vote for this budget because it does help the Northeast-Midwest.

I represent the Northeast-Midwest as a cochairman of the Northeast-Midwest Coalition, and many of the things that are related to the domestic part of the program benefit the Northeast-Midwest. I would like to support it.

But the thing I am concerned about is where is this $18 billion going to come from? Nobody has mentioned any increase in personal or corporate income taxes, and I certainly agree with that.

Nobody will say that such sums could be raised through moderate increases in user fees and other excise taxes. Where does that leave us? My fear is that the Ways and Means Committee will look to what's been called a quick fix—an oil import fee. I represent a part of Rochester and upstate New York area. I am concerned about what an import tax will do to the poor people, the people who heat with oil in the Northeast. I am concerned as to what it will do to the industries in upstate New York and in our region.

I have learned many times over that an oil import tax is not a quick fix. It is regressive, it is inefficient, it is an unfair tax, and it burdens the Northeast and the Midwest.

The Citizen-Labor Energy Coalition recently completed a study on the residential and national implications of an oil import fee. That study concluded that a $10 per barrel fee would result in an increase of more than $400 a year to families who heat with oil. It would increase U.S. petroleum costs by $53 billion. It would increase natural gas costs by $27 billion.

This is what the Citizen-Labor Energy Coalition has said.

It would have a crippling effect on the industry of the Northeast which heats with oil, seriously impairing their ability to compete, and even threatening their existence.

In short, Mr. Chairman, this is not a quick fix. It would cost consumers $3 for every $1 in revenue raised. It is bad public policy, and the House Budget Committee's budget resolution may force us into this type of bad public policy.

I urge all my colleagues, particularly my friends in the Northeast and Midwest, to oppose this resolution. The mystery of the $18 billion in revenues could turn out to be a real horror story.

I would also point out that on page 32 of the report, it points out the Strategic Petroleum Reserve [SPRO] Acquisition Program:

> The Committee recommendation assumes that legislation will be enacted to acquire oil for storage in the SPRO at a rate not less than 75,000 barrels-a-day, and to provide for continued construction of capacity for the Reserve.

On the page before that, it says that they are going to estimate some $700 million that they are going to save. So it is written in the report, if you will just look carefully. You will find, ultimately, that there is going to be an oil import tax, and it is going to hurt the people in the Northeast-Midwest.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I just simply say to the distinguished gentleman from New York, who I know has a great concern over this issue, that I come from a district where that is of great concern, too.

I would just simply say to the gentleman, to extrapolate from that statement that there is an oil import fee, I think is going a little bit too far.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman give me an assurance that there will be no oil import fee?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. I can simply say to the gentleman in the well, as he knows, that I do not sit on any of the committees of jurisdiction.

Mr. HORTON. I understand that; I do not, either.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. I would simply say to the gentleman that if there are any reconciled revenues, they will have to come back to this floor as part of reconciliation. I would also say to the gentleman from New York that as far as this person is concerned, how he can take that language, which simply says let us move from 40,000, which was the President's barrel rate, to 75,000. That is why that statement is in there because the committee is recommending a higher fill than the President.

Mr. HORTON. I understand what the gentleman is saying, but when I read that language, it appears to me that there could be a tax.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LOWRY].

Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am here to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY], the chairman, for a tremendous job. I have sat in that budget caucus of the Democrats now for it seems like 3 months this round as we have just plain been making tough cuts.

My friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], really spelled it right. There was not anything easy in this. There is not one of us who has not made cuts in our district that hurt a lot.

We have real deficit reduction. Now, regardless of whether we use the OMB estimates or whether we use the CBO estimates, the fact of the matter is that this budget that is before us is real deficit reduction.

Last year, when we passed the budget, one thing we could say is that we are telling you that we are using smoke and mirrors. We are using one-time asset sales.

□ 1450

We were using one-time asset sales; we were using these things to hit the Gramm-Rudman target, and we all knew that was a mistake. Today, of course, that mistake that we knew we were making last year, using one-time asset sales to hit the Gramm-Rudman target, came back to get us, because those are one-time savings.

But when we got back into the budget this year, there we were with the same problem up there. Something I am very proud of is the fact that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY], put together a budget that used none of those things. We got to $1,040 billion outlays, as opposed to the President's $1 trillion 46 billion outlays without using asset sales.

Then we do call for it to be balanced. We took $8.75 billion out of domestic and $8.75 billion out of defense and $18 billion out of revenues to get a real $36 billion, which is what we have to get to the deficits we are all committed to address.

Mr. Chairman, what we have in this document is an honest budget, one to be proud of, and I ask the Members to vote for it.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have talked with the Members several times in this budget discussion about the fact that the Democrats and the chairman of the Budget Committee had trashed the President's budget on its basic assumptions in January, February, and March, and now in April the Democrats have adopted the President's basic assumptions.

Why would they do that? It is very simple. If we take the President's assumptions over the assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office, it gives us about a $10.5 billion paper savings. What happens to those paper savings in August and September? We have to find real dollars to plug them. So when it is said that we have to find $18 billion in revenues, I think we had better add that $10-plus billion to it. Then let us not forget about the legislation that is currently moving through that has to be funded in some way. We have a welfare reform that can be anywhere between $2 and $5 billion. We have a catastrophic health program that is currently listed at $4.1 billion. The Black Caucus budget had it at $27 billion. I think we ought to fill in the blank on that one. Actually we are looking at something between $40 and $60 billion.

Is that what we are going to find in the Ways and Means Committee? No, the assignment for the Ways and Means Committee, a committee on which I sit, is that they are figuring about $18 billion in new revenues. I do not have a perfectly clear crystal ball, but I can say that I see enough in that ball to know that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is not going to raise the individual rates or the corporate rates in the new tax package that we just put into effect.

I want to talk to Members on this side of the aisle who represent tobacco States. I can assure them that when we close the doors in the Ways and Means Committee and we start trying to find the revenue, yes, you have spoken in favor of all the goodie parts of the bill on that side, but there is going to be a tobacco tax, a cigarette tax—probably 32 cents a pack—that is going to be seriously considered as a source of revenue. The average moderate taxpayer is going to get hit.

And we are going to take a look at a gasoline tax increase. For every penny increase, we get about $900 million. That is where we are going to look for the money, again from our middle-income, average taxpayer.

There is talk about an oil import fee. Let me tell the Members that if they are from an oil-producing State, the Independent Petroleum Association of America says, about the creative idea to fill the SPR without any taxpayer dollars: "were this not in writing," they say, we would not have believed it, but since a majority of the Budget Committee has accepted it as legitimate national policy, we have no choice but to comment on it.

The comment is that it probably means increased taxes to oil companies of up to 50 percent if their profits in 1988 are no different than their profits today.

So it is the Democrats I am talking to now about the good parts of this phony budget in terms of what is not cut, whether it be in agriculture, whether it be in welfare or anywhere else——

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

Mr. THOMAS of California. I do not have very much time. Normally I would yield to the gentleman from Texas, but I do not have enough time to yield.

Mr. Chairman, I want the Members to realize that they cannot have it both ways, that the revenue portion is going to have to be funded and it is going to come from tobacco.

Let us take a look at the wine and beer possibilities. You are hitting moderate-income taxpayers. We are hitting moderate taxpayers in terms of the so-called sin taxes. Those are regressive taxes. That is where the money is going to come from, and one of the reasons Republicans are going to vote no on this measure is because we were never honest in committee. None of us had the guts, on both sides of the aisle, although I made the commitment in private that I was ready to sit down and talk about revenues if they were ready to sit down and talk about the unmentionable; and that is

this: Let us take a look at millionaires who fly first class and who still receive money from the taxpayers' coffers after they get back what they paid in with interest, whether it be from several different pension funds or not.

Until we get serious about that portion of the budget, until we get serious about talking about the entire budget, as to where we get the money, those of you from tobacco States and oil-producing States, I want you to explain how come your areas are getting hit for the revenues. Remember, we cannot have it both ways.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY,] has 23½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA], has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, the preceding speaker said that we cannot have it both ways, but they do not want to have it any way. Yes, it is difficult to come up with a budget. That is why the Republican Party has refused to do it. They are simply determined to show that they are well equipped to be the minority.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I will yield to the gentleman just as he yielded to the gentleman from Texas; that is not at all.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. No, just as the gentleman would not yield to anybody before, I will not yield to him.

They are determined to show they are well equipped for minority status, and so they will stick to their irresponsibility. The gentleman has accounted for that $18 billion seven times over. Every possible tax, he says, is going to happen. He admits that there are in fact ways to raise taxes fairly. In fact, he said—and I thought it was an extraordinary statement—that he was willing in private to discuss raising revenues. Well, some of us are willing to discuss our responsibilities in public. We are willing to say that there continue to be in this Tax Code which was changed last year ways to raise revenues that would be equitable and reasonable and would not have an adverse regional impact.

I do not agree with what the gentleman talked about concerning the proposal of the Energy and Commerce Committee on filling the oil reserve. I do not believe it is going to happen. I vote for this budget with confidence that it is not going to happen.

I also vote for this budget reluctantly because we are in a difficult situation. But I say that in contrast to the failure of the Republican Party to put forward any alternative whatsoever. They understand it is a difficult job, and they responded by not even trying. I think it is far more responsible to do what the Democratic budget does and that is to be honest with people.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LEATH], a member of the committee.

Mr. LEATH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of rhetoric, as we always do when we get to this point in time. This institution, by its very nature, always has a degree of frustration about it. I think what we are seeing as we go through this particular debate is enormous frustration.

I see my friends over here are throwing hand grenades about, talking about oil import fees and tobacco taxes, trying to scare everybody they can, but I have not seen an alternative.

Is this budget something that I like? No, it is not something I like. Is this budget we are talking about and debating today what is best for the country? No, it is not what is best for the country. But in a democratic government, Mr. Chairman, we work within the options that we have available, and the plain, simple truth is that it does not make any difference, whether you are liberal, moderate, conservative, Republican, or Democratic, when you have a President who for 4 straight years has simply refused to participate in the process and has so frustrated his own party that for the first time in my memory they cannot do anything except come down here and criticize.

I do not like this budget, but let me say that I was sent here to be a part of government. I was sent here to make decisions. I was sent here to make the hard decisions and ultimately to govern.

My daddy told me a long time ago that 20 percent of something is better than 100 percent of nothing. So if that is all I can get in the legislative process, I am going to take it and accept the responsibility. Some day I hope I can live long enough that we can get together in this town and figure out that we ought to run for reelection 3 months out of every 2 years, and during the other 18 or 20 months we ought to govern. And until such time as we are willing to do that and the President is willing to come to the table with a full deck and say, "Ladies and gentlemen, I am ready to sit down and talk," we can argue about revenues.

Everybody in this town knows that we cannot solve this deficit problem without some additional revenues. The President knows that. He has had revenues in some form or another in every budget he has sent up here for the last 4 years. The American people know that.

I get very amused when people talk about how much we cut taxes. Nobody talks about the $75 billion a year in interest payments that we have strapped around our grandchildren for the rest of their lives.

□ 1500

Where $30 billion in new revenues 3 years ago would have solved this problem, as CHARLIE STENHOLM said, and we would not even be here today. But Mr. Reagan said, "No, you people on Capitol Hill can all agree to that but I will never agree to it."

Mr. Chairman, that is foolish.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak for a moment to the Members on this side of the aisle, particularly, to be sure that they understand as the party discipline comes down and you are being asked to play team ball here, that you have go to face up to the music that when you vote for this proposal, you got to go home and you have got to tell the folks, if you are from the Northeast, "I voted for a proposal that resulted in an oil import fee on you."

If you are from the tobacco States like I am, Kentucky, Tennessee, North and South Carolina and the rest, you have got to go home and you have got to tell your people that since you hear, "I voted for a proposal that allowed a tax increase on the cigarettes and tobacco." Or if you are from an alcohol-producing region, beer, wine, or what have you, you have go to go home and you have got to tell those people "I voted for a proposal that raised the taxes on these products that put you out of work." That is the choice that you face.

You cannot go home and say, well, you can, but I doubt that you would want to, you cannot go home and say, "Well, I wanted to play team ball. I got up there on the Potomac and I was convinced that I ought to play party, and play party discipline. I forgot my roots and I forgot where I came from and I ignored your interest and I voted for a tax."

They have got to raise $20 billion from somewhere. It is going to come from tobacco or alcohol or an import fee or a gasoline excise tax on your commuters or an income tax increase. It has got to come from somewhere, and if you vote for this proposal, you are voting for more taxes.

Take that home and tell that to your home folks.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of real and permanent deficit reduction; in support of education, jobs and increased competitiveness. In short, I rise today in support of the House budget resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I will vote for this budget resolution because I agree with the set of priorities it represents. The Budget Committee proposal balances its cuts equally from defense and nondefense programs and dedicates any revenues raised to a deficit trust fund. This trust fund will only be used to reduce the deficit, not to be applied to any new spending and I place a very high value on the importance of reducing the deficit as quickly and safely as possible.

Expecially high on my list of priorities is the protection of those programs helping our country's most vulnerable citizens—the poor, sick, and elderly. Who else will care if we are not the standard bearers for these neglected segments of society.

There are portions of this budget which do not make me happy however, especially the budget request relating to NASA.

I feel the cuts proposed in the NASA programs are devastating and if allowed to remain through the budget process will have severe repercussions on America's drive to retain competitiveness on a global basis in both the applied sciences and space technology.

Mr. Chairman, a strong commitment to NASA is needed in real budgetary terms if a competitive civilian space program is to be maintained. The benefits of a healthy space program are enormous in light of the effect the program has on the entire economy. NASA and its support contractors provide direct employment to 165,000 Americans throughout the Nation, with substantial spinoff benefits. The NASA budget proposal is basically unacceptable to me and all others who are deeply concerned with the direction America's space program is headed.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the fine effort your committee has made and the product that effort produced. Hopefully, my concerns about NASA will be addressed in the reconciliation process and those reservations aside, I urge my colleagues to support the House budget resolution.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE].

Mr. WOLPE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I speak both as a member of the Budget Committee and also as cochairman of the Northeast and West Congressional Coalition. I understand there has been this rumor circulating that somehow this budget resolution contains the recommendation or stipulation calling for an oil import fee. That is simply not true. If there were an oil import fee as part of this budget resolution, I personally could not have given it my support.

It is a totally erroneous, unfounded assumption and I certainly hope it will not, that rumor will not have any impact on the votes in this body.

There is no oil import fee recommended or stipulated in the House Budget Committee resolution.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, as January 1987 broke, this country, this House faced a challenge. A challenge probably more difficult than one we had ever encountered before. We had many new problems: Homeless people walking the streets of our cities; farmers foreclosing their farms; competition from abroad and a trade deficit that was enormous. Problems that we had to grapple with.

But probably the greatest problem of all, underlying all of them, was the huge budget deficit that we all had created. It was a challenge that many thought could not be met. In stunning testament to the difficulty of that challenge, other budgets that were put before us got 27 votes, 47 votes, 56 votes.

Most stunning of all was the overwhelming silence from the other side in their refusal to put forth a budget or rather their inability to put forth a budget. That is how difficult it was. Yet, this budget meets that challenge. We do change priorities from the last several years because our country has changed and priorities must change. But we change priorities, create new programs in a context of deficit reduction.

If people are asking: What is the future of this country; how can we grapple? They will look at this budget and they will say, "This was the beginning of the road." You do not simply have to cut and be negative. You can create and deal with people who need help and still you can reduce that deficit.

This budget is a budget of hope. This budget says we can meet our problems without spending through the roof. This budget is a budget that we can all be proud of.

I urge all my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this budget and urge my colleagues to vote no and return the budget to committee so that we can come out with something decent and honest that will serve the Nation in the future.

Here we have, for the second year in a row, a budget that has not been through CBO and cannot save the dollars it claims. It does not have any detail to back it up just like last year. Because we passed this kind of budget out of the House Budget Committee last year, we are already $15 billion over our outlays half-way through the year. A shameful performance.

This bill is full of things it says it is not full of. Yes, it has an oil import fee. You cannot save $600 million, continue to fill SPR at the same rate and not get the money from somewhere. If you get it from domestic producers, you increase their taxes 50 percent. We are not going to do that on our domestic producers, and so it comes down to the 2-percent oil import tax that you are talking about at the back of the room because we hear it from our colleagues, and by gum, it is going to be out there on my people in the Northeast who cannot compete with your people in the Southwest right now.

It is going to disadvantage manufacturers who are dependent on imported oil versus those who are dependent on other sources of energy even in my own towns in New England.

□ 1510

That is only one of the hoaxes of this budget. Run down the rest of them, the things that you say with one hand about health care, you are going to get it all for free, no increase, beneficiary pays and budget neutral. Look at your savings under energy. You are going to decimate the clean coal technology, our only hope to deal with acid rain; but you do not touch the Marine Technology Program, something from another era, something we have already done.

There are no clear priorities set in this budget. There are no real choices made and that is why the CBO has said over and over again and in writing, "We can't cost this out and because we can't cost this out, we cannot make the savings."

It is a sham, Mr. Chairman. It is the kind of sham that you call the President's assumptions until you adopt them.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant support of the House Budget Committee's budget proposal.

First, let me express my concern with the process by which we have arrived at this budget. We began with the submission of the President. We saw earlier today just how popular that was. The administration has refused to be player in the budget process, proposing a budget which was irresponsible and insensitive to the needs of the American people, especially rural Americans such as those I represent in South Dakota. I could not support a budget that devastated not only direct farm programs such as commodity prices, but also demolished programs important to rural America such as the REA, ASCS, rural housing, and FmHA rural development.

I have been similarly appalled with the behavior of the House. Political posturing seems more important to some in this House than responsible management of the Federal Government. I am sorely disappointed with the efforts of both parties. I am disappointed at Republicans who refused to work with the Democratic majority and who refuse to offer any alternative, while condemning the package offered by the committee. I am also disappointed with the Members of my own party, who have shied away from the truly difficult choices, and while they have produced the best of the budgets presented here, under admittedly difficult circumstances, I still find it impossible to give this budget my wholehearted support.

My dilemma is clear: Whether to support a budget which, although it is kinder to South Dakota than any other presented, is hardly fair to a struggling rural State. I applaud and support the efforts of the committee to extend Federal programs that help the hungry and homeless. But the budget fails to recognize that many of those hungry and homeless are displaced farmers. If we refuse to acknowledge the sources of the problem, if we refuse to direct our limited resources to those who need them most, if we refuse to take seriously the responsibility of managing our Federal resources, then we have not done our job.

My dilemma is compounded by the need to balance the budget. My primary goal when I was elected last year was to bring the budget into balance, and the committee's budget produces the largest amount of deficit reduction of any of the options presented. The budget deficit, the trade deficit, and the overvalued dollar—all interrelated problems—hit hard in an agricultural State, and the most important step we in Congress can take is to bring down the budget deficit.

It is therefore with great reluctance that I will vote for the committee bill. Given that I must choose between the President's budget and the committe budget, I will with strong reservations cast my vote for the committee budget.

We must do better in the future. Deficits must be reduced, but to do so in a fair, balanced way, we need the cooperation of everyone: The President and Congress, Republicans and Democrats. This is not a partisan deficit. It does not require partisan solutions.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY].

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Chairman, I do not like the committee's budget. It makes us cut domestic spending almost $9 billion. We are cutting defense almost $9 billion. We are increasing revenues $18 billion; but, Mr. Chairman, I will be honest, I cannot come up with a budget that I like myself this year. If we are going to try to reach the targets that we have set for ourselves, hardly any Member in this House, unless he is on the extreme right or the extreme left, can come up with a budget that he is happy with. That is why we do not have a viable alternative from the other side of the aisle.

Perhaps this budget will make this House, at a later date this year, address the issue of an import oil fee. Being from an oil State, I say it is about time.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, this budget is the only game in town. If you are for fiscal responsibility, if you are concerned about the debt that your children and your grandchildren are going to have to pay, I urge you to vote "yes."

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN].

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, an hour ago, I say to my colleagues, I was in the dentist's chair. It says something about this debate, that having a tooth drilled is a preferable activity, the only time I can remember looking forward to it to get away from something.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle go back briefly to last year, since they are complaining desperately about not having a Republican alternative. The Republicans brought an alternative to the floor, one that was mocked as being irresponsible, impossible, undoable, and one that ultimately was within $1 billion in all categories of what the Democrats finally adopted in the long run.

This time there was an intervening election and you won, something you seem to have forgotten. You now control both Houses. You deserve a chance for your budget. You robots who are going to vote deserve the change, and I am not sure it is the chairman's budget. We know it is not the chairman's mark, but it is the Speaker's budget. That we know. We watched those chains being yanked when people suggested things that might not benefit certain areas of the country.

I will tell you this, the American people now know what they elected. When we told them they will get more taxes, you said, "Oh, no, you won't."

Eighteen billion dollars, and now you are telling all your colleagues it is going to come from nowhere, not an oil tax, not a gas tax, not a cigarette tax, not a whisky tax, not a wine tax, and certainly we will not change anything on anybody, rich or poor.

Where is it coming from? The same place the numbers you made up in your budget, that is where it is coming from. It is going to come out of average working men and women, $18 billion in new taxes. Spending—you reconcile less than $4 billion.

All you care about is cutting defense and raising taxes. The American people now see what they have elected.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], the chairman of the Government Operations Committee.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, the deficit is the Nation's No. 1 economic and political problem. It saps our resources through exorbitantly high interest payments, and forces us into a trade imbalance which has nearly destroyed our competitive position throughout the world. Normally, if you would put 10 economists in the same room on any given problem, they would emerge with at least 57 options. However, on this they are united: We must reduce the deficit through an appropriate balance of revenue enhancement and real, permanent spending cuts.

House Concurrent Resolution 95, the House Budget Committee's plan before us, provides a significant further step toward deficit reduction in conformity with Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. Unlike the President's budget, which was overwhelmingly rejected, the House Budget Committee's plan sets priorities that will assist our citizens in gaining educational opportunity, adequate health care, and protection against the ravages of age and economics deprivation. The House Budget Committees' plan endorses this Nation's commitment to a strong national defense without yielding to requests for spending based upon waste and inefficiency.

This is not a perfect plan. If we wanted a perfect plan, we would have to write 435 of them, and probably 100 more in the Senate. It is a plan which is based on what has to be done; not necessarily what each of us would do if left to our own devices. For example, I myself would prefer if there were no revenue increases in here, but I know that is not feasible. Who's kidding who? I will not deceive the American people.

What adds to the strength of the Budget Committee plan is the enforceability of its deficit reduction elements. Under existing Budget Act procedures, the plan calls for a strong package of reconciliation savings. Levels in the plan will further be enforced through ceilings within which every committee of the House must live.

I am aware of various proposals for budget reform being offered by many

Members. Some are meritorious and deserve consideration. Others should be met with skepticism. We should not be giving the President item veto authority in any form. Biennial budgeting will not solve our problems. More importantly, I think it is unwise and dangerous to write deficit reduction targets into law, as in Gramm-Rudman. Doing so is bad economics, bad politics, and deceives the American people into believing something that is not feasible or part of reality. I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in support of this resolution; however, I would commend Chairman GRAY and the members of the Budget Committee for their hard work and their courage in taking the tough votes and reporting this resolution to the floor.

As the Congress and the President approach this year's budget cycle, we were faced with essentially three choices. We could fake deficit reductions down to the Gramm-Rudman target of $108 billion. We could enact real deficit reductions to that target and risk a recession, or we could enact real deficit reductions of about $36 billion, which would keep faith with Gramm-Rudman without sending the economy into a tailspin.

I am glad and pleased that in choosing the third path, the $36 billion in real deficit reductions, the Speaker and Chairman GRAY and members of the committee have chosen the path of leadership.

Particularly I want to commend Speaker JIM WRIGHT for having the guts to tell the American people the truth, that revenues have to be a part of the solution to our deficit problem

Today's debate reflects the difficulty in the path of leadership. It is easy to find fault with this resolution, but as its harshest critics have discovered, it is very hard to come up with a better plan.

However, I am seriously disturbed by the implications of the reconciliation instruction given the Energy and Commerce Committee. I want to state that I will vote against any conference report on the budget that contains any implication that an oil import fee will be included in the reconciliation legislation originating from the Energy and Commerce Committee.

At this point, however, Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is a worthwhile resolution and I urge my colleagues to support Chairman GRAY and the Budget Committee.

□ 1520

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, in January the President submitted his fully detailed budget to the Congress. The Congress had the opportunity at that time through its Budget Committee to take up the President's budget and to begin serious work with that budget. That is what I expected we would do. But instead we went on a road show. We engaged in a feeding fast. The whole Democrat Party—Budget Committee members, leadership, and all—while denouncing the President's budget and ridiculing it spoke instead about tax increases.

Then when the Budget Committee came back to town they asked us to join them in providing cover, and when we refused to do that, they gave us a one-page summary and refused to answer our questions.

It is no wonder that they refused to answer questions, because they do not know the answers. To this day CBO does not know what is in that budget. Nobody knows what is in that budget.

What we are being asked to pass on today will not hold water. I say vote "no."

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. OLIN].

Mr. OLIN. Mr. Chairman, this budget was not easy to come up with. The budget certainly is not going to be easy to implement. But this budget is tough and it is real. Conservatives can vote for it, and I hope that they will.

This budget makes a solid $38 billion deficit reduction. It has got balanced priorities. It has money enough in there through cuts to meet our priorities and our needs.

The revenue raised is going to go to deficit reduction, and it does not abandon Gramm-Rudman.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote for this budget, and then later in the year to support the actions to make it a reality.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] has 10 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] has 9 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, during this debate we have heard a lot about "Why didn't the Republicans come up with a substitute?"

The thing is that the majority party had an obligation to come up with a substitute, and we just wanted to see whether or not they could come up with it, and they have been squealing like little pigs caught under the barn door ever since, because they did not want to accept that responsibility, and once they did, we knew exactly what was going to happen. They were going to come right back to the way the Democrats always do, tax and spend and cut defense.

It is right here in this document. You can run from it all day, but you cannot hide. You cannot hide. We have heard about the reconciliation from the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Well, now, he knows that you never stipulate in reconciliation where he is supposed to get that $18 billion. He merely said if it comes back in reconciliation that there is an import fee there, he will not do anything about it, but he did not say where he is going to get the $18 billion in new taxes that is provided for in this bill.

How are you going to vote on those $18 billion worth of new taxes? You cannot hide from that. It is going to be there if you vote for this bill today. It is going to be there, and they are going to be able to go back home and say, "Look what we did. We put $18 billion in new taxes on your backs."

The American people do not want any new taxes. They want this Congress to do something about expenditures. They want us to terminate some of these programs that never should have been started in the first place.

How many are being terminated? None. None. Where is your courage to do something about those programs that we never needed? Can you tell me that we ought to continue a program at Amtrak, for example, that everybody who sets foot on it gets a subsidy of $27? No. Let the people who ride it pay the bill.

Do you think we ought to be fixing up private sidewalks in the United States with Federal funds? No, but we are doing it. I could give a thousand different programs that you ought to be reducing, and you are not doing anything about it. The American people want reductions and not taxes.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY], a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee budget. It's not a perfect budget, as everyone knows, but we make some hard choices in the budget:

We cut $9 billion of domestic spending.

We cut $9 billion of defense spending.

We recommend $18 billion in additional revenue.

And we cut the deficit by at least $36 billion.

Let's be honest: More action will be needed later this year to reach the $103 billion Gramm-Rudman target.

But let's also be honest about this: The committee budget will cut the

deficit, and it does include significant, permanent spending cuts.

You might wonder why some have criticized this budget, without offering an alternative. The simple reason is because they don't want the $18 billion of revenue, even though the President recommends $22 billion.

And they don't want to propose an additional $18 billion of spending cuts, to make up the difference. So the deficit would continue to grow.

The committee budget was the best proposal before the committee, and it is the best proposal before this House.

Mr. Chairman, I've heard several comments about the ineffective budget process.

But, let's look at the facts: Not long ago, the Congressional Budget Office projected rising deficits, year after year. Today, we have declining deficits, year after year.

Not long ago, CBO projected a 1990 deficit approaching $300 billion. Today, after all is done and said: The 1987 deficit will be about $50 billion below 1986.

The 1988 deficit will be more than $35 billion below 1987.

And the 1990 deficit will be more than $200 billion below what was projected in 1985.

By my definition, that's progress.

By any measure, that's real action in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, much more needs to be done.

We need to get the President involved.

We need to move away from fiscal policy by continuing resolution.

We need more deficit reduction—this year, next year, and beyond.

And we desperately need to stop mortgaging the future of America.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat: The committee budget was the best alternative before the committee, and the best alternative before this House.

It's far from perfect but it deserves our support.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT].

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chairman, as we get down to the final part of the debate on this whole budget process and this particular one that has come out of the Budget Committee, I just have to ask my colleagues if they really want to vote for this budget resolution. No, I think that there are a lot of them who do not want to.

I voted for more budget resolutions over the years than I voted against. Let me remind Members of something, though. You do not ever get in trouble for those budgets which you vote against; it is the ones that you vote for that you get in trouble on when you do not know all that is in them.

You do not have to worry about it, I know, because in the 99th Congress we waived the budget resolution 106 times. If it gets in our way, we will just waive it. We do not have to worry about it.

Since 1981 we have exceeded our own budget resolution by about $146 billion. But I caution my friends that they need to look at what is in this resolution, or really what is not in it, because they may see it later.

The broad parameters are this: We are going to cut defense; taxes will be raised. I want to emphasize that the President's budget called for $18 billion in user fees and in asset sales. There is a great difference between that and what is being proposed here, which is real tax increases. And also, yes, it has some domestic spending cuts, but it has a lot of increases, too.

Now let us look beyond those broad parameters at what we are really talking about. Cuts in defense: This budget calls for cutting defense outlays by $9 billion in fiscal year 1988, and by $42 billion over the 3 years fiscal year 1988 to 1990.

The plan would cut the budget authority by $14 billion in 1988 and over $51 billion in 3 years.

I see some gentlemen in the room here who do not like those figures. What does that really mean? It means that we have to cut something. Are we going to have to cut military personnel by $3.9 billion? Are we going to have to cut operation and maintenance by $4 billion? Are we going to have to cut procurement by $5 billion?

Well, you might say, oh, no, that is not in there. Then I ask the question: If not there, where? It must come from someplace, and those Members who are worried about defense had better be asking the question: What is it going to come from?

Let us take taxes, for instance. OK, so it is not user fees and it is not asset sales, which I like very much, quite frankly. I think that we have a lot of assets that we could sell.

Well, if not that, well then it must be an increase in taxes on individuals or an increase in the gasoline tax, which I do not like in the South and the Southeast and Southwest, the West. We have to drive to work down there; we do not get to ride mass transit paid for by Federal funds.

□ 1530

Well, if not gasoline, maybe it is tobacco. Some of you fellows like that.

How about beer and wine? I bet you do not like that.

Maybe it is the stock exchange tax that has been proposed by one of our leaders here, or perhaps it is an oil import fee. You might say, well, no, it is not that, it is not that.

Well, if not there, where?

With regard to this oil import fee, which I do not think is all that bad, but some of you folks do not like an oil import fee, this is a kind of now you see it, now you don't thing. You are talking about it, it says here we are going to save 700 million bucks in SPR, and then it says but we are going to continue to put in SPR 75,000 barrels a day. I thought what probably was going to happen is the independents, the private companies, would have to eat the savings of $700 million. Now I am told, no, no, we do not mean that.

Maybe it is an oil import fee. Then I am told, no, no, it is not that.

Well, what is it then? If not there, where?

With regard to domestic cuts, let me tell you what we are really talking about. We have a cut in space and science. What does that mean for the space station? Does it mean 30,000 jobs are going to be lost? OK, maybe not there, but if not there, where, because you have savings listed in this budget resolution that will come out of space and science.

Energy. You folks in the energy area, maybe some of you like the oil import fee, but let me tell you, the budget we are talking about here, the Democratic committee budget cuts the energy function by $2.1 billion in budget authority and $1.8 billion in outlays the fiscal year 1988 CBO baseline.

OK, if it is not an oil import fee, I mean it is savings in energy and it has to come from somewhere. We cannot just pluck it out of the air.

My colleagues, I could go on and on, but I will stop. Defeat this sham, and let us see if we can get together on a real budget resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] has 7½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] has 4 minutes remaining.

My GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JENKINS], a member of the committee.

Mr. JENKINS. My colleagues, our colleague from Mississippi is absolutely right. The safe vote is to vote no. The safe vote is to vote no on a budget resolution. It always is a safe vote. You do not have to take any responsibility. You do not have to take a bit of responsibility, and you can go back into your districts and tell your people look, I did not vote to raise any revenues. No, I did not cut water resources, I did not cut anything. I did not vote. I did not vote for any budget resolution. I had rather wait until we have a continuing resolution, then put it all in and not have the responsibility at all.

That is the safe route, and that is what we have done year after year after year, because nobody wants to take any responsibility. That is the difficulty we have.

Take the credit card approach. Put it all on the credit card. That is the aproach that is now being taken by the minority side. Let somebody else in another generation worry about it. Let someone pay for it besides us who face the voters every 2 years. Yes, that is the direction to go.

You have voted against President Reagan's budget. He only received 24 votes. He could not get any votes over here. You have voted against the budget offered by the gentleman from California, BILL DANNEMEYER. He only could get 54 votes. You have already had two chances. And after this one, if it goes down, you have one other chance.

You get to vote on sequestration, and if you are concerned about defense, let me remind you that if we vote on sequestration, you will reduce defense spending on the next vote after this by $59 billion in budget authority. Yes, if this budget resolution goes down, you can vote on the next one that will cut defense outlays by over $30 billion.

That is the choice that we have.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY].

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

Mr. Chairman, it has been often commented that this is a balanced budget, a balanced budget package. It cuts half and raises revenue for half of it.

It has been often commented that the cuts themselves are balanced, being half general military and half on domestic.

It has been often commented that these revenues are less than the President calls for, but that they are real.

But it has not been generally recognized that the spending cuts in this package are actually greater than the spending cuts in the President's budget. When you take away the phony asset sales, which are nothing more than paper sales equivalent to bond sales, then you come up with numbers with the President's spending actually $4 billion more in real spending than this package.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Democratic budget package.

Mr. Chairman, the wailing from the Republican side of the aisle confirms what many of us knew from the start: that this Democratic budget might not be perfect, but it is an honest budget and the best place to begin the difficult task of reducing the deficit.

This budget, of course, is not the last word or the final vote. It will go to conference with the Senate, return to the floor in the form of a conference reprort, and then, of course, it will be up to the House to actually appropriate the money and apply any finishing touches that might be necessary.

While it will not be the last time we visit this issue, it is clearly the best place to start. Unlike the administration's budget, it meets the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction targets without any gimmickry, smoke, or mirrors. It achieves $38.2 billion in real deficit reduction, almost twice the $19.8 billion in the President's budget that was bought through a fire sale of precious national assets.

It's time to talk sense to the American people, to offer the plain facts and the simple truth even if it doesn't make us feel good. The honest fact is that we need to continue spending restraint and we need to raise some revenue if we want to cut the deficit over time and reestablish a firm economic foundation as the President's own budget also proposes.

The truth is that until recently, we thought spending cuts alone could address the budget crisis. We said we would never consider raising taxes unless the President requested it first.

Well, President Reagan has requested a tax increase. He has asked for nearly $23 billion in new taxes this year alone. He realizes, and we Democrats agree, that spending cuts alone cannot solve this crisis.

But here is where we part paths. The President requested nearly $23 billion in new taxes, and without missing a beat, proclaims his opposition to any tax increase. In contrast, we Democrats believe that the American people deserve the truth. We believe they will understand the truth and they will appreciate hearing the truth about the budget crisis. And perhaps most importantly, we believe they want an end to the budget doublespeak that continues to come from the White House and the Republican side of the aisle in this House.

Why don't they just stand up admit that we have proposed $23 billion in new taxes because we believe we can't wait any longer to reduce the budget deficit? That's the honest, straightforward approach. If they were to make this one single little concession to honesty, we could go on to compare the tax increases in the various budget proposals in an open manner.

But it's clear that the Republicans and the White House are not willing to make even this single concession to honesty, so we're going to have to do it for them.

What are the differences between the two budgets?

The Democratic budget contains $600 million less in taxes than the President's budget, $21.8 billion compared to $22.4 billion in fiscal year 1988, with no fire sale of precious national assets, no one-time savings or accounting tricks to inflate the amount of deficit reduction.

The Democratic budget has even-handed spending cuts, a 50–50 split between defense and domestic programs. Congress has cut domestic spending by $300 billion since 1981 while the defense budget has grown every one of those years, so equal reductions are not unreasonable. The Democratic budget has $38.2 billion in real, permanent deficit reduction—not the one-time $19.8 billion in the President's budget. And the Democratic budget would apply the new revenues to deficit reduction, not new spending.

What does the difference between the two budgets mean for my constituents in west Texas? In case after case, the Democratic budget understands our priorities and concerns; the President's budget does not.

The Democratic budget rejects the President's proposed cut of 50 percent in drug abuse education, and it contains full funding for the national antidrug bill that was passed last year, a war on drugs that the President's budget would cripple.

It assumes full cost-of-living-adjustments (COLA's) for Social Security recipients, Federal and military retirees, and railroad retirees. It assumes full COLA's for veterans benefits and contains a 3-percent pay increase for Federal employees and active-duty military personnel. Furthermore, it rejects the administration's proposal to reduce Federal health benefits for 3.9 million workers and retirees.

It protects the University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso Community College, and Sul Ross University by rejecting the administration's proposals to shortchange our national investment in higher education. It funds fully the College Work Study Program, supplemental educational opportunity grants, guaranteed student loans, and Pell grants, rather than the proposed 40 percent cut by the administration. The Democratic budget restores 5–8 million children to the School Lunch Program who would have been thrown out of the program by the President's budget. It is a budget of educational opportunity, not educational retreat.

The Democratic budget protects high priority programs for children, senior citizens, and the homeless. It maintains the Supplemental Feeding Program for Women, Infants and Children [WIC], which affects over 2,000 mothers and children in El Paso alone.

In the field of international trade, the Democratic budget provides for adequate Customs staffing as opposed to the administration's proposed cut of 2,000 positions. It also increases funding for workers who are displaced by unfair foreign competition, a safety net that is becoming increasingly important as we struggle to regain our competitive edge, and it is far superior to the administration's budget in terms of worker retraining, another essential feature of competitiveness.

No; the Democratic budget isn't perfect. I'm not entirely satisfied with it. It goes too far in cutting certain defense programs, and we certainly intend to restore the proposed cuts in NASA and the Space Program, particularly as they might affect the State of Texas.

But these are all things that we can change in conference and in the House Appropriations Committee later this year. The most important consideration today is that we have an honest budget before this House and before the American people, one that contains $600 million less in taxes than the President's budget and one that tells the American people the truth.

As the unfolding scandal of the arms sales to the terrorist government of Iran and the illegal Contra supply operations have shown, telling the American people the way it really is—the honest truth about the problems of Gov-

ernment—is in short supply. This Democratic budget does that. It tells the American people that we have real problems that demand real solutions, not the business-as-usual partisan rhetoric we hear from the other side. This budget is only the first step of our work, but it tells the American people the truth, and that's the best place to start.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairmam, I rise in support of the Democratic budget proposal.

Mr. Chairman the members of the Budget Committee are to be congratulated for developing a budget that realistically addresses the deficit without sacrificing vital Government services. This resolution refutes the Reagan priorities of all guns and no butter, and instead focuses on programs targeted toward working people and retirees.

The 100th Congress will make many tough decisions in the upcoming months. I would like to stress that as the individual committees go to the work on the details of the fiscal year 1988 budget, we must keep some very important points in mind.

We have a responsibility to the American public not to raise revenues until every reasonable reduction is made. New revenue should be included only after these cuts have been made. Congress must now begin the task of examining each item in the budget, and I believe that the Pentagon's budget would be the best place to start.

The Budget Committee did attempt to restrain the growth in military spending. Unfortunately, this budget does not reduce defense budget authority enough.

It is past time to introduce an element of realism into the increasingly surreal debate on our defense needs. Seven years of little or no restraint in the defense budget have virtually eliminated any pressure on the Pentagon to set priorities, develop a clear and consistent strategy, or develop any reasonable management guidelines for the vast expenditures that the Department of Defense oversees. It is estimated that the Department of Defense will have $50 billion in unobligated funds for fiscal year 1988. Before throwing any more money at the Pentagon, I would like to take a close look at those unobligated funds. I would like to know how the estimated $22 billion earmarked for secret research and development programs is being spent. I would like to have some reasonable assurance that the weapons systems the Department of Defense is purchasing will work. It is time that we demand the same kind of austerity from the Department of Defense that we are requiring of our children, our poor, our aged, and our working, taxpaying families.

Working Americans have already paid more than their fair share of the deficit reduction. Cuts in everything from education to health benefits have compromised the quality of life for millions of Americans. I will not support any effort to raise revenues at the expense of hard-working American families.

In addition to addressing critical issues of national importance, this budget also protects several areas vital to the Northwast.

The Budget Committee's refusal to go along with the administration's disastrous revision of Federal timber receipt distribution formula is good news for our region. The proposed change, from a base in gross receipts to net receipts, would have cost the State and local governments of Oregon over $100 million. That money is compensation to the State and county governments for the lost tax base as a result of substantial Federal ownership of land in the State. Such a change would be the final blow to the already struggling local governments of Oregon.

The committe also rejected the administration's renewed attempt to squeeze more money from the economy of the Pacific Northwest by revising the repayment terms for the Federal Columbia River Power System. Such a change is like a bank raising the interests rate on a home mortgage simply because it wants more money. The ratepayers of the Northwest already bear the costs for the FCRPS and are repaying the debt in full.

Unfortunately, the Senate Budget Committee has included this so-called repayment reform package which would alter the terms of BPA's repayment contract with the Federal Government. It is estimated that the Senate language, if adopted, will add nearly $350 million a year to our electric rates. It is vital that the House version of the budget prevail.

On behalf of the people of Oregon. I would like to thank Chairman GRAY for his commitment to protect BPA ratepayers and timber receipts when this resolution goes to conference with the Senate.

The committee resolution will not solve our deficit problem, but it is a step in the right direction. Today, we begin an honest budget process, not one based on deficit smoke and mirrors. A process that should be based on cutting all the fat out of the Government before we ask the American people to pay higher taxes.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to vote for the budget resolution approved by the House Budget Committee. It is not perfect, but it is, in my judgment the best alternative of any of those presented to the House today. No budget can satisfy everyone, but the committee resolution provides a fiscal blueprint which addresses national priorities and distributes the sacrifices necessary to cope with our Federal budget dilemma in a fairer manner than any other plan offered for our consideration. I believe it is important that we choose between these plans, and that we choose today.

While I support the broad outlines of the committee resolution, I am concerned about a provision within it which would task the Energy and Commerce Committee with establishing a user fee system to pay for the filling of the strategic petroleum reserve. Let me make my position on this matter crystal clear. I am opposed to any fee or tax which would increase the price of imported, but not domestic, oil. The strategic petroleum reserve is a national security resource, the cost of which should be borne by the Nation as a whole, not solely by regions like New England that must rely on imported oil. I support a 75,000 barrel-per-day fill rate for the reserve, if the costs of that rate are fairly shared. Some of my colleagues believe that the user fee language in the committee budget would have to operate like an oil import fee. Others believe it would cause an increase in the price of oil, whether produced domestically or abroad.

I expect that the Energy and Commerce Committee, through the reconciliation process, will resolve the controversy on this issue in a way that ensures that the strategic petroleum reserve user fee will treat the price of all oil equally. I will not support a budget reconciliation bill that does not have that result. Further, I want to make it clear, that should the budget resolution return from conference with this user fee provision changed in a way that mandates an oil import fee, I will vote against the conference report. Increased revenues are necessary to deal responsibly with the No. 1 problem facing our economy, our budget deficit, but the burdens associated with those revenues must be distributed equitably. An oil import fee will simply not meet that test and therefore should not be a part of the budget ultimately adopted by this Congress.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I watched the Hagler/Leonard fight up in Charles Town Monday night. In watching that fight I saw a fascinating mixture of violence, showmanship, workmanship, and intelligence.

I was thinking about how these same qualities are evident in the budget debate. I see the violence that the President's budget would wreak on the core of America. The lost educations, the death of health care for the elderly, the veterans asking why the country they defended turned its back on them, the coal miners who lost their jobs because of hidden taxes that cheat the coal industry.

I see the showmanship of the minority party, which offered no budget of its own, which traded responsibility for cheap shots.

I see the workmanship of BILL GRAY, who has given us a responsible agenda for America. I watched him work to include everyone in this debate, and I watched the showmen turn their backs.

And finally, I see the intelligence in the final product of the chairman's work. BILL GRAY has given us a document that improves educational opportunities, that improves the quality and availability of health care for the elderly, that keeps our commitment to veterans, and that reduces this administration's deficit significantly and responsibly, with no hidden taxes on those who can least afford it.

Mr. Chairman, on Monday two great champions fought and one was

crowned. There is some disagreement over the split decision in that fight. I had no vote in that decision, but today I do. On my card, BILL GRAY's budget is a clear winner. On my card, Mr. Chairman, it is a unanimous decision that BILL GRAY will go home from this Chamber tonight and the American people will know that a great statesman became a great champion for the best qualities of his country.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire of the minority how many speakers they have left and the time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] indicates one speaker on the minority side.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] has 4¼ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

In conclusion, I would say this is not a perfect budget, but it is not a phony budget and it is not a sham. It has real deficit reductions of $38.2 billion.

The $2 trillion debt we now have is real. The $150 billion trade deficit is real.

The gentleman a moment ago was totally correct when he said we can run but we cannot hide. If these assumptions are wrong, sequestration in August will certainly cause us to get right.

This budget is not perfect, but it is not a sham and it is not phony. It is real.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Chairman, today the House will adopt a budget of $1.038 trillion. A $1 trillion budget is an incredible figure, but it pales next to the incredible figure of our $2 trillion national debt.

A couple of years ago, nearly everyone in Congress called for action to reduce the national debt. We used such words as "fiscal restraint," a responsible budget," and "real deficit reduction." I guess times have changed, because today we are ignoring these expressions as we debate this budget. Here we are with a budget that raises taxes by $18 billion, yet it still fails to reduce the deficit to an acceptable level. Although times have changed, our national debt has not.

We constantly face tough decisions in our day-to-day work, but there is one decision that is not tough. We must take serious steps toward reducing the budget deficit. Today we are shirking our responsibility, a responsibility we put on ourselves when we approved Gramm-Rudman legislation. As a cosponsor of that legislation, I am disappointed in how readily Congress abandoned it. Sure, this budget claims to meet the $108 billion deficit target. It does not do it through significant spending cuts. It does it by raising taxes.

I call on my colleagues to honor the commitment we undertook, and make the decisions that will bring about real deficit reductions. We cannot continue to rely on accounting tricks to reduce the deficit. We may fool ourselves, but we cannot fool the American people.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I contend the House budget proposal contains a fundamental flaw of potentially devastating proportion—it fails to plan for our Nation's future.

I would like to speak specifically to an area of the budget with which I am particularly familiar—function 250 which provides for the funding of our science, space, and technology programs. The House budget cuts $1.1 billion below the President's request, a full 12 percent reduction in funding for these essential programs.

Fermilab, the world's most powerful particle accelerator, is located in my congressional district in Batavia, IL. This tremendous high energy research facility has proven itself to be a very prudent investment by the Congress and the U.S. taxpayer. It has lead to scientific discoveries of profound social and economic significance. In fact, it has been estimated that as much as one-third of our current GNP is directly related to high energy physics research done over the last 40 years. You don't have to be a scientist to understand those numbers.

It is estimated that the House budget proposal would result in the loss of 200 jobs in our Nation's high energy research facilities. The operation of Fermilab and the Stanford Linear Accelerator would have to be curtailed by one-third. In addition, funds would not be available for the most promising new research tool on the horizon, the superconducting super collider, recently endorsed by the administration.

Science, Space, and Technology Chairman Roe spoke on the House floor yesterday to express his deep concern with the shortsightedness of this budget with regard to basic science programs, including the severe cuts planned for our Nation's Space Program, a source of pride and inspiration for all of us. I must echo his concerns in this regard, and applaud his efforts to preserve the U.S. position at the leading edge of scientific research and knowledge.

The future of America's security, economy, technology and leadershp role in the world community depend upon the steps we take today to plan for our Nation's future. I would suggest to all Members of this body, Democrats and Republicans, that we had better start at the beginning—where it counts.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 93 and believe it represents a near perfect compromise in a year of very difficult economic and political choices.

The resolution reported by the Budget Committee is a fair approach to deficit reduction as it provides for equal cuts in both military and domestic programs.

House Concurrent Resolution 95 achieves a real and permanent deficit reduction of $38.2 billion, unlike the administration's budget which depends in many respects on 1-year savings due to asset sales. It is no secret however, that these "one-shot" budget savings actually often result in increased costs in future years. In fact, the permanent deficit reduction realized by the committee's resolution is almost twice as large as the $19.8 billion which would be realized under the President's proposal.

The measure also meets the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit target for fiscal year 1988 by producing a deficit of $107.6 billion, $400 million under the target of $108 billion.

Unfortunately, however, one element of the committee's resolution has become somewhat controversial—the $18 billion revenue increase, the nature of which will be decided by the Ways and Means Committee. In my estimation, this provision should not be met with such consternation—even the President's budget calls for $23 billion in "revenue" increases. I am confident that the committee will design a revenue package that is economically feasible and one which will not result in an increase in income tax rates, I, for one, oppose income tax increases. I would, however, support other revenue enhancers such as an increase in the cigarette tax. In my opinion, a truly meaningful deficit reduction package must combine revenue increases with fair and reasonable cuts. It is also important to note at this time that these revenue increases would be totally dedicated to deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, this budget proposal also has my strong support because it provides adequate funding for education and for other important domestic programs including those which benefit our children, senior citizens, the needy and the homeless, in sharp contrast to the budget proposed by the President.

The simple reality is that to meet the basic and critical human needs which are our primary responsibility, we must enact a budget which deals realistically with the deficit. While revenue enhancement is difficult, it is unavoidable if we are to truly get the deficit under control. While the administration tries to claim the high ground of fiscal responsibility, its budget actually sacrifices the interests of the average American.

Mr. Chairman, I support the committee's budget resolution and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I come before the committee now to let my colleagues know my own misgivings of how the budget resolution we are about to adopt will affect the safety and operations of our aviation system. Because of the budget ceilings that are being set for the aviation programs under transportation function 400, we will neither be able to expand the capacity of our airports, nor will we be able to modernize our antiquated air traffic control facilities and equipment to handle growing numbers of airplane flights.

With this level of funding, we will not be able to add to our already overburdened air traffic controller work force. We will also not be able to increase the staffing levels of our safety cops-on-the-beat, the air carrier and general aviation safety inspectors, or to expand the ranks of the already overextended specialists who maintain our air traffic control equipment.

We are already years behind in replacing the equipment used by controllers. Much of the equipment now being utilized is 20 years behind the state-of-the-art. But with these

budget numbers, we will get even further behind. There is barely enough in the budget resolution to continue what we started procuring last year. Moreover, there are no dollars to purchase or install the equipment for which research and development will be completed this year. Among the items likely to be delayed are terminal Doppler weather radar for the detection of wind shear and hazardous weather, the advance air traffic control computer system, improved radars for en route centers and air traffic control terminals, and the new communications system for air-to-ground and facility-to-facility communications.

In short, the budget numbers for aviation programs contained in the budget resolution just about ensure that the delays we are experiencing now will only worsen. These numbers also will abruptly cut off our efforts over the past 2 years to maintain and improve the aviation system's margin of safety. These funding levels may, in fact, contribute to the erosion of aviation safety in the future.

This will occur despite the fact that we have the funds in the aviation trust fund necessary to make these improvements at airports and in the air traffic control system. Through an 8 percent passenger ticket tax, a tax on general aviation fuel, and cargo and other taxes, aviation users contribute more than enough revenues to support full funding of these aviation needs. Through these taxes, more than $3 billion will go into the trust fund in fiscal year 1987.

Unfortunately, the budget resolution we are adopting will prevent us from spending the trust fund to meet the aviation system's capacity and safety needs. Right now, the uncommitted surplus in the trust fund is more than $4 billion, and it is estimated to increase to $5.6 billion by October of this year.

If the money is available and if it can be used only for these necessary aviation programs, why is it just sitting there? As has been the case since the fiscal year 1982 budget resolution, we keep holding the money in the trust fund hostage to make the Federal budget deficit look smaller on paper.

Like my colleagues, I am also worried about the size of the Federal deficit, and I supported fiscally prudent measures to cut the deficit. But having money just sitting in the trust fund is not such a measure. Not spending the money is only a bookkeeping shuffle—not real deficit relief.

The only way to change this situation is to make some fundamental changes in the way we treat the aviation programs in the budget and appropriations process.

I have been joined by a group of my colleagues in introducing H.R. 8 to take the aviation and user-financed trust funds "off-budget." Going "off-budget" has, sadly proven to be the only way we can meet the current and future needs of the aviation system.

Under H.R. 8, we would keep mechanisms in the process to keep the fund solvent and deficit-proof. It is unfair to collect an 8 percent ticket tax and then refuse to spend the revenues collected. It is also unfair to users of the aviation system for us to use the trust fund to offset deficits in the rest of the budget when aviation needs are going unmet.

There is no question the need for aviation improvements exist. There is also no question that without a change in how the Aviation Trust Fund is treated by the congressional budget process and Gramm-Rudman-Hollings provisions, we are going to be in an increasingly difficult bind.

The delays and inconveniences to date will pale by comparision to what lies ahead. People who will want to fly simply will not be able to fly. Travelers will be grounded because the system will not be able to accommodate enough airplanes.

In the future, then when you may come to me and ask what the Aviation Subcommittee is doing to end delays or to make sure the skies are safe, I will have to remind you that while we knew the needs and had collected funds from aviation users to address the needs, our congressional budget resolution prevented us from moving forward.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my concern about the Budget Committee's fiscal year 1988 budget resolution regarding funding for the administration of the Unemployment Insurance [UI] Program. The Budget Committee chose to freeze funding for this program at fiscal year 1987 levels, a reduction of $100 million below the CBO baseline. This cut comes on top of a funding freeze imposed on the Unemployment Insurance Program for the current fiscal year. If this reduction is accepted by the Appropriations Committee, the Unemployment Insurance Program would be operating in fiscal year 1988 at fiscal year 1986 funding levels.

The Budget Committee's recommendation is particularly disturbing as it comes on the heels of efforts to reverse last year's ill-considered cut. Within the next few weeks, I will be rising again to urge your support for the Appropriations Committee's supplemental appropriations bill, which contains $100 million for the administration of the Unemployment Insurance Program. The Appropriations Committee has included these funds in its bill because it recognizes that the funding freeze imposed on the Unemployment Insurance Program last year is having a devastating effect on a great many States. All across the country, either Unemployment Insurance offices are being closed, service to the public is being contracted, or State employment security officers are losing their jobs. In some States, including New York, all of these things are occurring.

I fear that we are on the verge of repeating this dismal scenario. Last year, the U.S. Department of Labor recommended a $144 million increase in the Unemployment Insurance Program; Congress gave it nothing. This year the Department of Labor recommended an increase of $70 million; the Budget Committee has recommended no increase. The Unemployment Insurance Program is thin, very thin. The freeze of last year is cutting away at the meat of the program. Another freeze would cut into the bones of the program.

The Budget Committee's recommendation regarding Unemployment Insurance would deal a serious blow to this vital program. It is a blow that the Unemployment Insurance Program cannot withstand, the States charged with implementing the program cannot withstand, and, most importantly, our constitutents cannot withstand. When the Appropriations Committee establishes its priorities within the overall budget resolution, I urge it to provide adequate funding for the Unemployment Insurance Program.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, this has been an interesting day. All the options available are pure fantasy.

Our first adventure was on the President's budget that was a trip through historyland. The budget is based on figures a half a year old. Its assumptions are impossibly rosy. Democrats have laughed at it, but have today paid it the ultimate compliment of imitation. They have used the same impossible assumptions for their laughable budget.

The second adventure was the Dannemeyer amendment. That was a visit to the Land of Oz. The Wizzard would turn debt into gold.

The third adventure was the Black Caucus. It was a journey to Never-Never Land. Eschewing alchemy, it is based on a mountainous tax load and the whimsical notion that unemployment is limited to 4 percent.

The fourth adventure was the worst. It was the vote on the Democrat budget. That, too, was a fantasy voyage, based on all the impossible assumptions. That its composers sneered at in the President's budget.

I call it the worst of the day's adventures because we expect better of the House leadership. It was not the worst budget presented today. But, it was disappointing because this House and the American people expect the House Budget Committee to present a rational, coherent budget.

A budget based on assumptions dismissed out of hand in the President's work is not a rational one. Either this House can expect good work from its committees, or it should reject the committees' products. In this case rejection is the only reasonable choice.

In addition to its whimsical basis, the Democrat, or House Budget Committee, budget resolution has too much spending and too much new taxes. Even if it had a rational basis, it would still be a loser.

Like the other losers, it deserves a negative vote.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget plan developed by the House Budget Committee. I want to compliment the members of the Budget Committee, and especially Chairman GRAY, for developing a viable budget plan under difficult circumstances.

I am probably like most of the Members of this House in that I am not enamored of any of the alternatives that are before us. I am frankly disappointed that we do not have additional choices and that, in particular, the minority has opted against developing its own alternative. This has greatly limited our choices.

On the other hand, some plan is better than no plan, and it is the Budget Committee proposal that makes the best effort at deficit reduction while attempting to accommodate the many competing and conflicting interests in this House.

The Dannemeyer plan, in contrast, bases a large part of its deficit reduction on a novel and untested plan of tax amnesty and refinancing the national debt with gold-backed bonds. It assumes that tax amnesty would

raise some $15 billion over a 3-month period. I am not sure that it would be wise to adopt such refinancing or amnesty plan without a great deal more study and evaluation.

The President's plan calls for $1.02 trillion in spending, including a $24 billion increase in defense, a total of $20 billion in foreign aid, and sharp cuts in Federal support of education, health, mass transit, housing, and agriculture.

While I share the administration's support for a strong national defense and an end to waste, I am concerned that some of the cuts go too far. For example, the administration's budget seriously shortchanges a major component of our war on drugs, by proposing to terminate this year a program which we enacted just last year to furnish $225 million in Federal assistance for State and local drug enforcement efforts, as well as deep cuts in drug testing and treatment.

By the same token, I am concerned about proposed cuts in mass transit, health care for the poor and elderly, and help for farmers, as well as the failure to provide increased resources for environmental protection and cleanup.

Administration proposals for massive cuts of $4 billion in aid to education and student loans are also cause for major concern. The administration is proposing to cut by more than a third the Pell Grant Program, which helps the most economically disadvantaged of our Nation's students attend college. That is the wrong direction, in my judgment, when our country needs to invest more, not less, in our young people and our ability to compete in international markets.

I am similarly concerned that the administration has not recognized the chronic nature of our revenue shortfall. Many of the administration's deficit reduction proposals are based upon one-shot revenue-raising measures—such as the sale of some $9 billion in Government assets—rather than on structural changes that will yield long-term reductions. I don't oppose turning certain Government resources over to the private sector, but a fire sale of assets just to reduce the deficit is not wise, in my judgment.

Just as the administration's budget plan is too draconian with respect to social programs and unrealistic with respect to revenues, the Dymally/Black Caucus plan goes too far in the other direction. It calls for tax increases of $56 billion over and above what is already in the Budget Committee resolution in order to fund widespread increases in various social and welfare programs. Moreover, the Dymally defense cuts include some defense programs which, in my judgment, are important to our national security, such as the Trident II (D-5) missile and the Trident submarine.

This leads to consideration of the Budget Committee plan. As with the other alternatives, it is not perfect. In particular, I am concerned that the Budget Committee, like the administration, has opted to use the unrealistic economic assumptions of the Office of Management and Budget [OMB] in order to project the impact of revenue and spending decisions. These assumptions are that economic growth will be 3.9 and 3.7 percent for 1987 and 1988, respectively, instead of the more realistic projection of 3.5 and 2.9 percent developed by the Congressional Budget Office [CBO].

Similarly, the OMB has predicted inflation of 3.8 and 3.6 percent for 1987 and 1988, instead of the 4.5- and 4.4-percent increases foreseen by the CBO.

If the CBO projections are more accurate than the OMB projections, and that is most likely the case, it will mean we are off by some $25 billion to $30 billion in our deficit estimates, and that is a very serious variance, in my judgment.

I have some other reservations about the Budget Committee plan, including its cuts once again in Medicare. It is not enough to say that we do not want these cuts to have a negative impact on beneficiaries, because saying it does not guarantee it. I have already seen definite problems result from previous cuts, and it is inevitable that further cuts will result in further problems for beneficiaries, particularly in the quality of health care they receive.

I am also concerned that the Budget Committee plan may go too far in cutting defense below the level needed to keep pace with inflation. I have no question that too much in the way of defense cuts will have a negative impact on our readiness.

On the other hand, in terms of broad parameters, the Budget Committee plan is probably the best of all alternatives before us as a jumping off place for developing a good fiscal 1988 budget. The Budget Committee has done a good job in holding the line of growth in other Federal programs, and also in recognizing that, to cut the deficit, we must focus on all parts of the budget equation, including revenues. By making fundamental structural reforms, instead of one-time revenue raising measures, it places us on a better glidepath to zero deficits than the administration budget which merely delays the day of reckoning.

Also, very importantly, the Budget Committee plan provides full funding for the war on drugs.

Moreover, no matter what problems any of us would have with the individual alternatives before us today, all are preferable to the fiscal buzzsaw that is the Gramm-Rudman Deficit Reduction Act. And it is those mindless, across-the-board cuts of Gramm-Rudman—including a $37 billion defense cut—that would be the fallback if we fail to approve a budget plan.

I urge my colleagues to bear in mind that this is not our last opportunity to work the budget into a more desirable form. In terms of a basic starting point, the House Budget Committee has done a commendable job, and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this alternative.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the first concurrent resolution on the budget as reported by the Budget Committee. I want to commend my colleagues on the Budget Committee for coming up with a reasonable and realistic budget in difficult circumstances.

The budget resolution divides deficit reduction equally between spending cuts and revenue increases. Deficit reductions in the committee resolution total $36 billion—$4.3 billion more in deficit reductions than those in the President's budget. Using the President's economic assumptions, the committee's budget will reach the Gramm-Rudman target of $108 billion. Of course, using more accurate economic assumptions, the deficit under this budget will be $132 billion—still a substantial reduction below the CBO baseline of $171 billion. The committee resolution assumes spending cuts that will total $17.5 billion in outlay reductions next year. These cuts are divided equally between the Pentagon and domestic programs—the same formula called for in Gramm-Rudman.

This committee budget proposes reductions of Pentagon outlays by $8.75 billion below the CBO baseline. The resolution includes budget authority of $289 billion for military spending in fiscal year 1988, compared with $312 billion requested by the President. While this may seem like a drastic cut, it is important to put this reduction in perspective. First, outlays will still be $2.1 billion over the current level. Second, since 1980 military spending has increased by over 50 percent. At the same time, domestic discretionary spending has decreased by nearly 27 percent. While it is clearly time for military spending to share in efforts to reduce the deficit, the $289 billion is sufficient to support a stong and adequate national defense.

The committee budget also rejected the President's proposed 14-percent increase in foreign aid. Instead, the committee recommends a cut in foreign aid of over $1 billion.

The committee budget also assumes cuts of $8.75 billion in domestic spending next year. The budget does not, however, include the draconian spending cuts and program eliminations recommended by the President. Most discretionary spending programs would be frozen at the current level.

I was pleased that the committee saw fit to reject the drastic cuts in education progams and to recommend an inflation adjustment in progams within the education and training function. The committee further recommends increases above inflation for certain vital education programs such as chapter 1, handicapped education, and Pell grants.

This is in sharp contrast to the President's budget request for a 28-percent cut in education programs. The differing priorities of the committee resolution and the President's request are best illustrated by comparisons in education programs. For example, while the President's budget called for the elimination of vocational education, the committee resolution assumes an increase in vocational education to match inflation. For guaranteed student loans, while the President's budget included cuts of 61 percent below the levels authorized in the Higher Education Act of 1986, the committee resolution funds these programs at the levels contained in the 1986 act.

Within the jurisdiction of my Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the resolution assumes a 3-percent salary increase for Federal employees and requires no changes or reductions in benefit programs.

The resolution also assumes a reduction of $100 million in the appropriation to the U.S. Postal Service which subsidizes the postal rates paid by nonprofit organizations and other preferred rate mailers. It is my explicit understanding that this reduction will be made

possible by an earlier-than-projected effective date for a postal provision of the 1986 Reconciliation Act and that there will be no resultant increase in existing preferred rates.

The budget resolution also rejects the President's drastic cuts in Medicare and Medicaid funding. The budget assumes cuts in Medicare of $1.5 billion next year in contrast with the President's requested cuts of over $5 billion. The Budget Committee directs that these savings be achieved without increasing the out-of-pocket expenses of the elderly.

It is becoming increasingly clear that we cannot make serious and substantial reductions in the deficit without new revenues. The President's budget recognized this by requesting $22.4 billion in increased revenues. But his revenues consisted primarily of asset sales and other devices that would result in only one-time savings. If we were to enact such changes, we would be faced with the need to find additional revenues again next year. It simply does not make sense to sell Federal assets to achieve phony reductions in the deficit.

At the same time as his budget includes over $22 billion in new revenues, the President continues to threaten to use his veto pen on any tax increase. While such a stance may result in short-term political gains for the President's party, our Nation is the clear loser. As a nation, we cannot continue to run the Government on a credit card and leave the bills for our children and grandchildren.

While I would prefer to use alternatives to taxes to cut the deficits, it is clear that it is impossible to make substantial deficit cuts without new taxes. Most importantly, the Budget Committee plan specifies that these new taxes be used only for deficit reduction. Any increases in spending for specific domestic programs included in the budget are offset by reductions in other domestic programs.

While this budget is not perfect, it makes real and permanent spending cuts in an equitable fashion—something the President's budget fails to do. I urge my colleagues to support the committee's plan.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against all of the budget alternatives being presented here on the floor today. This is not a budgetmaking process. it is a budgetary farce.

To make it appear that we were being given a real choice today, the rule governing debate allowed us to consider four budget alternatives. None of them was a realistic option. None of them could be taken seriously.

The budget proposal marked up by the majority of the Budget Committee is no more reasonable and no more realistic than any of the alternatives.

It would call for 50 billion dollars' worth of new taxes on the American people over the next 3 years. It calls for a 6-percent real cut in defense spending which on top of the defense cuts from last year would return us to the disastrous state of military "nonreadiness" that characterized the Carter years.

This is not a budget at all. This is not a budget process. It is a farce and I am not going to grace this charade with a yes vote for any of the unacceptable alternatives presented today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, the funding level contained in the budget resolution we are considering today is not what it should be for our Nation's veterans, but given the current budget deficit, it is acceptable. It does provide for full COLA's for compensation, DIC, and pension beneficiaries. It does provided, for example, a current services budget for veterans' health care—but no additional funds for vitally needed nursing home care units, no additional funds to treat an ever-increasing number of AIDS patients and no funds to help homeless veterans in our domiciliary program.

The proposed resolution rejects the President's proposal to increase the VA housing loan fees from 1 to 2.5 percent, which would have increased veterans' loan costs by an average of $2,000 and reduced the number of veterans receiving loans by 22,500 in 1988 alone. The resolution does not assume $300 million of VA housing loan asset sales proposed in the President's budget for 1988, and the resolution rejects the President's recommendation to cut veterans' burial plot allowances by $30 million during fiscal year 1988.

The resolution assumes that the peacetime GI bill will be made permanent. This legislation, H.R. 1085, recently passed the House by a 401-to-2 vote.

So I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, the Honorable BILL GRAY, and all members of the committee, for having restored most of the reductions in veterans' benefits and services proposed by the administration. Since the day he took over as chairman of the House Budget Committee, BILL GRAY has shown a special sensitivity to the needs of veterans. He has supported veterans' programs against the attacks of the administration and others who portray some veterans' programs as duplicative social programs. Like those of us who serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Mr. GRAY knows that veterans' health care and compensation, DIC and pension benefits are the backbone of this Nation's commitment to honor the men and women who answered the Nation's call. So I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania and members of the committee for recognizing that veterans have a special priority when it comes to the national budget.

But I want my colleagues to know that this budget will not allow for any expansion of current programs whatsoever. What we have, Mr. Chairman, is a current services budget—nothing more. There is no growth, but there is an allowance for inflation.

Our committee recommended a level of funding that was somewhat higher than current services. We plan to authorize the Veterans' Job Training Program for 2 more years—through fiscal year 1989. We asked the Budget Committee for additional funds for treatment of Veterans with AIDS, and to provide funds for additional domiciliary beds for homeless veterans. We also think there is justification for increasing the number of VA-operated nursing home beds, and that increased support for the VA's decentralized hospital computer program was warranted.

With this resolution, these enhancements will have to wait until we can figure out a way to fund them. Yet, this resolution would increase funding for Pell grants; increase funding for dislocated workers; increase education grants that will "increase American competitiveness"; increase funding to provide expanded job training and placement activities for welfare recipients, and would increase funding for child welfare services, Indian child welfare and education, handicapped education and Head Start.

The resolution assumes $970 million in budget authority for aids funding in 1988 for function 550, which is $436 million, or 82 percent, above the President's request. For how many AIDS cases, we don't know. Yet, our request for $30 million to take care of 1,200 veterans suffering from AIDS was not included.

Finally, the resolution adds $550 million in budget authority in 1988 for the homeless including an additional $100 million above the baseline for health funding. Our committee request for $15 million to add 600 additional domiciliary beds for homeless veterans in New York City, Los Angeles, Washington, DC, and similar locations was not allowed.

Mr. Chairman, on balance, this budget is adequate given the problem we have with resolving the terrible budget deficit. In comparison with what the administration proposed, it is a very good budget. But I am concerned with the incresed funding for various domestic programs while maintaining a current services budget for veterans. When the supplemental appropriations bill is considered by the House, and when other appropriation measures are reported, we will have to review them carefully and decide whether other programs are being increased at the expense of our Nation's veterans. If we find that such is the case, I will be prepared to offer appropriate amendments to make certain that veterans are treated fairly.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, there is a lot in this budget, a lot of it good and a lot of it bad. But before the Members vote on this, I want to register an objection with a provision which is hidden in here somewhere: that is an oil import fee. The economic effect of the proposal to fill the strategic petroleum reserve is to impose the equivalent of a 30-cent-a-barrel import fee and thereby take $450 million from consumers and give it to oil companies.

An oil import fee is bad energy policy, bad fiscal policy, bad budget policy. An oil import fee hits hardest on the poor, and hits hardest on those businesses which use oil. It makes the oil companies rich and the American consumer poorer. An oil import fee also hits hard consumers who use home heating oil, and hits the New England region particularly hard.

Now, I know that some Members dismiss this proposal as saying, "well, its only 30 cents a barrel." Those sentiments are both self-deceiving and self-deluding. We all know that once a tax gets in there, it has the longevity of a Supreme Court Justice and the direction of the stock market. Once this tax gets in there, there's only one direction for it to go: up, up and away. I think all the Members should be made aware that this budget contains an oil import fee, and that this Member plans to fight that effort throughout the House.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the House Budget Committee's proposed budget resolution for fiscal year 1988. The committee's proposed budget is

not a perfect budget, there are many things I would do differently. Nonetheless, the committee's budget is far better than all the alternatives which are before us.

Over the next few weeks and months we will hear a lot about the budget resolution, what it does, and what it does not do. Much of what we hear will be an attempt to distort or shade the truth for partisan political profit. I hope that we can put aside our partisan differences, and just look at the economic impact of the alternative budget proposals.

It is important for us to remember that a budget resolution is just that, a resolution. It is a plan which sets guidelines on how to achieve a goal. But it is a flexible plan which allows many different ways to achieve the ultimate goal.

In and of itself, a budget resolution does not either spend money or raise revenues. It simply makes it possible for the Congress to consider subsequent legislation to spend money and raise revenues.

The actual spending of tax dollars is not done in the budget resolution, it is done in the appropriations bills we will consider this summer. Similarly, the budget resolution does not change Government revenues, only a tax bill reported out of the Ways and Means Committee can raise or lower taxes.

It is inaccurate to claim, as some have done, that this budget resolution, or for that matter any budget resolution, will increase taxes. By itself, no budget resolution can raise taxes. Only a separate tax bill, passed by the House and Senate, and signed into law by the President, can raise taxes.

In recent years the administration has come up with many new euphemisms for tax increases. It has called them "user fees," it has disguised them as "asset sales," and worst of all, it has referred to them as "revenue enhancers."

This year's administration budget proposes to reduce the deficit by bringing in $22.4 billion in new revenues. The administration uses all of the usual euphemisms to disguise these new revenues, calling $10.9 billion "asset sales" and $3.8 billion "user fees." When all is said and done, however, the President's budget does raise revenues by $22.4 billion.

The Budget Committee's proposed budget, on the other hand, only contains $21.85 billion in new revenues, $550 million less than the President's proposed budget.

Unlike the President's proposed budget, the House committee's budget also does not rely on one-shot asset sales to raise revenues. Once you have sold an asset it is gone, you can't sell it again the following year. Thus by relying on 10.9 billion dollars' worth of asset sales this year, the President's budget will make it that much harder to reduce the deficit next year. We won't own those $10.9 billion in assets next year and thus we will have to make those revenues up somewhere else. The committee's budget resolution does not make that mistake.

On the question of the overall deficit, the committee plan and the President's plan are fairly similar. Both meet the Gramm-Rudman deficit target. The committee's plan does have a slightly lower deficit, $107.6 billion versus $106.8 billion. Over 3 years the committee's proposal reduces the deficit by $10.8 billion more than the President's proposal.

What are the other major differences between the House committee's proposed budget and the President's proposed budget?

The committee budget increases defense spending by $2.1 billion while the President's budget increases defense spending by nine times as much, $18.65 billion.

The President budget proposes 17 percent more budget authority for foreign aid than the committee's budget.

The President's budget proposes eliminating or slashing a wide range of job creating community development programs which are essential to the economic prosperity and growth of the 11th District. The House committee's proposed budget, on the other hand, preserves these important programs. Among the programs the President's budget axes are: The Economic Development Administration [EDA]; Urban Development Action Grants [UDAG]; Community Development Block Grants [CDBG]; Housing for the Elderly and Handicapped (section 202); and Infrastructure development (highways and sewer construction).

The President's budget also proposes eliminating, or substantially cutting basic social safety net programs and programs which make our Nation more competitive in the international marketplace such as: International trade programs; student aid grants and loans; job training programs for individuals laid off due to imports, home weatherization funds, the VA and FHA Home Loan Guarantee Programs, the program which trains math and science teachers, Medicaid, community health care, and child immunization, Medicare, school lunch, Drug Control and Education Programs.

Instead of cutting these vital programs the House committee budget preserves them, and by cutting other, less vital, programs, provides modest increases in funding for: job training, drug interdiction and education, student aid, the homeless, AIDS research prevention, and nutritional aid for pregnant women and infants.

The House committee budget also provides full cost-of-living adjustments for Social Security recipients, veterans, black lung recipients, Federal military and civilian retirees, and railroad retirees. It also rejects the administration proposals to increase Medicare premiums and deductibles, or to decrease Medicare services.

One particular area which both the President and the House Budget Committee propose to cut is the Federal Flood Insurance Program. Both would cut this program, which has helped northeastern Pennsylvania recover from many floods, by $100 million. I believe a cut of this magnitude would defeat the purpose of the program by increasing premiums so high that many homeowners and businesses would be forced out of the program. As a member of the House Banking Committee, which has jurisdiction over the flood insurance program, I will work for changes in this section of the budget. There are other, better, places to make cuts.

It is also important to remember that if we do not adopt the House Budget Committee's proposed budget today the result may well be sequestration under the ill-advised Gramm-Rudman law.

Sequestration would be a disaster for our nation. It would result in an actual cut in our national defense of 14 percent, and it would cut all nondefense discretionary programs by 20 percent. That means the FBI and the Drug Enforcement Administration would be cut by 20 percent, as would Child Immunization Programs, our National Parks, Job Training, and Safety Programs, the GI Bill Program, hazardous waste cleanups, air traffic control, cancer research, meat inspections, and many, many other important programs. It would also impose smaller cuts on Medicare and Veterans' hospitals and student aid, and it would eliminate COLA's for many retirees.

Sequestration would require severe cuts in military personnel, supplies and readiness. It would take away financial aid grants from 800,000 students. It would throw nearly 200,000 displaced workers and welfare recipients out of job training programs. It would sharply limit highway construction, thus reducing employment in the construction industry by several hundred thousand workers. It would cripple our efforts to discover the cause of AIDS and to find a cure for cancer. It would cut $800 million from our efforts to stem the flow of drugs into the United States and to educate our children on the dangers of drugs.

Sequestration, therefore, is not a viable alternative.

None of the other budgets we are considering today is perfect. All could be improved. But unlike the President's budget, the House committee's budget protects job creation and economic development programs, it protects the elderly, and it increases our commitment to educate our children and keep them free of drugs. The House committee budget has a lower deficit than the President's budget, and it relies less on new revenues, user fees and one-shot asset sales. For these reasons, and because it substantially reduces the deficit, the House committee budget deserves our support.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I, like many of my colleagues, have concerns about the Budget Committee's 1988 budget resolution both for what it does in terms of Medicare reductions and for what it prevents us from doing with regard to long-term care and the medically uninsured. However, these are difficult times requiring difficult decisions.

I believe that the Budget Committee's budget resolution demonstrates the committee's sensitivity to the continuing plight of the poor, the disabled and the elderly. Therefore, I urge your support of the House Budget Committee's fiscal year 1988 budget resolution, especially for what it does to minimize cuts in Medicare—1988 reduction of $1.5 billion—and to prevent cuts and make improvements in Medicaid—1988 increase of $0.6 billion.

Medicare has been cut significantly in the past several budget cycles and any further erosion could well impair the quality of care delivered to America's senior citizens. It must also be kept in mind that out-of-pocket health care costs already consume 16 percent of elderly income, more than when Medicare and Medicaid began 20 years ago. Even without further cuts, out-of-pocket costs are projected to consume an even greater percentage of income, as much as 18.5 percent by 1991.

Today, Medicaid covers only about half of America's poor. Because any major reductions would go far beyond what States can be expected to absorb, any Medicaid cuts will almost certainly result in decreased eligibility and benefits. So-called savings under the administration's proposals would actually jeopardize the lives and well-being of the poorest and most vulnerable of America's elderly, young, and disabled and their families.

I strongly urge you to support the Budget Committee's lead in ensuring that the beleaguered Medicaid Program is protected and in recognizing that poor children and elderly require special handling, even when budgets are tight. I believe that the committee's fiscal year 1988 budget resolution clearly expresses Congress' commitment to maintain the current level of Medicaid services, and that it sends the real, and symbolic, message that Congress will take special steps to better protect the health of its poor.

As for Medicare, the committee's fiscal year 1988 budget resolution recognizes the importance of protecting the elderly and disabled against increased out-of-pocket costs and includes the following language: "Beneficiaries would be protected since services would not be reduced and neither premiums nor other out-of-pocket costs would be increased."

Furthermore, the committee's resolution minimizes reductions in Medicare provider payments and thus shows its concern that proposed changes affecting Medicare providers might result in unintended and unwarranted negative effects on health care access and quality. As a result, I believe that the authorizing committees can proceed cautiously relative to making Medicare provider payment changes which may negatively affect health care access and quality.

Again, I want to commend Chairman GRAY and his committee and express my support for the Budget Committee's work to protect both the Medicare and Medicaid Programs and their beneficiaries and to express my support for its fiscal year 1988 budget resolution.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget plan submitted by Chairman GRAY, and congratulate him and the other members of the Budget Committee for the excellent plan they have placed before us. We all favor reducing the deficit. The Federal debt is one of the problems exacerbating our trade deficit. But, it is not a problem that can be plastered over and made to disappear in the blink of an eye. It requires major surgery with a delicate touch, and that is what our colleagues on the Budget Committee have performed.

There has been a lot of talk about competitiveness in this Chamber about the ability of Americans to regain and maintain our status as a world leader in politics, technology, and commerce. One way to ensure the future of our Nation is to ensure the future of our children and grandchildren. They must receive the education necessary to get along in this increasingly fast paced, high tech world of ours. The President's budget does this by calling for the reduction or termination of almost every program of student assistance now available, such as: Pell grants, SEOG and college work study programs, drug education programs, education grants for math and science teacher training, guaranteed student loans and vocational education. That just does not make sense. The budget before us safeguards our children's future by maintaining these programs at the present rate or slightly increased. The President seems to want to stunt the growth of America's children, and with it America's potential.

Recently my colleagues passed by an overwhelming margin H.R. 558, the Emergency Homeless Relief Act now pending before the Senate. That gave me a clear message that this House believes in America's commitment to provide decent housing for her citizens, and for those without any home.

H.R. 558 provided funds for emergency assistance to homeless individuals and families with children. The President's budget sterilizes this effort by making it almost certain that the homeless population will grow in the years to come. Families with children is already the fastest growing group of the homeless. Do we truly want to put more children on the street? The President would like to eliminate housing for the elderly and the handicapped, and the section 8 Low Income Housing Assistance Program. His grand science includes providing vouchers as the only source of housing assistance. Vouchers provide housing assistance for 5 years as compared to 20–40 years in section 8. Vouchers have been found to cost low-income familes more than the 30 percent of income that section 8 costs. Vouchers also do not work well in crowed urban centers where the vacancy rate is low. Many families with vouchers have been unable to find anywhere to use them. Lastly, they are not cheaper. The list goes on and on, but let's put an end to it right here. This budget is realistic in its approach, and it reduces the deficit without reducing America's commitment to her poor, her children, and to the future.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the resolution that has been so skillfully crafted by the Budget Committee under some of the most difficult political conditions in recent years. I especially want to commend Chairman GRAY for his leadership on this issue. This is admittedly a partisan budget. The absence of the views of the committee's Republicans—which were actively solicited—is regrettable.

It is important to note that the committee proposal makes tremendous strides toward reducing the deficit and, if adopted, it will result in $4.3 billion more in real and permanent spending reductions than the administration's budget.

I am, however, concerned that what we are voting on is merely a shadow of the real budget many of us believe we should be considering today. This is a budget that few of us really want and I suspect one that even fewer of us really like.

But it is essential that we adopt the committee's budget proposal. We must send a strong signal to the American people that we will preserve current funding levels for housing, health care, education, and community development programs. Given the current uncertainties about trade and the economy, it would be unwise now to jeopardize the gains we have achieved from these programs, especially in the most economically distressed communities.

We have seen many tangible benefits from these programs, such as the urban development action grants. Projects funded by this and other economic assistance programs have saved or created more than 440,000 jobs since 1978 along the Northeast-Midwest industrial corridor. Failure to continue funding these successful efforts could have a potentially devastating impact not only in the Northeast and Midwest, but also in the Nation's vital energy producing region, which is struggling to bounce back from a severe economic crunch.

The committee's proposal also preserves education and employment programs that are the foundation for our Nation's most valuable economic asset—people. A skilled, adaptable and educated workforce will, over the long run, ensure that the United States remains competitive in the international marketplace. The committee's proposal increases grants for critical math and science teaching training programs. Ensures that more than one million low-income students continue to have access to Federal education grants, and expands job training programs for dislocated workers and welfare recipients.

Personally, I can't think of a wiser investment in our future.

The committee's budget commits the Congress to growth, to greater economic opportunity and to real progress toward reducing the deficit. I urge its adoption by my colleagues.

Mr. KONNYU. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the point that those of us in this House who are for fiscal sanity and fiscal solvency are somewhat precluded form the dabate today.

I support reducing the Federal budget deficit, but I believe it can be done through a series of commonsense reductions in Federal spending. I cannot vote for the Democratic budget because I do not support the concept of asking the taxpayers to reduce the budget deficit through increased taxes.

I support our President's goal of strengthening America's national defense, a need that is especially critical in these times of increased Soviet adventurism. So, I cannot vote for the Black Caucus budget alternative because it effectively neuters America's defense programs and threatens our national security.

I have great respect for my California colleague, Congressman DANNEMEYER, and he and I share a great many thoughts about what is wrong and what is right with America. But I do not agree with his views on the gold standard and I cannot vote for a budget that includes a return to the gold standard.

I opposed the President's budget, which came closest to being the correct budget for America, because of the unfair cuts against education.

Mr. Chairman, I assume that sooner or later we will come to our senses around here and start thinking about what is best for America. When that happens, perhaps I will be able to vote for a budget that will be enacted on its own merits because of the good it will achieve for the taxpayers of this great country.

Thank you.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it has come to my attention that the "Allocations of Spending and Credit Responsibilities

to House Committees" as printed on pages 81 through 87 of the Budget Committee's report on House Concurrent Resolution 95 (H. Rept. 100-41) contains several technical errors.

The following corrections should be noted:

On page 81, under "discretionary appropriations action", the amount of budget authority for function 400, Transportation, should read $10,804 million and the "discretionary action" budget authority subtotal should read $485,978 million. On page 82, the Appropriations Committee total budget authority should read $606,635 million. On page 85, under the Public Works and Transportation Committee, the budget authority figure under the category "discretionary action' in function 400 and in the subtotal should read $2,241 million, and the committee total should read $17,766 million. These technical changes are offsetting and do not change either the grand totals in the budget resolution nor the totals in function 400, Transportation.

On page 82, after "Agriculture Committee, committee totals", insert "Armed Services Committee".

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the Budget Committee's budget proposal because it is the least onerous of the alternatives before the House today. However, I am deeply disappointed in the final figures contained in the budget for our space program. The Committee's action to make a significant reduction in NASA's funding from 1987 levels is shortsighted and dangerous. It virtually guarantees that the United States will continue to fall further behind the Soviet Union in the race to explore space and utilize the tremendous potential it holds for the expansion of human knowledge, creation of new technologies, and resource exploitation.

I do not place full blame, or even the greatest share of the blame, for this situation with the Budget Committee. As a result of the fiscal restraints imposed on Congress by passage of Gramm-Rudman, and this administration's steadfast refusal to present Congress with a workable budget or work with Congress to find the revenues necessary to reduce the Federal deficit and continue to fund vital programs like the space program, the members of the Budget Committee found themselves caught between a rock and a hard place.

Further complicating the problem is the President's unswerving commitment to funding for his Strategic Defense Initiative. The billions of dollars which he insists on pouring into this wasteful and destabilizing program could much more effectively be spent to bolster our civilian space program. SDI will never be the peace shield the President hopes for. Instead it will be a black hole which gobbles up desperately needed research and development funds which could be much more effectively spent by the civilian side of our space program.

The space program is a microcosm of one of the greatest weaknesses of our current inability to make American industry more competitive. While the United States is now spending more than ever before on research and development, fully 80 percent of those funds are spent by the Pentagon. Because of the cloak of secrecy which surrounds so many of the military's programs, civilian engineers and scientists cannot benefit from these funds.

That is exactly the situation in which we find ourselves in the competition for funds between SDI and the civilian space program. This administration is in the process of moving NASA out of commercial space operations and civilian research, and instead making NASA an extension of the Pentagon. The ultimater price for this mistaken policy will be the continued stagnation of our space program while other nations like the Soviet Union, Japan and Europe forge ahead of us in space exploration.

The United States cannot maintain its position of dominance in the development of new technologies unless we lead the way into outer space. We cannot do that unless we provide NASA with the funds it needs to run a first class space program. This budget will not do that. It threatens our ability to build a replacement shuttle for the *Challenger*. It threatens the future of a civilian space station. And, it threatens future manned and unmanned probes to neighboring planets like Mars.

While the United States suffers from a failure of vision, the Soviet Union is moving more aggressively than ever into outer space. While we debate whether or not to build a space station, theirs is in operation and expanding. While our shuttle sits on the ground, the Soviets, Japan, and Europe are moving aggressively to build and launch their own. And while we dismiss sending probes to Mars, the Soviets are moving methodically and steadily toward such a program.

The figures contained in this budget resolution are inadequate. They are clearly not in our national interests. While I regret that this administration failed to provide Congress with a meaningful alternative budget, I also regret that my party is responsible for crafting a budget which fails to meet even the most modest needs of an aggressive space program. I hope that Congress will recognize its error an act to provide the funds necessary for the United States to lead the way into outer space.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in absolute support for the budget resolution as proposed by the House Budget Committee. I believe it to be a most realistic and honest approach to our dual need to reduce the deficit but to maintain fairness and growth.

The budget proposed by the committee is far more than just the lesser of several evils. It is far and above the superior budget because it meets all of the critical tests. It would achieve and in fact exceed the Gramm-Rudman requirement toward lowering the deficit. It would recognize the long overdue reality that Gramm-Rudman cannot and will not work unless we have both spending cuts and new revenues as part of our plan. Finally, the Budget Committee proposal recognizes that for programs aiding those in need—they have been cut enough and the need continues to be there and in fact is more intense than ever before.

The key numbers we must remember throughout this process are $108 billion and $36 billion. The first is the number that the deficit must be at the end of fiscal year 1988. The second is the number we must either cut spending or increase revenues by to get there.

The Budget Committee proposal would do so by recommending $18 billion or one half of the amount required would come from new revenues to be produced by the Ways and Means Committee in later deliberations. I would like to interject into the discussion at this point the fervent hope that we examine all forms of revenue raising in our review—not simply raising taxes. I offer my package of nontraditional revenue enhancers, namely a one time tax amnesty and a national lottery. Combined these two would produce at least $30 billion in immediate new revenues and in the case of tax amnesty would produce a permanent new group of taxpayers.

The remaining process toward achieving the $108 billion target would come from reducing defense outlays by $8.75 billion below what is needed to keep up with inflation. However it should be noted that defense outlays would still be more than $2 billion above fiscal year 87 levels. Finally the remainder would be achieved by reducing domestic outlays—nondefense—by approximately $8.75 below inflation.

A closer examination of this proposal produces some positive results in the area of fairness. For example almost all of the critical programs under function 500 involving social services and those in employment and training and income security would receive an inflation increase as they should. This would be a far cry from the Draconian cuts proposed in the President's budget earlier this year.

According to information provided by the New York State Washington office this would mean in selected programs the following: The Community Services Block Grant would receive $72 million more in the Budget Committee proposal than under the President's budget; the Social Service Block Grant would be increased by $97 million, and Maternal and Child Health Care Block Grant would be increased by $17 million.

In the all important Medicaid Program, by this budget proposal refusing the President's proposed cap on Federal expenditures, it will produce an additional $2.2 billion in vitally needed Federal aid.

The Budget Committee proposal would result in more funds for mass transit, superfund enforcement and significant and long overdue increases in low income housing as well as low income home energy assistance.

This budget is far fairer to education than the President's budget proposal. It assumes an additional $2.2 billion in budget authority in chapter I education funds, handicapped education Pell grants and other need based education programs. It will mean in higher education that the 1 million students who were expected to be dropped by the President's budget have a new lease on life.

This budget is the way for us to go. I opposed Gramm-Rudman from the outset and still do. However it is the law of the land and we must work within it. At least we have dispelled the notion that deficit reduction and elimination can only come with spending cuts. This budget is balanced and will take us a long way in the right direction toward deficit

reduction without increased pain for those in need.

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Chairman, today we are debating the potential consequences of the House Budget proposal for fiscal year 1988. I would like to submit the following study by the American Research Institute on the probable effects of this budget on the national security needs of our Nation. I concur with the conclusions reached in this study and am taking this opportunity to say that the deleterious repercussions of this budget on our national defense are one of the main reasons why I will oppose this budget.

AMERICANS RESEARCH INSTITUTE POLICY STUDIES

THE EFFECTS ON NATIONAL DEFENSE OF H. CON. RES. 93

The budget presented to the House by Budget Committee Chairman GRAY portends radical reductions in military spending, which could result in an alarming decrease in our military preparedness.

I. Major Effects of the Budget Resolution

(1) H. Con. Res. 93 assumes cuts of equal proportion across all accounts in the defense budget. This takes no consideration of particular current needs in readiness and substainability and offers little flexibility for solving immediate inadequacies.

(2) It potentially accomplishes a de facto shift in national security strategy through the budget process. For example, it could force troop reductions from 100,000-300,000 without considering the commitments to allies, or the effect on the U.S.-Soviet balance.

(3) This budget could force major cuts in necessary Operations and Maintenance and Procurement funds which may lead to inadequacies in spare parts, training, and personnel provisions. This could reduce the response time of our military forces to immediate threats and soften the perception of U.S. resolve by potential adversaries.

(4) Security assistance programs could be reduced, inhibiting aid to allies in Central America, the Mediterranean, and Asia.

II. Specific Issues.

If the targets of H. Con. Res. 93 are adopted, the following proportional reductions in budget authority would be achieved in the major defense spending accounts.

Research and Development: $1.8 billion reduction.

Military Personnel: $3.9 billion reduction.

Military Construction & Housing: $400 million reduction.

Procurement: $5 billion reduction.

Operations & Maintenance: $4 billion reduction.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, 6 years ago, the Republican leadership committed this country to a radical experiment. Using their control of the Presidency and the Senate, they instituted a program of huge increases in military spending, tax cuts for the wealthy, and large cuts in many social programs, including education, jobs training, and basic science and research. After 6 years, it is high time we assessed the results of that experiment.

What we have after these 6 years is a national debt twice as high as the debt built up in the previous 204 years, under Presidents Washington through Carter. What we have is a less-competitive country that has built up a $150 billion trade deficit, in large part because we have refused to invest in the scientific and educational foundation needed to compete in this world. What we have is nearly 7 percent of our workforce unemployed—8 percent where I come from—with few programs left to train men and women for jobs that will support their families.

It's time we stopped experimenting with our country's future and stepped back onto solid ground. The budget plan proposed by the House Budget Committee begins to do that. It reduces the deficit without gimmicks, and it invests in our future. It strikes a better balance than any alternative I've yet seen—particularly the budget proposed by the President.

The committee's proposal reduces the deficit by $38.2 billion in 1988, $2 billion more than the President's plan. And the committee's deficit reductions are honest ones, without any of the tricks in the President's budget—like sales of Government assets, or creative accounting to make the deficit look smaller. The committee's budget also meets the Gramm-Rudman guidelines for deficit-reduction—and does so not only for 1988, but makes real progress for the following 2 years as well, something the President's budget fails to do.

The committee's proposal would require fewer new revenues than the President's proposal. As much as the President says he is against new taxes, his budget proposal would raise an additional $22.4 billion from the American people—through user fees, sales of our assets, and, according to his own secretary of the Treasury, tax increases. The Budget Committee proposal would raise slightly less, about $21.8 billion.

This $21.8 billion would come from some new user fees, improved IRS enforcement of the current tax code, and $18 billion in revenues to be raised through legislation to be developed by the Committee on Ways and Means. This can and should be done without changing any individual income tax rates. It can and should be done through changes that make sense on policy and equity grounds, not just budgetary grounds. Last year, as part of a comprehensive budget proposal, I identified several of those types of changes, including an oil import tax, user fees, and indexing alcohol and tobacco excise taxes for inflation. These are some of the ways in which the new revenue should be raised.

The budget proposal does not sacrifice common sense or the common good. It adequately funds our Nation's vital defenses. In fact, defense expenditures will increase by $2.1 billion in 1988 and allow a much-needed cost-of-living salary increase for members of our Armed Forces.

The committee's budget also increases our country's investments in education, science and research—areas that are fundamental to our ability to compete in toughening world markets. Student loans to our Nation's neediest, yet most promising, young people are maintained, and education grants that directly target the U.S. comparative weakness in math and the sciences are strengthened. Training programs for dislocated workers and welfare recipients are made a priority, so people can find jobs and avoid the vicious cycle of welfare dependency.

Unlike the administration's budget, the committee's budget does not abandon the poor or the elderly who need our help, nor the infants and young people who represent America's future. We cannot be penny-wise and pound-foolish with the Nation's most precious resource—our people.

Some people would like to spend more money on defense. Some people would like to spend more money on domestic programs. Some people would like to avoid new taxes. I would like to do all those things. But we cannot. Given the deficit created by the decisions made 6 years ago, this budget strikes about as good a balance as is possible among our national goals, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, this budget is a valiant effort by the Democrats on the Budget Committee to salvage what they could, but let's be honest about what we are doing today. This budget is a retreat from what we know our national priorities should be.

We must face political realities: there is a fellow at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue ready to swing the veto axe. But it is a shame. It is a shame that we have to play the game of incrementalism, making small change here and there, when a fundamental rethinking of our priorities is called for. It is a shame that in the midst of growth and prosperity there is so much suffering, so much homelessness, so much poverty, so much unemployment in so many places.

It is a shame that we can do no more than tinker with the wrong-headed, short-sighted priorities of this administration. The President sent us a budget in which 60 percent of all the cuts come from health care and education. The committee has done a whole lot better than that, and we have refused to go along with the President's hatchet job on vocational education, on guaranteed student loans, on AIDS research, on the war on drugs, and on Medicare payments. But there is much that is left undone.

We, in Government, are out of touch with what the American people are thinking and saying right now. They are telling us that we need to invest in the future of this country: we need to invest in the education of our children, in the health of our people, in the rebuilding of our roads and harbors and bridges, and in the quality of the environment in which we live.

We need to invest in American workers, first by developing a sensible policy toward economic change and industrial growth, and second by ensuring that workers who are disemployed by economic change are not left out of our national prosperity.

We need to invest in decent and affordable housing for all Americans, yet we have appropriated no money for new construction of pubic housing in years. Instead we wait until homeless Americans line the streets of our cities and then offer them token emergency assistance.

It is a shame that our country is being ripped in two, into classes of rich and poor, of powerful and weak, of haves and have-nots. While the rich grow richer and the stock market sets new records almost daily, more and more Americans are losing their jobs and their homes. Of the 11 million jobs created since 1980 that Reagan is always crowing

about, 60 percent pay less than $7,000 a year. Our middle class, the American working class, is disappearing. We are becoming a Nation of high-income, BMW-driving, elitist, Vaurnet-touting, privileged yuppies on the one hand, and impoverished, disenfranchised, underprivileged, working-class Americans on the other. Before long, most Americans will be unable to pay for decent health care, for their children's education, or for a roof over their head.

It is a shame that we are bound by the immature and emotionally-motivated constraints of Gramm-Rudman. We should be able to deal with the deficit in a practical, business-like way, recognizing that it must come down, but not at the expense of investment in the programs that will allow us to grow and thrive in the future. We are shooting ourselves in the foot if we cut funding for education, health care, and housing today, only to face problems of far greater urgency and far greater cost tomorrow.

We have to pay our bills, and we will. First, we have to negotiate real reductions in our defense spending—reductions in nuclear and conventional weapons that will genuinely enhance our national security. Second, we have to get Americans paying their taxes again: only 80 percent of our citizens comply voluntarily with the tax laws. In the 1960's that figure was up at around 95 percent. That is a revenue loss of $70 billion right there that is just slipping through our fingers year after year.

We, as a country, have not gone bust. It is simply that we must work to restore the faith of the American people in the decency and efficacy of their Government. We need to earn their trust by spending their money more wisely, not simply by spending less and less of it every year as the mechanical buzzsaw of Gramm-Rudman forces us to cut more and more out of the most vulnerable parts of the Federal budget.

I will vote for the budget proposed by the committee, but I will do so knowing that our Government has let the country down. We have failed to hear the American people calling for compassion, for fairness, for a decent life for every child who grows up in the richest Nation on Earth. Maybe we will do better next time around, maybe we will remember the old words of Teddy Roosevelt, a Republican President who knew this country well, "This country will not be a good place for any of us to live, unless it is a good place for all of us to live."

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the minority leader.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I find it rather odd that the majority leadership's budget, the document reported out of the standing committee, is being brought to the floor as an amendment. Isn't that typical of our budget process today? We have as our base vehicle a bogus budget which really has no reason for being other than to make Members of the majority so uncomfortable they cannot vote against the real budget resolution.

Just a short time ago we went through another fraudulent process, the vote on the President's budget recommendation. Note I did not say the President's budget. He does not have the power to finalize a budget. He can only make recommendations, and it is the Congress that works its will on the recommendations.

□ 1540

In short, the President proposes, the Congress disposes. It is up to the legislative branch to adopt budgets, control spending, raise taxes, and reduce deficits. I wish the Members of the majority could face up to that fact and, too, I wish the media could be made to appreciate that distinction as well. Then we would have no reason for road shows and the like. If you want to blame the President, then do not be wimpy about it, make the budget a joint resolution so that he can veto or sign it. Right now he cannot do that. Why not force him to veto your handiwork just like you did with the clean water bill, the highway bill, and those log-rolling continuing resolutions? If that is good politics for you, why would not a budget veto be as well. I know this President would be more than happy to accommodate you.

It is very important for us now, the majority and minority alike, to join hands to defeat this so-called amendment. The document is a fraud. By its passage we would be perpetrating that fraud on the American people. We would be deceiving them. Are we to pass a budget of a trillion dollars which orders only $3.8 billion in spending cuts, real ones? Are we going to pass a budget in which 80 percent of the deficit reduction is tax increases?

Are we to issue yet another blow to the already crippled oil industry? It would seem so by the looks of the budget's creative scheme to fill the strategic petroleum reserve by confiscating private stocks.

Let us defeat this amendment and agree to meet in May at what is becoming our annual debt ceiling carnival. Sometime in the middle of May we will be faced again with the prospect of shutting the Government down. It will be then that this whole matter of the budget process and the need to reform it will be staring us right in the face again.

We came to this debate with good solid budget reforms under our arms but you would not even allow us to bring them onto the floor. We had concluded that reforms were more important to the budget process than the budget substitutes themselves, and we had both, as the gentleman from Mississippi pointed out, 108 or 6 budget waivers last year alone. The process is a shambles.

Senators DOLE and DOMENICI have proposed reform packages. We have proposed them on our side here, you have not. Maybe in May you will be ready. Maybe then we can sit down with the President and talk seriously about this fiscal quagmire this Congress has created. We will be ready. We have been ready. We are going to come together again on this issue in May one way or another. I suggest we make it more like a family outing rather than a family feud. We have been feuding enough over this issue. I would urge Members to vote on this amendment for all its faults and move on to the next stage in the process. Do not be all that concerned that you are left only with a sequestering base here because, frankly, that can also be eliminated and then we can come back and work our will on a meaningful budget in which we are players and participants in the process.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on this side to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], majority leader of the House of Representatives and the ranking Member of the House Committee on the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] is recognized for 3¾ minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. I have the greatest respect for our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They have great ability and have shown in the past that they are capable of contructive legislative effort in addressing the problems of the country. Unfortunately, on this critical issue of the budget their decision to abdicate that responsibility, to put aside that role of leadership, has earned them the recent criticism of one of the editorials which treated with mock respect what it called the "matchless show of leadership, principle, and courage expressed by the Republicans in not providing a budget."

It is all very well for them to say they did not have a chance to offer budget reforms; but this is not the proper place for reforming the budget process. That is another issue for another day and we will take it up.

Today the matter before us is the adoption of a budget. One hundred forty-eight Republicans voted against the President's budget priorities. Very well. One hundred twenty-four voted against Mr. DANNEMEYER's. At least he should be given credit for offering one. They do not seem to like anything, their own budget, the President's budget, the committee budget. They do not like sequestration. Apparently the advice from the Republican side is: "Don't vote and you won't get into trouble."

What a motto for statesmanship, what a motto for carrying out the responsibilities and obligations of membership in this body. If they were to fill the chairs on the other side with life-size replicas of Members that could remain silent or vote "no" on receiving the command from some bat-

tery, they would be able to contribute as much to this process as, unfortunately the Members of the other side are today.

They are constantly setting off little mines, little charges, to try to discourage Members from voting for a responsible program. They know there is no oil import tax in its budget resolution. They know there cannot be one. They know there are not any tobacco taxes or gasoline taxes in its resolution. They know there cannot be. Yet the gentlemen and ladies who have taken this well do not seem to have any suggestions for what we should do.

Are they whining because they lost an election? Is that the Republican Party speaking? Are they complaining because somebody treated them with some kind of alleged sarcasm? Is that the Republican Party speaking? Is this the party that supported the Budget Act? Is this the party that supported Gramm-Rudman-Hollings? Is this the party that insists it wants the deficit reduced and yet cannot bring us a single proposal of constructive merit to vote on? Is this the record that you, as Republicans, want to take to the American people?

If this kind of abdication of leadership and responsibility is to become a hallmark of your Party, your internal concerns about your future well taken.

I believe the Republican Party tradition can rise to a higher standard. In the meantime, since all sense of responsibility lies on this side, I compliment the Committe on the Budget and, in the unfortunate absence of Republicans, ask my Democratic Members from all parts of this country and all wings of the party, from CHARLIE STENHOLM in Texas to CHARLES SCHUMER in New York to stand and agree that we will do what is necessary to take the people's business forward. We are not going to go vote the easy vote, to condone hiding, ducking, and wandering away from the responsibilities we were sworn to carry out.

Instead, we are going to adopt this budget. We are going to take this deficit down and build an opportunity for economic growth in the future. If we must do it alone, we will and hope there will be a better day when Republicans will stand with us.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 192, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

AYES—230

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Anthony
Aspin
Atkins
Barnard
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilbray
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Cardin
Carper
Chapman
Chappell
Clarke
Clay
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Coyne
Crockett
Darden
de la Garza
DeFazio
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flake
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grant
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hefner
Hertel
Hochbrueckner
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Jenkins
Johnson (SD)
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lowry (WA)
Luken, Thomas
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCurdy
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Panetta
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Pickett
Price (IL)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Richardson
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Sharp
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

NOES—192

Applegate
Archer
Armey
AuCoin
Badham
Baker
Ballenger
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bates
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boulter
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Buechner
Bunning
Callahan
Campbell
Carr
Chandler
Cheney
Clinger
Coats
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Conte
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
Daub
Davis (IL)
Davis (MI)
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Fawell
Fields
Fish
Frenzel
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Grandy
Green
Gregg
Gunderson
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hiler
Holloway
Hopkins
Horton
Houghton
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Johnson (CT)
Kasich
Kolbe
Kolter
Konnyu
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Lukens, Donald
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McKinney
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison (WA)
Myers
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Petri
Porter
Pursell
Quillen
Ravenel
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Saiki
Saxton
Schaefer
Schneider
Schuette
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Skeen
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stallings
Stangeland
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tauke
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Upton
Vander Jagt
Walker
Weber
Weldon
Whittaker
Wolf
Wortley
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Annunzio
Burton
Daniel
Garcia
Kemp
Livingston
Lloyd
Pickle
St Germain
Tauzin
Vucanovich

□ 1600

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pickle for, with Mr. Burton against.

Mr. Tauzin for, with Mr. Livingston against.

Mr. Garcia for, with Mr. Kemp against.

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, 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. 93) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990, pursuant to House Resolution 139, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House with an

amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of ascertaining from the leadership if additional votes are expected today and what the additional legislative schedule might be.

□ 1610

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader if that would be appropriate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will tell the gentleman that there will be some unanimous consent requests that are pending. Beyond that, this would conclude legislative business for the day and for the week.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression, under my unanimous consent request, that perhaps there was one bill that had been defeated earlier this week under suspension that might be brought up.

The SPEAKER. This would be the subject of a unanimous consent request, the Chair is advised.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material, on House Concurrent Resolution 93.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF THE HONORABLE JAMIE L. WHITTEN TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS UNTIL APRIL 21, 1987

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 9, 1987.

I hereby designate the Honorable JAMIE L. WHITTEN to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions until April 21, 1987.

JIM WRIGHT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mrs. VUCANOVICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain that I was unavoidably detained and missed the last vote. If I had been here, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was detained during the vote on the Dannemeyer amendment and the vote that preceded it. I would like the RECORD to show that I would have voted "no" in both instances.

THE SPECIAL PAY AND CIVIL SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1987

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Special Pay and Civil Service Improvements Act of 1987, which is a package of reforms affecting civil service employees and retirees.

In developing this bill, I have worked closely with Federal employee organizations, the National Association of Retired Federal Employees [NARFE], personnel officials nationwide, administration officials and concerned citizens. This package contains positive changes to correct errors, oversights, and shortcomings in the current statute and establish benefits for employees and retirees.

I am pleased to offer this package of improvements for Federal employees and retirees and hope my colleagues will join in supporting these needed improvements in the civil service. A section analysis and a copy of the bill are included with this statement:

BILL ANALYSIS

TITLE I—SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITY

SEC. 1101. AUTHORITY RELATING TO HIHGER RATES OF PAY.

Amend Section 5303 of Title V:

(a) Expands the pay range beyond the current General Schedule grade limitations so that higher salaries can be established for individuals in positions which are or are likely to become significantly handicapped in recruiting or retaining qualified individuals to perform those jobs.

The range may be expanded to accommodate the needs of the problem positions. The minimum rate, however, may not be less than the minimum rate paid by the General Schedule for this grade nor can the maximum rate exceed the Executive Level V pay cap.

This section also *expands the factors* which cause hiring and retention difficulties beyond the current statutory proviso. Currently, a loss of personnel to private industry is the only basis on which a special pay rate can be authorized. This limitation poses a particular problem because many federal public service jobs have no private sector counterpart or equivalent (such as police officers and firefighters).

To correct this limitation, the statute is amended to include other factors which may be causing recruitment and retention difficulties such as: pay of federal and/or non-federal employers, undesirable working conditions, remote geographic location, and other factors which may be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President taking into consideration the turnover rate of positions, number of vacancies, hirelag, nature of the work, environment, number of pending retirement-eligible employees, significant decline in the quality of recruits or other factors.

(b) Expedites the OPM approval process for granting special rate requests. In recent years, agencies have lost prospective job candidates while waiting for OPM to approve a special rate request. Agencies will submit pay rate requests in accordance with prescribed regulations and OPM must respond to the application in writing within 45 days. Approved authority will be in effect for two years. This two year authority may be amended, though, particularly if after one year, the recruiting or retention problems intensify. Nothing in this statute precludes an agency from seeking a new rate request even prior to the expiration of a previously approved two-year rate authority.

(c) Provides that OPM may review annually an agency's special pay rate program. The authorization of higher rates expires at the end of two years or upon OPM's making a written determination that such special rates are no longer needed to deal with the recruitment and retention problem.

(d) Allows pay-in-person provision. If an individual covered under a special pay rate leaves, the pay associated with that position does not remain in effect if the agency's special rate authority has expired. The position will revert to General Schedule grade status.

(e) Provides that special rates termination does not result in reduction. Should the special rate authority expire, an individual's pay is not reduced but will continue in accordance with the General Schedule levels as long as that person is in that special rate position.

(f) Provides an annual pay increase to be available and to amount to at least as much as the general pay raise approved for General Schedule employees.

Example: If, on October 1, special rate employees receive a 2 percent raise, but on the following January 1, General Schedule employees receive a 3 percent raise, then the special rate employees will receive an additional 1 percent so as not to fall behind GS employees.

(g) Makes provisions for OPM to prescribe transition rules for employees to move out of the special pay rate program since the periodic step increases will be different from the normal GS, PMRS, SES or other pay system step increases.

Adds new section—Section 5303a. Periodic Increases:

(a) Provides that Special Pay Employees will receive periodic step increases in similar manner to General Schedule employees.

(b) Relaxes Initial waiting periods to allow for rapid advancement through the grade during the first three steps of the grade. Authority is granted to waive the minimum requirement of one year in grade. This opportunity for quick advancement will serve as an attractive recruiting tool in persuading top quality job candidates to choose government service. Administration of this authority must provide mechanisms to protect against favoritism.

(c) Allows waiver of this within grade system by the agency head in cases where an alternative personnel system or other within grade system is in place.

Establishes new section—Section 5303b. Bonus Payments:

(a) Establishes recruitment and retention bonuses (not to exceed $10,000) to provide incentives for individuals to choose federal service, incentives for senior personnel to stay with the federal government, and incentives for individuals to take supervisory positions.

(b) Provides time in-service agreements designed as recruitment and retention bonuses to attract and keep valuable employees. Receipt of a bonus represents a commitment on the part of the individual to remain in government service for a certain specified period to be determined between the individual and the agency. Such service agreements can not require more than 3 years and should outline what will happen should the individual depart before completing the service agreement. Any bonus requires at least a 6 month commitment to continued service.

If an individual receives a bonus, commits to a time agreement and then separates from government service, the remaining time and corresponding amount of the bonus relative to that period should be repaid to the government unless waived by the agency head. Individuals who are involuntarily separated from government service by reason of a reduction-in-force will not be required to return any bonus amounts for time unserved.

(c) Provides that bonuses shall be paid before the end of the service agreement whether distributed in a lump sum fashion or over the course of the service agreement. Although service agreements may vary, it is not the intent of the legislation to hold such bonuses until the end of a service agreement. Portions should be paid at appropriate intervals prior to completion of the service agreement.

(d) Provides that bonuses are not considered as a part of an individual's basic pay.

Establishes new section—Section 5303c. Advances of Pay:

(a) Provides for the advancement of basic pay up to two pay periods for individuals who are just starting out in civil service and are hired under the Special Pay Rate authority. Recent college graduates comprise a significant portion of special rate-type occupation recruits. These individuals frequently do not have the funds for making a security deposit on housing or for securing a means of transportation. This pay advancement authority allows more financial flexibility for employees who are just getting established.

(b) Requires repayment.

Establishes new section—Section 5303d.

TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES FOR NEW APPOINTEES

(a) Authorizes the agency head to pay travel and transportation expenses, as deemed appropriate, for newly hired employees appointed to special pay rate positions. This is a common private sector option and will assist agencies in attracting job candidates when recruiting at colleges and institutions a great distance from the federal installation.

SEC. 1102. SPECIAL APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) Amends Section 3329 of Title V to provide direct-hire authority to agencies for the hiring of recruited candidates (rather than the current practice of recruiting talent and then listing persons on an OPM register which may take up to six months to clear).

Agencies must adhere to the same merit systems principles, EEO standards and other regulations which govern hiring procedures in the federal government. Additionally, by definition, special rates are applied when positions cannot be filled. This direct hire authority may not be used to hire individuals over qualified employees already in-house.

(b) Directs OPM to prescribe regulations by which individuals may apply directly to an agency for appointment to a position for which this Act applies.

SEC. 1103. SERVICE FOLLOWING TRAINING.

(a) Recognize that, in recent years, the government has become a "training ground" for the private sector—a place where individuals can get "hands-on" training early in their careers which is highly marketable in the private sector. It is necessary to tie some sort of service agreement for training provided at the government's expense. One of the reasons that positions under special rate authority are classified as such and are hard to keep filled is because of the desirable training associated with those jobs.

(b) Links training of four weeks or longer to a service agreement of at least three times the length of the training or one year, whichever is longer. This should help reduce turnover in these positions. This applies to recruits to federal service under the special pay rate authority and does not apply to training which is required annually for an individual to remain proficient in performing the job.

These service agreements are more stringent than those required of other federal employees for several reasons: 1) the pay associated with these positions is higher; 2) the nature of the training makes these pay slots a particular target of private sector employers thus directly contributing to the classification of these positions as special pay rate essential; and 3) the combination of costs associated with the salaries, training and recruiting make turnover within the same fiscal year a financial hardship on the employing agency.

SEC. 1104. ELIMINATION OF GS-11 THRESHOLD FOR CERTAIN PAY AUTHORITY.

(a) Eliminates the current prohibition against granting an initial entry salary above step one of the grade—a permission only granted at grades GS-11 and higher.

SEC. 1105. ESTABLISH PARITY AMONG LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL.

(a) Directs OPM, through this Act, to bring parity or some sense of equity between law enforcement personnel within a certain geographic region. Existing statutory police pay systems makes parity difficult; however, this section gives OPM the authority to set law enforcement officers' pay at comparable levels based on difficulty, danger, or other appropriate criteria without reducing existing salary levels.

In the Washington, D.C. area there are at least ten distinct police forces—the corresponding salaries of which are set without regard to each other. This section directs OPM to deal with these inequities between police pay systems by using the special rate authority to make needed adjustments. This should cut down on adverse selection and turnover of law enforcement personnel between agencies.

SEC. 1106. ESTABLISH PARITY AMONG HEALTH CARE PERSONNEL.

(a) Directs OPM to deal with the pay problems created by separate statutory pay systems granted medical personnel at the Veterans' Administration which is not available to all other federal medical personnel. Statutory pay systems throughout the government contribute to adverse selection between federal agencies where a lucrative pay system may exist at one agency, but is not in effect at the agency across the street.

In recent years, medical personnel in the federal government (particularly civilian health care personnel stationed in military medical facilities) have been turning over at record rates. In 1986, the national Institutes of Health was forced to shut down 60 beds in the cancer research ward because of a severe shortage of nurses. One contributing factor to this turnover rate is attributed to the disparities in salary rates of these individuals as compared to their counterparts within the Veterans Administration. This provision gives OPM the authority to establish health care personnel pay rates at competitive levels with the VA so as to minimize the costs associated with high turnover.

SEC. 1107. APPROPRIATIONS LIMITATION.

(a) Provides that the provisions of this Act shall be funded from existing appropriations.

SEC. 1108. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) Provides that Special Pay Rate authority will take effect 120 days after enactment.

SEC. 1109. REPORTING DATE.

Directs GAO to monitor the special pay rate program to determine whether it is addressing recruitment and retention problems, to identify any abuses of this authority, and to make an annual report of its findings to Congress.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS CIVIL SERVICE AMENDMENTS

SEC. 1201. RETIEMENT CREDIT FOR LEAVE WITHOUT PAY.

(a) Authorizes those federal employees who participate in the President's Executive Exchange Program to earn retirement credit during the entire one year period they are in the exchange program. Under the exchange program, individuals go on "leave without pay" status beginning with the fiscal year; however, current law prohibits the earning of retirement credit for any period on leave without pay in excess of six months in any calendar year. Employees lose three months retirement credit while participating in this program. This provision will correct discrepancies between fiscal year and calendar year requirements.

SEC. 1202. THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.

(a) Prevents circumvention of the "120-Day Get-Acquainted Period." Current law prohibits a reassignment of Senior Executives during their first 120 days under a new politically appointed supervisor. Some agencies have gotten around this restriction by detailing executives to other positions and then reassigning them at the end of the 120 days without giving the career executive the opportunity to "get acquainted" with his or her new supervisor. This correction will eliminate this "end run" around this "get acquainted" period and require that the 120 days be spent under the supervision of the new political supervisor.

(b) Sets individual SES pay. This correction will protect the "rank-in-person" provisions established as in integral part of the Senior Executive corps and would prohibit agencies from establishing SES pay levels based on the position rather than performance as required under the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978.

(c) Corrects performance awards system.—Currently, Senior Executives are prohibited from receiving a Rank Award and a Performance Bonus in the same fiscal year. Because agencies vary in making such awards during the year and because Presidential Rank Awards are frequently given late in the year, this system has defeated the original intent of recognizing high-performing executives. This provision will correct this conflict of awards.

(d) Allows travel and transportation reimbursement for the last move home of Senior Executives who have been required to relocate during their government service. Currently military and Foreign Service personnel who are relocated by the government during their government service are reimbursed, upon retirement, for the costs of their last move home.

One stipulation in being hired into the elite senior executives corps is the understanding that such executives will move when directed by the government or face possible removal if they do not accept the reassignment. Many agencies have also cited this lack of "last move home" reimbursability as a reason for being unable to recruit high level, near-retirement age SESers to take a top assignment at an out of town location. This provision allows Senior Executives who have been directed to relocate during their civil service careers, and who are eligible for a Federal annuity, to have the "last move home" reimbursed.

SEC. 1203. EMPLOYEE ALLOWANCES.

(a) Removes the current statutory limitation of $10/day allowance for employees stationed at remote worksites.—This $10/day allowance was passed in 1966 and has not been changed since. Clearly it is inadequate and contributes to the high turnover rate among individuals who are already inconvenienced by remoteness of their employment.

A specific example in California illustrates this problem. Employees on the Navy's San Nicholas Island in the Pacific must take a plane on Monday morning from Pt. Magu, California, to the island and are not able to return until Friday afternnon. For this they receive $10/day above their salary. This section seeks to eliminate the inequitable allowance rate and provide more flexibility in the statute to reflect economic changes.

(b) Removes the 20-year old statutory allowance limit of $125 allowance for uniforms required as part of Federal employment in certain positions. Because uniforms run far in excess of this amount, an agency should fully reimburse an employee for the cost of uniforms. It is recognized, however, that making such cost coverage a mandatory government expense would cause vendors to significantly increase their charges for such uniforms. To allow agencies to more successfully negotiate competitive prices, the statute is changed to reflect that the government will pay $400 of the total cost of the uniform.

SEC. 1205. USE OF COMPENSATORY TIME OFF.

(a) Allows employees the option of taking compensatory time off instead of overtime if they prefer.

SEC. 1206. JOB PERFORMANCES APPRAISALS: CONSIDERATION FOR WITH-IN GRADE INCREASES.

(a) Revises current law to show that performance appraisals must be recorded in writing, and that an acceptable level of competence is decided by such written performance appraisal rather than by the end of the agency.

TITLE III—RETIREE BENEFITS

SEC. 1301. ENTITLEMENT OF UNIFORM PLAN ENROLLEES TO ENROLL IN OTHER HEALTH BENEFITS PLANS.

(a) Repeals the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act enacted in 1959. Civil servants who retired before 1960 are covered by the Uniform Health Plan carried by Aetna. This plan is not as comprehensive as the Federal Employee Health Benefit Program (FEHBP) which covers federal employees and retirees since 1960. This legislation would bring those annuitants under the FEHBP.

(b) Entitles pre-1960 annuitants to enroll in the FEHBP in the plan of their choosing, and directs OPM to notify each retiree covered under the old Uniform Health Plan of this choice.

(c) Enrolls automatically those annuitants who did not make a FEHBP decision in a plan similar to the Uniform Health Plan in which they were previously enrolled prior to passage of this Act.

(d)-(e) Outlines the necessary administrative procedures and regulations required of OPM.

SEC. 1302. RE-ENROLLMENT BY CERTAIN ANNUITANTS IN HEALTH BENEFITS PLAN.

(a) Allows a second chance for current retirees to elect coverage under the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program. Retirees must have been covered by the FEHBP for at least five years during their active government service.

(b) Directs OPM to notify such annuitants of this opportunity to re-elect coverage and provides that OPM shall hold an open session of six months to give ample time for annuitants to elect coverage.

(c) Provides the Director of OPM with authority to enter into agreements with health benefits carriers for the purpose of covering these annuitants. With less than five percent of all annitants having failed to elect coverage at retirement, the number of individuals eligible to revisit this decision will be quite small. To prevent any sort of premium increase for other health benefits subscribers, OPM is authorized to change a penalty fee, or additional premium for this benefit.

SEC. 1303. DEFERRED ANNUITANTS ENROLLMENT FOR SELF ONLY COVERAGE FROM SELF AND FAMILY COVERAGE IN CERTAIN CASES.

Allows retirees who are eligible for a deferred annuity and are married to an annuitant who is currently covered under a FEHBP "Self and Family enrollment" to be covered by the FEHBP on a Self Only plan as long as the spouse also opts for a Self Only plan. Two "self only" plans are less expensive to the annuitant and to the government than one "Self and Family" enrollment.

SEC. 1304. INFORMATION FOR EMPLOYEES AND ANNUNITANTS TO MAKE CHOICES.

Directs OPM to Provide more information to subcribers on the performance records of each carrier including the average amount of time it takes a carrier to process a subscriber's claim. This provision is included so that subscribers can make informed enrollment choices.

SEC. 1305. REQUIREMENT OF CARRIERS TO SUPPLY CERTAIN INFORMATION.

Directs health benefits carriers to include information in their benefits brouchures on the amount of time it takes to process a subscriber's claim and information on what justifications are used to determine "usual, customary, or reasonable" expenses.

SEC. 1306. STUDY AND REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.

Directs OMP to conduct a study within six months after passage of this Act on the feasiblity and cost effectiveness or desirability of offering a third enrollment status for FEHBP subscribers. Currently, federal employees and retireees can choose between two categories: "Self only" or "Self and family".

Traditionally, it was believed that a self and spouse option would cause adverse selection and subsequent higher premiums since older employees and retirees were more likely to choose this option. As the workforce has changed and more young couples are delaying the start of a family, this category may be a realistic option with cost benefits for the government as well.

SEC. 1307. SEQUENTIAL PAYMENTS OF HEALTH BENEFITS FOR ANNUITANTS.

Provides for coordination of Medicare and FEHBP which are both administered by the federal government. The primary carrier should be able to forward a benefits claim balance directly to the secondary carrier before it returns to the annuitant or employee. This will cut down on unnecessary paperwork and accounting on the part of both the government and the older civil servant. OPM should serve as coordinator for this process.

SEC. 1308. SURVIVOR ANNUITY BENEFITS.

(a) Makes a technical correction regarding calculating a reduced annuity. Under P.L. 98-615, Congress accidentally eliminated a benefit previously allowed for annuitants who marry after their annuity begins. Previous law allowed an annuitant to take a reduction in his or her annuity at the time of marriage to provide for a survivor benefit. Because of an oversight, though, the law now requires that an annuitant must make a contribution toward the survivor benefit for periods when he or she received a full annuity but was not married. This provision corrects the problem and makes clear that an annuitant should pay for a survivor benefit at the time of marriage.

(b) Directs GAO to study the survivor benefit program. The federal survivor benefit annuity system seems to diminish in value much more quickly than does the standard annuity. Because a survivor is not in a position to supplement his or her income, it is essential that the survivor annuity be made more resilient and durable to outlast the ravages of inflation.

GAO is directed to conduct a study and make recommendations on cost effective ways to provide a stronger survivor annuity program. Such options as a supplemental contribution to the retirement system for a more substantial survivor annuity, provision of other choices for larger annuity reductions at retirement, provsion of additional benefits for older survivors or survivors who have been widowed for many years, and changes in the survivor annuity contribution formula should be investigated among GAO's considerations.

H.R. 2091

A bill to improve the pay and management of employees of the Federal Government

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Special Pay and Civil Service Improvements Act of 1987".

TITLE I—SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITY

SEC. 1101. AUTHORITY RELATING TO HIGHER RATES OF PAY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out section 5303 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"§ 5303. Higher minimum rates

"(a)(1) Subject to paragraph (2) of this subsection, when the Director of the Office of Personnel Management finds that recruitment or retention of well-qualified individuals for agency positions described in paragraph (3) of this subsection is or is likely to become significantly handicapped because of any condition described in paragraph (4) of this subsection, the Director may establish, for one or more areas or locations where the condition exists, higher minimum rates of basic pay. The Director may establish such higher minimum rates for one or more grades or levels, occupational groups, series, or classes, or subdivisions thereof, and may make corresponding increases in all step rates of the pay range for each grade or level for which the higher minimum rates are so established.

"(2) A minimum rate established for any grade or level under paragraph (1) of this subsection may not exceed the rate of pay for a position under level V of the Executive Schedule described pursuant to section 5316.

"(3) The positions referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection are positions paid under—

"(A) section 5332 of this title;

"(B) the pay scales for employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration, under chapter 73 of title 38; or

"(C) section 403 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980.

"(4) The conditions referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection are as follows:

"(A) The rates of pay paid Federal Government employees of an agency in positions referred to in such paragraph are lower than the rates of pay paid Federal Government employees in similar positions in the same agency or other agencies.

"(B) The rates of pay paid Federal Government employees in positions referred to in such paragraph are lower than the rates of pay paid employees of employers other than the Federal Government in similar positions.

"(C) The working conditions for employees in positions referred to in such paragraph are undesirable.

"(D) The positions referred to in such paragraph are in a remote geographic location.

"(5) In making findings under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall consider the number of employees who have applied for retirement in an agency or will soon be eligible to apply for retirement, at the time the Director is making findings under paragraph (1), the rate of turnover in positions, vacancies in positions, the length of time necessary to recruit individuals to fill vacancies, the undesirable nature or environment of the work, any marked decline in the quality of employee applicants, and any other information the Director determines appropriate.

"(b)(1) The head of an agency may request the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to establish higher rates of basic pay under subsection (a) of this section for any positions in such agency. The Director shall transmit to the head of the agency a response to such request within 45 days after the date on which the head of an agency transmits the request to the Director.

"(2) Any request under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall specify the period, not to exceed 2 years, for which the head of an agency anticipates that the exercise of the authority under subsection (a) of this section is necessary to mitigate the problem specified in the request.

"(c) Any exercise of authority under subsection (a) of this section may—

"(1) be reviewed by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management once each year; and

"(2) terminate on the earlier of—

"(A) the last day of the period specified in the request for such exercise of authority made under subsection (b) of this section; or

"(B) the date on which the Director of the Office of Personnel Management makes a written determination that the exercise of such authority is no longer necessary to mitigate the problem specified in such notification.

"(d) A rate of pay established with respect to a position pursuant to the authority under subsection (a) of this section shall remain in effect after the termination of the exercise of such authority under subsection (c) of this section, unless such position is vacant on the date on which the exercise of such authority terminates or, if the position is then filled by any individual, until the beginning of any break in the service of such individual.

"(e) After the termination of the application of a higher minimum rate of basic pay established under subsection (a) of this section with respect to any position, the rate of basic pay payable to an employee, while serving in such position without a break in service in such position (except for a period of leave without pay) on and after the day before the date of such termination, may not be reduced by reason of such termination.

"(f)(1) Subject to paragraph (2) of this subsection, the rates of basic pay established under subsection (a) of this section may be revised, within the limits of that subsection, by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management. Revisions under this paragraph shall have the force and effect of law.

"(2) If the rates of pay under the General Schedule are increased pursuant to section 5305 of this title in any fiscal year, then, not later than the effective date of the increase in such rates, each rate of pay in effect for a position under subsection (a) of this section on September 30 of the preceding fiscal year shall be increased by any percentage that is not less than the overall percentage of such increase in the General Schedule rates of pay. Nothing in this paragraph prohibits more than one increase in such rate of pay during any fiscal year.

"(g) The Director of the Office of the Personnel Management shall prescribe procedures for converting positions covered by the pay rate system administered under this section to the General Schedule, the performance management and recognition system under chapter 54 of this title, the Senior Executive Service, or another appropriate pay rate system.

"§ 5303a. Periodic increases

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, each individual who is paid a rate established under section 5303 of this title and who has not reached the maximum rate of pay for the grade or level of such individual's position shall be advanced in pay in the same manner as is provided in section 5335 of this title.

"(b) An individual referred to in subsection (a) who is serving in pay rate 1, 2, or 3 shall be advanced in pay successively to the next higher rate within the pay range involved at the beginning of the next pay period following the completion of such period of service, not to exceed 52 calendar weeks.

"(c) The head of an agency may waive the application of this section in the case of—

"(1) any group of employees of the agency who are participating in a demonstration project under chapter 47 of this title; or

"(2) any other group of employees of the agency, as determined appropriate by the head of such agency.

"§ 5303b. Bonus payments

"(a)(1) Under regulations prescribed by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, the head of an agency may provide for recruitment and retention bonus payments under this section—

"(A) to employees serving in positions for which the minimum rate of basic pay has been established under section 5303 of this title;

"(B) to employees whose responsibilities include the regular supervision of any employee paid at a rate established under section 5303 of this title; or

"(C) subject to the approval of the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, to any other employees of such agency.

"(2) A bonus payment under this section shall be equal to an amount, not to exceed $10,000, determined by the head of the agency making such payment.

"(b)(1) A payment may not be made to an individual under this section unless such individual has entered into an agreement with the head of the agency employing such individual which provides that—

"(A) such individual will continue in the service of the agency for a period of time determined under paragraph (2) of this subsection; and

"(B) if separated (except by reason of a reduction in force) from the agency before the end of the period agreed to, such individual will repay to the Government any amounts paid to such individual under this section.

"(2) The period of service applicable under paragraph (1) of this subsection may not—

"(A) be less than 6 months; and

"(B) exceed 3 years.

"(3) If an individual fails to repay any amount required under paragraph (1)(B) of this subsection, such amount is recoverable by the Government from the individual or the estate of such individual by—

"(A) setoff against accrued pay, compensation, amount of retirement credit, or other amount due the individual from the Government; and

"(B) any other method provided by law for the recovery of amounts owed to the Government.

Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the head of the agency concerned may, under the regulations issued under subsection (a) of this section, waive in whole or in part a right of recovery under this subsection if it is shown that the recovery would be against equity and good conscience or against the public interest.

"(c) The full amount of a bonus under this section shall be paid, whether in a lump sum or in the form of periodic payments, before the end of the period of service agreed to under subsection (b) of this section.

"(d) A payment under this section is not part of the basic pay of an individual.

"§ 5303c. Advances of pay

"(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, an agency head may provide for the advance payment of basic pay, covering not more than 2 pay periods, to any individual who is newly appointed to a position if the rate of pay for such position is established under section 5303 of this title.

"(b) In the case of a failure to repay any amount advanced under this section, such amount may be recovered, and the recovery of such amount may be waived, in the same manner as is provided in section 5303b(b)(3) of this title

"§ 5303d. Travel and transportation expenses for new appointees

"The head of an agency may provide travel and transportation expenses under section 5723 of this title to a new appointee to a position for which the rates of basic pay are established under section 5303 of this title.".

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out the item relating to section 5303 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"5303. Higher minimum rates.
"5303a. Periodic increases.
"5303b. Bonus payments.
"5303c. Advances of pay.
"5303d. Travel and transportation expenses for new appointees.".

SEC. 1102. SPECIAL APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 3329. Appointment procedures in areas with recruitment or retention problems

"(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, the head of an agency may make selections and appointments on an expedited basis to fill any vacant position for which the minimum rate of basic pay is established under section 5303 of this title.

"(b) The regulations prescribed under this section may include procedures under which individuals may apply to an agency directly and an individual may be selected for appointment to a position from among those so applying.".

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 3328 the following:

"3329. Appointment procedures in areas with recruitment or retention problems.".

SEC. 1103. SERVICE FOLLOWING TRAINING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4108 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

"(b)(1) An employee selected for—

"(A) appointment to a position for which the minimum rate of basic pay is established under section 5303 of this title; and

"(B) training by, in, or through a Government facility under this chapter,

shall enter into a written agreement (described in paragraph (2) of this subsection) with the Government before the appointment and assignment for training are made. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the head of the agency making the appointment may waive the requirement for a written agreement in any case if an agreement in such case would not be in the interest of such agency or any other public interest.

"(2) A written agreement entered into by an employee under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall include provisions which require such employee—

"(A) to continue in the service of the employee's agency after the end of the employee's training period for at least 3 times the length of such training period or 12 months, whichever is greater, unless the employee is involuntarily separated from the service of such agency; and

"(B) to pay to the Government the amount of the additional expenses incurred by the Government in connection with training such employee if the employee is separated from the service of the employee's agency before the end of the period for which the employee has agreed to continue in the service of such agency.

Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the head of such agency may waive in whole or in part a right of recovery under this paragraph if it is shown that the recovery would be against equity and good conscience or against the public interest.

"(3) This subsection applies with respect to a period of training only if such training is for a period of four weeks or longer.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Subsection (c) of section 4108 of title 5, United States Code, as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by inserting "or (b)(1)" after "subsection (a)(2)".

(2) The first sentence of subsection (d) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by striking out "subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (c)".

SEC. 1104. ELIMINATION OF GS-11 THRESHOLD FOR CERTAIN PAY AUTHORITY.

Section 5333(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "in GS-11 or above" in the second sentence.

SEC. 1105. SIMILAR RATES OF PAY AMONG LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL.

(a) RATES OF PAY.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management should, to the greatest degree practicable, prescribe rates of pay for law enforcement officers that—

(1) establish similar rates of pay for all law enforcement officers employed in similar positions; and

(2) considers the degree of difficulty, danger, and any other factor the Director determines appropriate.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "law enforcement officer" shall have the same meaning as such term is defined pursuant to section 8401(17) of title 5, United States Code.

(c) LIMITATION.—Nothing in the provisions of this section may be construed to reduce the rate of pay of any law enforcement officer.

SEC. 1106. SIMILAR RATES OF PAY AMONG HEALTH CARE PERSONNEL.

(a) RATES OF PAY.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management should, to the greatest degree practicable, prescribe rates of pay for employees of the Federal Government serving in health care positions similar to rates of pay for health care positions to which chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, applies.

(b) LIMITATION.—Nothing in the provisions of this section may be construed to reduce the rate of pay of any person described in subsection (a).

SEC. 1107. APPROPRIATIONS LIMITATION.

The administration of the provisions of this title and the amendments made by this title shall be to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts.

SEC. 1108. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1109. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

The Comptroller General—

(1) shall monitor the implementation of the amendments made by this title to determine their effectiveness in dealing with recruitment and retention problems and to identify any abuses of authority; and

(2) shall submit an annual report to Congress in writing with respect to any findings under paragraph (1).

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS CIVIL SERVICE AMENDMENTS

SEC. 1201. RETIREMENT CREDIT FOR LEAVE WITHOUT PAY.

(a) CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM.—Section 8332(f) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting "an employee participating in the Executive Exchange Program established by Executive Order 12394, dated December 5, 1986," after "service," in the last sentence.

(b) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—The last sentence of section 8411(d) of title 5, United States Code (as added by section 101(a) of the Federal Employees' Retirement System Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-335; 100 Stat. 523)), is amended by striking "Credit" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except for an employee participating in the Executive Exchange Program established by Executive Order 12394, dated December 5, 1986, credit."

SEC. 1202. THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.

(a) REMOVAL.—Section 3592(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by inserting "or (3)" after "paragraph (2)"; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) For the purpose of applying paragraph (1) of this subsection to any career appointee, the number of days that such career appointee is detailed to a position other than the position to which the career appointee is assigned shall not be counted in determining the number of days that have elapsed since an appointment referred to in subparagraph (A) or (B) of such paragraph.".

(b) SETTING INDIVIDUAL SENIOR EXECUTIVE PAY.—Section 5383(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: "Such criteria may not include a formal or informal classification of the position at a particular Senior Executive Service pay level.".

(c) PERFORMANCE AWARDS.—Section 5384(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by

adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) Except as provided in section 5383(b) of this title, payment of a performance award under this section and an award under section 4507 of this title may not be restricted on the basis that both such awards relate to the same performance period.".

(d) TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES.—Section 5724(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) upon the separation of a career appointee (as defined in section 3132(a)(4) of this title) the travel expenses of that individual, the transportation expenses of the immediate family of such individual, and the expenses of moving (including transporting, packing, crating, temporarily storing, draying, and unpacking) the household goods of such individual and personal effects not in excess of 18,000 pounds net weight, to the place where the individual will reside (or, if the individual dies before the travel, transportation, and moving is completed, to the place where the family will reside), if such individual—

"(i) has previously been transferred in the interest of the Government from one official station or agency to another for permanent duty during the term of Government employment of such individual; and

"(ii) is eligible to receive an annuity upon such separation under the provisions of subchapter III of chapter 83 or of chapter 84 of this title.".

SEC. 1203. EMPLOYEE ALLOWANCES.

(a) REMOTE WORKSITE ALLOWANCE.—Section 5942 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5942. Allowance based on duty at remote worksites

"(a) Notwithstanding section 5536 of this title, an employee of an Executive department or an independent establishment who is assigned to duty, except temporary duty, at a remote worksite is entitled to receive an allowance under this section. The allowance payable to an employee under this section is in addition to pay otherwise payable to such employee.

"(b) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe in regulations the amount or amounts authorized to be paid as an allowance under this section and the sites, areas, and groups of positions to which each such amount applies.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, the term 'remote worksite' means a worksite that is so remote from the nearest established communities or suitable places of residence as to require an appreciable degree of expense, hardship, and inconvenience, exceeding that which is normally encountered in metropolitan commuting, for an employee who is commuting to and from his residence and such worksite.".

(b) UNIFORM ALLOWANCE.—(1)(A) Section 5901(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$125" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$400".

(B) Section 5902 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5902. Increase in maximum uniform allowance

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5901, each of the respective maximum uniform allowances for the respective categories of employees to whom uniform allowances are paid under section 5901 of this title shall be increased by the percentage increase in the consumer price index for July of the year in which the determination is made above the consumer price index for July of the preceding year.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'consumer price index' means 'price index' as defined pursuant to section 8331(15) of this title.".

(2) The first increase in pay rates made under section 5902 of title 5, United States Code, (as amended by paragraph (1)(B) of this subsection) shall take effect on October 1, 1987.

SEC. 1204. USE OF COMPENSATORY TIME OFF.

Section 5544 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting "or (if granted under subsection (c) of this section) compensatory time" after "overtime pay" each place it appears; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) The head of an agency may, on the request of an employee of such agency, grant such employee compensatory time off from his scheduled tour of duty instead of overtime pay for an equal amount of time spent in irregular or occasional overtime work.".

SEC. 1205. JOB PERFORMANCE: APPRAISALS; CONSIDERATION FOR WITHIN-GRADE INCREASES.

(a) PREPARATION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS.—Section 4302(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting ", in a written performance appraisal," after "evaluating" in paragraph (3).

(b) WITHIN-GRADE INCREASES.—(1) Section 5335(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "as determined by the head of the agency." at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "determined on the basis of a current performance appraisal.".

SEC. 1206. APPROPRIATIONS LIMITATION.

The administration of the provisions of this title and the amendments made by this title shall be to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts.

TITLE III—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

SEC. 1301. ENTITLEMENT OF UNIFORM PLAN ENROLLEES TO ENROLL IN OTHER HEALTH BENEFITS PLANS.

(a) REPEAL.—The Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (Public Law 86-724; 74 Stat. 849) is repealed effective 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) ENTITLEMENT TO ENROLL.—(1) Any person enrolled in a health benefits plan administered pursuant to the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act on the date of enactment of this Act, is entitled to enroll in any health benefits plan administered pursuant to chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) The director of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

(A) notify each person affected by the provisions of paragraph (1) of the entitlement provided pursuant to such paragraph; and

(B) provide a period of open enrollment for such person for a period of 6 months beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) AUTOMATIC ENROLLMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONS.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall enroll any person who—

(1) is enrolled in a health benefits plan administered pursuant to the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) does not enroll in a health benefits plan pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b).

in the indemnity benefits plan described under section 8904(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(d) DEPOSITS IN THE EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND.—Any money remaining in the Retired Employees Health Benefits Fund established pursuant to section 8 of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act, after paying all obligations of such Fund, shall be deposited in the Employees Health Benefits Fund established pursuant to section 8909 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) ADMINISTRATION BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.—(1) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall administer the provisions of this section to provide that—

(A) each person affected by this section shall receive continuous coverage under a health benefits plan;

(B) each person who was entitled to a benefit under a health benefits plan administered pursuant to the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act shall be entitled at a minimum to the same benefit, if such person is enrolled in the indemnity benefit plan described under section 8904(2) of title 5, United States Code; and

(C) the administration of all the provisions of this section are completed within 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management may enter into such agreements with health benefits carriers under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 1302. RE-ENROLLMENT BY CERTAIN ANNUITANTS IN HEALTH BENEFITS PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any annuitant, as defined under section 8901(3) of title 5, United States Code, who on the effective date of retirement of such annuitant was eligible to continue enrollment in a health benefits plan under section 8905(b) of such title, and who, on the date of enactment of this Act, is not enrolled in a health benefits plan administered pursuant to chapter 89 of such title may enroll in any such plan during the period of open enrollment provided pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) shall apply to any annuitant whose effective date of retirement occurred before the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) NOTIFICATION AND OPEN ENROLLMENT PERIOD.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

(1) notify all persons eligible to re-enroll pursuant to the provisions of this section, of such eligibility; and

(2) provide for a period of open enrollment for such persons for a period of 6 months beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) RE-ENROLLMENT FEE.—(1) Any annuitant who re-enrolls in a health benefits plan pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1) shall pay a re-enrollment fee as determined by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall determine for each annuitant who re-enrolls in a health benefits plan pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1)—

(A) the class of individuals who would be affected by an increase in premium payments to provide for coverage to such annuitant through re-enrollment; and

(B) a re-enrollment fee to be paid by such annuitant at the time of re-enrollment to offset such anticipated increase determined under subparagraph (A).

(3) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall deposit all re-enrollment fees paid pursuant to paragraph (2)(B) in the Employees Health Benefits Fund established under section 8909 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management may enter into such agreements with health benefits carriers under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 1303. DEFERRED ANNUITANTS ENROLLMENT FOR SELF ONLY COVERAGE FROM SELF AND FAMILY COVERAGE IN CERTAIN CASES.

Section 8905 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a person who is entitled to a deferred annuity under chapter 83 or 84 of this title or any other retirement system for Federal Government employees, and is covered under this chapter by a self and family enrollment of another employee or annuitant, may enroll for self only in a health benefits plan under this chapter, if such other employee or annuitant changes such coverage to self only. The annuitant entitled to a deferred annuity may not enroll for self and family coverage.".

SEC. 1304. INFORMATION FOR EMPLOYEES AND ANNUITANTS TO MAKE CHOICES.

Section 8907(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by striking out "and" at the end thereof;

(2) in paragraph (3) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) other information that employees and annuitants need in order to make an informed enrollment choice including claim processing time of plans offered under section 8903 (1), (2), and (3), and any other information that the Director of the Office of Personnel Management determines may help to better inform employees and annuitants for the purpose of making such choice.".

SEC. 1305. REQUIREMENT OF CARRIERS TO SUPPLY CERTAIN INFORMATION.

Section 8910(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking out the semicolon and "and" at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof ", including the time required to process claims and issue claim payments;";

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) the justification for the manner that the carriers determine medical charge levels to be usual, customary, or reasonable.".

SEC. 1306. STUDY AND REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.

Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall conduct a study and report to Congress on the feasibility of providing an enrollment category for an individual and the spouse of such individual only (to be designated as "self and spouse only") for the health benefits plans administered pursuant to chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 1307. SEQUENTIAL PAYMENTS OF HEALTH BENEFITS FOR ANNUITANTS.

(a) SEQUENTIAL PAYMENTS.—Chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 8909 the following new section:

"§ 8909a. Sequential payments of health benefits for annuitants

"If an annuitant is covered by a health benefits plan offered by a carrier under this chapter and by any other health benefits plan provided in an insurance policy or contract, medical or hospital service agreement, membership or subscription contract, or similar arrangement, any claim for the payment of health benefits submitted to that carrier by or on behalf of that annuitant shall be paid as follows:

"(1) The carrier shall—

"(A) make any payment required under the plan offered by that carrier; and

"(B) if any portion of the claim is not paid by that carrier, forward the claim to the administrator of the other health benefits plan together with a statement of the amount paid by the carrier and a detailed description of the item covered by the payment.

"(2) The administrator of the other health benefits plan shall—

"(A) pay any portion of the unpaid amount of the claim required under the plan; and

"(B) notify the annuitant of the amount of the claim paid by that plan, a detailed description of the items covered by the payment, and any unpaid amount of the claim for which the annuitant is required to arrange payment or other settlement.".

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 8909 the following:

"8909a. Sequential payments of health benefits for annuitants.".

SEC. 1308. SURVIVOR ANNUITY BENEFITS.

(a) REDUCTION OF ANNUITY FOR SURVIVOR BENEFITS NOT RETROACTIVE.—(1) Chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (C) of paragraph (5) of section 8399(j) by—

(i) striking out the comma and all that follows after "9 months after the date of the remarriage" in the first sentence of clause (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof a period;

(ii) striking out the second sentence of clause (ii);

(iii) striking out clause (iii); and

(iv) redesignating clause (iv) as clause (iii); and

(B) in paragraph (2) of section 8339(k) by—

(i) striking out "(i)" in subparagraph (B);

(ii) striking out clause (ii) of subparagraph (B); and

(iii) striking out subparagraph (C).

(2) Chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by—

(A) striking out section 8418; and

(B) striking out the item relating to section 8418 in the table of sections at the beginning of such chapter.

(b) STUDY AND REPORT BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall conduct a study and submit a report to Congress, including recommendations, on ways to maintain the long-term value of survivor annuities administered pursuant to subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code.

CONGRATULATING THE PEOPLE OF BERLIN ON THE CITY'S 750TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution, (H. Res. 142) expressing the sense of the House congratulating the people of Berlin on the occasion of the city's 750th anniversary in the year 1987, commending the people of Berlin for their centuries of great tradition and continuing courage in the face of historical adversity and recognizing the deep and lasting relations they have with the people of the United States of America, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 142

Whereas 1987 marks the seven hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the great city of Berlin;

Whereas Berlin is renowned for its traditions of openness and diversity;

Whereas Berliners have bravely constructed a flourishing democracy in the midst of Communist tyranny;

Whereas the bonds linking Berliners and Americans are profound and lasting;

Whereas Berlin looks confidently to a future of freedom and accomplishment in close partnership with the United States; and

Whereas the words "Ich bin ein Berliner," ring eternal in the hearts of both Americans and Berliners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives

(1) expressly congratulates Berlin on the occasion of the City's seven hundred and fiftieth anniversary in the year 1987;

(2) commends the people of Berlin for their centuries of great tradition and continuing courage in the face of historical adversity; and

(3) recognizes the deep and lasting relations Berliners have with the people of the United States of America.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL 6 P.M. WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 1987, TO FILE SUNDRY REPORTS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations have until 6 p.m. Wednesday, April 15, 1987, to file sundry reports. This request has been cleared with the minority.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENDING THE DATE FOR SUBMITTING REPORT REQUIRED BY NATIONAL COMMISSION ON DAIRY POLICY

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1123) to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to extend the date for submitting the report required by the National Commission on Dairy Policy, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON DAIRY POLICY.

(1) EXTENSION OF REPORTING DATE.—Section 143(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1446 note) is amended by striking out "1987" and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

(b) LEASING AND CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.—Section 144 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1446 note) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, to the extent there are sufficient funds available to the Commission under section 145 and subject to such rules as may be adopted by the Commission, the Commission may—

"(1) lease office space in the District of Columbia; and

"(2) procure temporary or intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.".

SEC. 2. PHASE IN OF CONSERVATION PLANNING PROCESS FOR PRODUCERS PLANTING ALFALFA.

(a) Section 1212 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3812(b)) is amended by striking the period at the end of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or" and (b) by adding the following new paragraph:

"(5) on highly erodible land planted to alfalfa during each of the 1981 through 1985 crop years as part of a rotation practice approved by the Secretary if the person has submitted a conservation plan based on the local Soil Conservation Service technical guide and approved by the local soil conservation district, in consultation with the local committees established under section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) and the Secretary, such person shall have until June 1, 1988, to comply with the plan without being subject to program ineligibility under section 1211.".

SEC. 3. CONSERVATION PLAN FOR HIGHLY ERODIBLE LAND.

Section 1212(a)(2) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3812(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "conservation plan" the following: "that documents the decisions of the person with respect to location, land use, tillage systems, and conservation treatment measures and schedule and that is"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary, Soil Conservation Service, and local soil conservation districts shall minimize the quantity of documentation a person must submit to comply with this paragraph.".

Mr. JEFFORDS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment be considered as having been read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, do I understand that this is the dairy promotion extension for the Dairy Promotion Board with one amendment from the Senate?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Speaker, the House passed H.R. 1123 on March 3, 1987. The House passed bill would have amended the Food Security Act of 1985 to extend for 1 year the date by which the National Commission Dairy Policy must submit its report to the Secretary of Agriculture and Congress. The effect of the amendment would be to extend the life of the Commission for 1 year.

Briefly, the Senate amendment retains the House passed language to extend the National Commission on Dairy Policy, and includes provisions to—

First, amend section 144 of the Food Security Act to provide the Dairy Commission with authority, to the extent there are sufficient funds available to the Commission, to lease office space in the District of Columbia, and procure temporary or intermittent services;

Second, amend section 1212 of the Food Security Act to conditionally release from the program ineligibility provisions of the sodbuster law, production on highly erodible land planted to alfalfa during each of the 1981 through 1985 crop years as part of an approved rotation practice, if the person has submitted a conservation plan—which must be approved by the local soil conservation district, in consultation with the local ASC Committee and the Secretary of Agriculture, then the person would have until June 1, 1988, to comply with the plan;

Third, amend section 1212 of the Food Security Act to clarify that a conservation plan, for the purpose of the sodbuster law, documents the decisions of a person with respect to location, land use, tillage systems, and conservation treatment measures and schedules;

Fourth, amend section 1212 of the Food Security Act to provide that the Secretary, Soil Conservation Service, and local soil conservation districts must minimize the quantity of documentation a person must submit to comply with sodbuster provisions that allow an exemption for a person that complies, as of January 1, 1990—or 2 years after completion of a soil survey for the farm—with an approved conservation plan.

Mr. Speaker, we have reviewed the Senate amendments and find them to be acceptable. I urge my colleagues to support the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1123.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I am more than happy to manage this bill today, especially since this body unanimously approved our original proposal to extend the reporting date for the National Dairy Policy Commission.

I am extremely troubled, however, that an attempt was made in the other body to use this legislation to severely cripple our extremely important sodbuster protections.

The compromise before us now appears satisfactory to conservationists and does not undercut the heart or force of the sodbuster law. But I would still like to take this moment to voice my distress that any attempt to weaken our conservationist law was made at all.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of extending the National Dairy Policy Commission. However, this Senate-passed bill has a conservation provision which I will not oppose but I must admit it gives me concern.

At hearings today before the Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, and Rural Development no witnesses expressed outright opposition to the language but the conservation groups were not very enthusiastic about it.

I am not sure what it accomplishes but want to state that I do not believe it condones the full scale sodbusting of alfalfa land between now and June 1, 1988, and hope the administration will administer this amendment as narrowly as possible.

The amendment speaks only to a delay in compliance with a conservation plan and makes no exemption from the drawing up or beginning implementation of the plan. The conservation planning and implementation of the plans should proceed fully as prescribed in current regulations and Department guidelines. Any departure from this would be a lack of faith in abiding by the law and Congressional intent.

You can be sure that we expect the Department to use its discretion in the most balanced and fair manner possible and that this in no way exempts producers from good faith efforts to implement the required conservation plans.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMENDING EUROPEAN COMMUNITY FOR THE ROLE IT HAS PLAYED IN DEVELOPMENT OF THE CLOSE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPE ON THE OCCASION OF THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF TREATY OF ROME

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 121) to commend the European Community and the government of the member states of the European Community for the role which the Community has played in the development of the close relationship existing between the United States and Europe on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Rome, which established the European Community and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] for the purpose of explaining the bill.

Mr. LANTOS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have a resolution commending the European Community on its 30th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Rome. When this resolution was initially presented, some of our friends on the Republican side wanted to include a reservation on the common agricultural policy of the European Economic Community. We have accomplished that by unanimous agreement and we now have complete accord between the Republicans side and our side on the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like simply to rise in support of the measure. In remarks last week, I outlined the many laudable activities of the European Community in the past 30 years. I think we have made the point that there are certain problems in their trade policies which we will continue to address.

I think we should look at the positive side and I am certain that the Speaker's address to the assembled group of European and American parliamentarians in Madrid this week will strike the proper balance as does this legislation.

□ 1620

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY].

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

I would like to thank both the gentleman from New York and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for allowing some language to go into this resolution, which I would like to read into the RECORD right now, Mr. Speaker.

In this resolution there is language now that says:

Amendment: page 2, paragraph 4:

Whereas the United States recognizes the importance of a strong trading relationship between the United States and the European Community which is seriously strained by the Community's Common Agricultural Policy that inhibits the ability of the American farmer to compete in world agricultural markets and the effects of which must be resolved in negotiations in a manner consistent with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade;

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I rose in opposition to this resolution last week because it did not contain this language and I did not think it was a proper time to be sending bouquets to the European Community; however, it is not my intention to spoil a birthday present or a birthday party.

I want to thank again the ranking member and the distinguished chairman for allowing me to address a concern for American agriculture in their resolutions.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman for his supporting remarks, and I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in support of the resolution. I always like birthday parties. I think we should be strongly in support of this resolution.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 121

Whereas the extensive destruction caused by World War II and the immediate postwar need for economic and political recovery persuaded major European statesmen, such as Sir Winston Churchill, Robert Schuman, and Jean Monnet, to advocate a united Europe;

Whereas on March 25, 1957, the six member states of the European Coal and Steel Community—the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—signed a treaty in Rome to establish a customs union and to create a framework to promote the free movement of people, services, and capital among the member states, to support agricultural growth, and to create a common transport policy;

Whereas the European Community was expanded with the addition of the United Kingdom, Denmark and Ireland in 1973, Greece in 1981, and Spain and Portugal in 1986, making the European Community a body of twelve countries with a population of over three hundred and twenty million people and a total Gross Domestic Product of nearly $2,700,000,000;

Whereas as a unit, the European Community is the largest trading partner of the United States, with a total two-way trade of $125,000,000,000 and United States direct investment in the Community totaling $81,500,000,000, which generates goods and services worth over $400,000,000,000 annually;

Whereas the European Community is working to complete the objectives established in the Treaty of Rome to eliminate economic and physical barriers and to increase political cooperation among its member states in order to further the goal of a United Europe;

Whereas the European Community has contributed to the prosperity and democratic values of its member countries and to the development of a peaceful Europe through reduction of historical tensions and rivalries, which has enabled the European Community to become an important voice in world affairs; and;

Whereas the United States had consistently supported the objective of European unity and the enlargement of the European Community as desirable developments which promote prosperity, world peace, and democracy, and which contribute to the strengthening of the vital relationship between the United States and the nations of Europe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the great significance of the Treaty of Rome on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of its signing:

(2) commends the European Community and the nations which are members of the European Community for the positive role which the Community has played in the growth, development, and prosperity of postwar Europe; and

(3) acknowledge the vital role of the European Community in the development of the close and mutually beneficial relationship that exists between the United States and Europe.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. LANTOS

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the preamble.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the preamble offered by Mr. LANTOS: On page 2 of the resolution, after the third paragraph of the preamble beginning on the page, insert the following:

"Whereas the United States recognizes the importance of a strong trading relation-

ship between the United States and the European Community which is seriously strained by the Community's Common Agricultural Policy that inhibits the ability of the American farmer to compete in world agricultural markets, and the effects of which must be resolved in negotiations in a manner consistent with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade;"

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS, TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, APRIL 10, 1987, TO FILE REPORTS AND BILLS ON H.R. 27, FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN RECAPITALIZATION ACT; AND H.R. 28, EXPEDITED FUNDS AVAILABILITY ACT

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs have until midnight, Friday, April 10, to file reports and bills on H.R. 27, Federal Savings and Loan Recapitalization Act; and H.R. 28, Expedited Funds Availability Act.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE], of the full Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs does concur in this request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of receiving the schedule, and I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the distinguished Republican Whip for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have concluded the legislative business today, except for consideration of any unanimous consent requests.

Mr. Speaker, I might advise the Members, there is one pending matter that has not been resolved and that is the return from the other body of the recess resolution. Because it has not yet been returned to the House, it will be necessary, I think, for me to ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to delcare recesses subject to the call of the Chair, both today and tomorrow.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES TODAY AND TOMORROW SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare recesses, subject to the call of the Chair, both today and tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the schedule for the week of the 20th and the 21st of April, on Monday, April 20, the House will not be in session. That is the last day of the recess.

On Tuesday, April 21, the House will meet at noon and consider five bills under suspension of the rules, as follows:

H.R. 28, Expedited Funds Availability Act of 1987;

H.R. 318, restoration of Federal recognition to the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and the Alabama and Coushatta Indian Tribes of Texas;

H.R. 1567, Cow Creek Band of Indians judgment distribution;

H.R. 799, To designate a segment of the Kings River, CA, as a wild and scenic River; and

H.R. 1963, Surface Mining Act amendments relating to the 2-acre exemption and the set-aside of State funds for abandoned mine reclamation.

On Wednesday, April 22, the House will meet at 2 p.m. and take recorded votes on suspensions debated on Tuesday, April 21, and also consider H.R. 1827, supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1987, subject to a rule, to consider the rule and general debate only.

So again to repeat, on Wednesday, April 22, we will have, first, recorded votes on any votes ordered on suspensions debated on Tuesday, April 21, and second, the rule and general debate only on the supplemental appropriations bill.

On Thursday, April 23 and the balance of the week, the House will meet at 11 a.m. to consider H.R. 1827, the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1987, to complete consideration.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes the announcement of the schedule. Conference reports, of course, may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would allow me just 1 minute to emphasize a point, it is not intended there would be recorded legislative votes on Tuesday, April 21; the suspensions on which votes are demanded will be deferred until Wednesday, the 22d, is that correct?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 1987

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, April 22, 1987.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, April 21, 1987, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations, and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF DELEGATION TO ATTEND CONFERENCE OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION IN MANAGUA, NICARAGUA, APRIL 27, THROUGH MAY 2, 1987

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 22 United States Code 276a-1, the Chair appoints as members of the delegation to attend the Conference of the Interparliamentary Union to be held in Managua, Nicaragua, on April 27 through May 2, 1987, the following Members on the part of the House;

Mrs. BOGGS of Louisiana, chairman;

Mr. SCHEUER of New York, vice chairman;

Mr. BATES of California;

Mr. FUSTER of Puerto Rico, and

Mr. SUNIA of American Samoa.

CORRECTION IN SPECIAL ORDER LIST FOR TODAY

Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, because of an error on the special order request sheet yesterday, I ask unanimous consent that the name of Mr. MOLINARI be substituted for the name of Mr. MARLENEE for today's special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND].

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

There was no objection.

□ 1630

LATE ARRIVALS—A SERIOUS PROBLEM IN THE AIRLINE INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUNDQUIST] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, today I am going to address an issue of interest to all Americans. It is the question of late arrivals for all of us who fly the airlines.

Too often Congress is the last to know anything, but in this instance, Mr. Speaker, I would say because we are all commuters and we go back and forth every week two or three times that we are the first to know that something is wrong with the airline service in the United States.

But we are not the only ones who miss events, who miss speeches, whose blood pressure goes up. We have business people who miss contracts. We have small children who arrive late, and their parents are at the other end of their destination waiting and worrying. We have the military trying to get home on leave or back on duty. We have grandparents trying to reach relatives, and those on vacation.

What do they get when they come to the gate and find that it is time to leave and a plane has not shown up? They get a shrug. What do they get when the luggage is lost because of the mixups, because of the problems of connections? They get a shrug.

So we are not alone in Congress when we say that we have a serious problem in the airline industry, because the exception is now the rule. The rule now is that all airlines are going to be late.

In 1986, Mr. Speaker, there was an increase of 25 percent in the arrivals of planes that have been delayed. Twenty-five percent of the planes were delayed in 1986 additionally. That means that 1,144 flights per day in the United States were delayed for 15 minutes or more.

Think of the heartbreak. Think of the money. Think of the frustrations. Think of the high blood pressure.

And what happens when you go to the ticket counter and say, "I missed my flight. When is the next flight?" The shrug.

Now we know what is going on. We know the problem. Airlines are scheduling too many planes at the same time. They are overbooking.

Now FAA has a responsibility. FAA does not measure—in our aviation committee we asked the question of the head of FAA, "Are you measuring these delays?" FAA said, "No, we're not measuring these delays." We get the shrug from FAA.

Now we in Congress have shrugged today when we did not increase the budget for FAA to construct new facilities on airports. But, Mr. Speaker, we do not want to go back to regulation. We like deregulation. We like more flights. We like cheaper flights. But we can have both. And I submit that we will put up with some delays if it is necessary.

With the advent of all the new computers certainly we can do a better job of scheduling. Certainly the airlines can do a better job of scheduling.

I have cosponsored some legislation out of frustration that says that if a flight is canceled for other than weather or safety that they will have to give free tickets to everybody on board that plane and their free flight.

Now I have done that out of frustration. Maybe what we should do is to say to those airlines who are the worst offenders, "We're going to auction off your slot. You won't have that slot if you can't manage your airline any better than that."

What do we need? We need management by FAA. We need management by the airlines, because if they do not manage, we in Congress will manage for them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say if the airlines do not do the job, let us pull the shrug out from under them.

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

Mr. SUNDQUIST. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I was on the floor when the gentleman made the statement about spouses being home waiting on other spouses coming home from business trips. I would like to share a story of my frustration.

My wife is an attorney. She was on a business trip in Oklahoma. She was making a connecting flight out of Memphis. There was a delay. The passengers continued to ask the attendants whether or not they would be able to make their connection in order to make the deadline on the time to land at National. The word was, "Don't worry, you'll make it. Don't worry, you'll make it."

They eventually got on the flight, and as they headed toward Washington National they realized that they were going to land in Dulles. They landed at Dulles and they were greeted with a bus that was going to take them from Dulles over to National.

Now once they get to National they know that the taxicabs have gone home for the night because the airport is closed down, so if they get to National, then they can walk home.

So here you have passengers in the middle of Dulles needing to go to National or downtown where their cars are or where their businesses are or other places where their homes are, and they are in the middle of the night and they are being provided a service that is shortsighted, a service that is going to even leave them more stranded than they were at the time.

So I think that the gentleman has hit a very raw nerve that is floating around out there.

When I was first sworn in as a Member of Congress, my sister bought and paid for an airplane ticket 6 months in advance in order to get the cheap rate, got on the airplane, and got bumped because the plane was oversold. It took about 6 months to get anybody's attention at the airline to make any correction on that.

I encourage the gentleman to continue with his aggravation and his frustrated posture in hopes that maybe we can straighten this out.

I was so frustrated from a recent trip that I stopped and talked to one of the Delta Air Lines pilots. I asked him what the situation was, and he said it was horrible, it had gotten worse over the last 3 years, and he did not know what the solution was going to be, but something needed to be done.

There is frustration at all levels, and I encourage the gentleman and I applaud the gentleman for taking this time to bring it to our colleagues' attention.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that he inadvertently overlooked three Members seeking recognition for 1-minute speeches.

DODGERS' PIONEERING SPIRIT NEEDED ONCE AGAIN

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

Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago the Dodgers made a historic decision to end the racial barrier to black entry into major league baseball. The Dodgers created the first national opening for black players in the most symbolic of American sports—baseball. With the Dodgers' action, race relations in American sports could never be the same.

As a microcosm of American society, the Dodgers' decision was also an ex-

cellent example of just how far we could go as a democratic society in providing opportunities and utilizing the talents of all American citizens.

Ironically, on the anniversary of Jackie Robinson's entry into the major league, the attention being focused on the Dodgers and major league baseball shows us just how far we still have to go.

Despite one of the best records in the league for hiring minority players, the Dodgers have never had a black general manager, field manager, pitching coach or instructional coach. In their entire history, the Dodgers have had only one black major league coach and only one black department head.

Statistics show that 15 of the 26 major league teams have no minority representation in management positions.

During the last 40 years, just three blacks have ever managed a major league team. Of 130 major league coaches, only 13 are black. No blacks have ever owned major league teams. No blacks currently serve the baseball commissioner, Peter Ueberroth, in an executive management position. The highest post ever attained by a black in the commissioner's office primarily involved public relations and community service work.

The management numbers in major league baseball are highly discouraging, and clearly reflects an insidious problem not only found in baseball, but in football, basketball, and other organized sports.

The Dodgers must continue their pioneering spirit and implement a plan that solidly places minorities in executive management and coaching positions.

Commissioner Ueberroth has expressed his willingness to implement an affirmative action plan throughout the league. The Dodgers owe it to Los Angeles, and their loyal fans, to be pioneers once again and move forward with an affirmative action plan now.

□ 1640

THE FEDERAL RADIOACTIVE WASTE LIABILITY ACT OF 1987

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

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, one thing is certain about nuclear waste; almost no one wants it. The topic will get almost anyone's constituents excited, particularly about the possibility of accidents involving nuclear waste.

Since 1985 I have been leading the effort to ensure that the Federal Government is completely and unquestionably responsible for any transportation or storage accident involving nuclear waste. In the beginning I stood alone. At that time most of my colleagues thought I was crazy to stick my neck out in support of unlimited liability. No longer do I have to stand alone. My colleagues have come to recognize the fairness and simplicity of this approach. Today Congressman AL SWIFT and I start this process again, knowing that full compensation for nuclear waste accidents has become an accepted concept.

I am convinced that our past efforts in this arena contributed to the remarkable success we had last year in expanding nuclear waste liability under Price-Anderson. Although the tentative agreement that was reached last year by the three House committees of jurisdiction was not perfect, it was a long way from the $500 million liability limits that we started with. The legislation Congressman SWIFT and I are introducing today is an effort to move the Congress even closer to the concept of unlimited liability for accidents involving federally-controlled nuclear waste.

The bill, "The Federal Radioactive Waste Liability Act of 1987," addresses a troubling concern voiced by the States now involved in the site selection process for disposal of radioactive waste. That concern simply expressed is: "Who has liability in the event of an accident and for how much?" The bill we are introducing today is intended to eliminate this ambiguity by placing the brunt of the responsibility where it belongs—squarely on the Federal Government.

In the event of an accident involving civilian nuclear waste the Nuclear Waste Fund would provide full coverage. The Nuclear Waste Fund is made up of utility contributions. Existing amounts could be used in the event of an accident. In addition, the Secretary of Energy has borrowing authority should the liability exceed the amount in the fund. Should an accident occur involving defense waste, the liability would be covered by the U.S. Treasury.

In my view, it is irresponsible for the Federal Government not to accept full responsibility for the nuclear waste for which it holds title. This legislation is an effort to ensure that the Government is fully and strictly liable for nuclear waste accidents. I hope this legislation will provide direction to the Congress as we debate the renewal of the Price-Anderson Act.

H.R. 2082

A bill to amend the Price-Anderson provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to establish liability and indemnification for nuclear incidents arising out of the storage, disposal, and transportation of radioactive waste to which the United States holds title

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as "The Federal Radioactive Waste Liability Act of 1987".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) The Federal Government currently does not, but should, assume the responsibility to provide total indemnification for public liability claims arising out of nuclear incidents relating to the storage, disposal, and transportation of radioactive waste to which the United States holds title;

(2) indemnification for claims arising out of nuclear incidents involving radioactive waste generated at civilian facilities should be made from amounts available through the Nuclear Waste Fund established in section 302 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10222); and

(3) it is the policy of the United States to provide full compensation, without regard to fault, to all persons and entities entitled to such compensation for claims arising out of nuclear incidents relating to radioactive waste to which the United States holds title.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to amend the Price-Anderson provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) to ensure that the Federal Government assumes the responsibility to provide, in part, through the use of the Nuclear Waste Fund, total indemnification for public liability claims arising out of nuclear incidents relating to the storage, disposal, and transportation of radioactive waste to which the United States holds title.

SEC. 3. FEDERAL RADIOACTIVE WASTE LIABILITY AND INDEMNIFICATION.

Section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2210) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"q. FEDERAL RADIOACTIVE WASTE LIABILITY.—

"(1) INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary of Energy (hereafter referred to in this subsection as the "Secretary") shall enter into agreements of indemnification with each contractor of the Secretary carrying out any contractual activity with respect to radioactive waste to which the United States holds title, including the transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal of such waste. In such agreements of indemnification, the Secretary shall—

"(A) notwithstanding the provisions of subsection e., indemnify the persons indemnified to the full extent of the potential public liability for claims arising from nuclear incidents arising out of, or in connection with, any such contractual activity; and

"(B) include the provisions authorized in subsection n. (1) to be incorporated in agreements of indemnification, which provisions shall also be made applicable to nuclear incidents.

"(2) NONCONTRACTUAL ACTIVITIES OF SECRETARY.—For purposes of any activity that is undertaken by the Secretary with respect to radioactive waste to which the United States holds title and that is not undertaken by contract, the Secretary shall be considered to be a contractor with whom an agreement of indemnification has been entered into under this subsection.

"(3) PAYMENT.—The Secretary shall make all payments required under an agreement of indemnification entered into under this subsection. Such payments shall be made as follows:

"(A) CIVILIAN WASTE.—Claims arising from any nuclear incident involving radioactive waste to which the United States holds title that is generated at a civilian facility shall be compensated in accordance with the provisions of this Act from amounts in the Nuclear Waste Fund established in section 302

of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 10222). The payment of claims under this subparagraph shall not be subject to subsection (d), or the penultimate sentence of subsection (e)(2), of section 302 of such Act. If sufficient amounts are not available in the Nuclear Waste Fund to expeditiously pay valid claims made under this subsection, the Secretary shall exercise the authority provided in subsections (a)(4) and (e)(5) of section 302 of such Act.

"(B) NONCIVILIAN WASTE.—Claims arising from any nuclear incident involving radioactive waste, other than that described in subparagraph (A), to which the United States holds title, shall be compensated in accordance with the provisions of this Act and, to the extent approved in appropriation Acts, from the general revenues of the Treasury.".

SEC. 4. PRECAUTIONARY EVACUATIONS.

(a) LIABILITY OF FEDERAL CONTRACTORS.—Section 11 w. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014(w)) is amended by inserting after "nuclear incident" the first place it appears the following: "or, in the case of an indemnity agreement entered into under section 170 q., a precautionary evacuation".

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 11 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"dd. The term 'precautionary evacuation' means an evacuation of the public within a specified area near a nuclear facility, or a nuclear transportation vehicle in the case of an accident involving a vehicle transporting radioactive waste to which the United States holds title to or from a production or utilization facility, if the evacuation is—

"(1) the result of any event that is not classified as a nuclear incident but that poses imminent danger of bodily injury or property damage from the radiological properties of such radioactive waste and causes an evacuation; and

"(2) initiated by an official of a State or a political subdivision of a State, who is authorized by State law to initiate such an evacuation.

"ee. The term 'civilian facility' means a commercial production or utilization facility licensed under section 103 or 104 b. of this Act.".

SEC. 5. APPLICABILITY OF WAIVER OF DEFENSES REQUIREMENT TO LIABILITY FOR FEDERAL RADIOACTIVE WASTE ACTIVITIES.

Section 170 n. (1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2210(n)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively;

(2) by striking out "or" at the end of subparagraphs (A) and (B); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) arises out of, results from, or occurs in the course of, activities undertaken by the Secretary (including activities undertaken by contract) involving radioactive waste to which the United States holds title, including the storage or disposal, of, or research and development on, such waste and the transportation of such waste to a storage or disposal site or facility and the construction or operation of any such site or facility.".

SEC. 6. TRANSPORTATION AND TRANSFER OF TITLE.

Section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2210) (as amended by section 3 of this Act) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"r. TRANSPORTATION AND TRANSFER OF TITLE.—

(1) TRANSPORTATION.—Radioactive waste to which the United States holds title may only be transported by a contractor of the Secretary of energy.

(2) TRANSFER OF TITLE.—Title to radioactive waste generated at a civilian facility shall transfer to the United States when such waste is removed from the site where it was generated.

AIRPORT DELAYS

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

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reinforce what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUNDQUIST] has said tonight on the issue of delays in airports. The gentleman from Tennessee knows that back in 1984 we had a similar problem, and at that time Congress said we are going to stand for it, the traveling public is being abused. We put bills in. As a consequence, all the carriers got together for 8 days over here in Virginia at two of the biggest hotels, and they dealt with the problem.

Now this time, in 1987, we have a worse problem. Mrs. Dole has sought to address the problem. She has appealed to the same carriers, and the carriers told her and the traveling public to go to blazes. Now it is getting worse, and it is going to get even worse this summer as we go into increased travel time.

I am going to be doing a special order later on and I will touch on the subject. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Tennessee for bringing forth this very important subject. I think it is something we are going to have to face, and face in the very near future.

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

Mr. MOLINARI. I am glad to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. I thank the gentleman for yielding and appreciate his comments.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI] has long been a leader in public works and transportation and has had an interest in aviation. I compliment him for his persistence over the years in trying to bring to the American public an airline industry that is reasonable, that has flexibility, and does the service that we demand as Americans.

But the gentleman is right, we are in trouble and something has to occur. If it does not occur within the industry itself, then we in Congress will address it. And sometimes when we address a problem, it gets worse or it gets more complicated.

But I will join with the gentleman from New York in his efforts, and I thank him for his comments.

Mr. MOLINARI. I thank the gentleman.

THE CLEAN AIR SOLUTION TO OUR ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to announce to the Members of the House that I am introducing a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require that all gasoline sold by refineries in the United States contain a certain percentage of ethanol or certain percentage of both ethanol and methanol, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1985 to extend for 8 years certain tax benefits for fuels contained in alcohol fuels and to provide that revenues to the highway trust fund shall not be reduced by reason of such tax benefits. This would require the use of alcohol fuels and methanol in all gasoline sold in the United States.

This proposal addresses some of the most pressing environmental, economic, energy and security questions confronting the Nation.

It attempts to partly revive the economies in three basic industries: In the industry of agriculture, in coal, and in oil and gas, and it would improve the quality of our environment by reducing the pollution content of all of the air that is breathed by those of us living here in the United States. It would reduce dependence upon foreign oil by improving the security of our Nation. It would actually enhance our security much more than the deployment of the strategic defense initiative, star wars, because it would lessen dramatically our dependence upon oil that is derived primarily from the Middle East and the Persian Gulf region. It would also reduce our trade deficit by $6 billion annually, and finally it would achieve these goals without additional cost to the taxpayers and increase the cost of fuel at the pump.

All of these goals are addressed in this bill, and I submit it to the attention of the Members of the House for their consideration, inviting their active involvement, their advice in developing this piece of legislation, together with amendments thereto which they might wish to offer.

The heartland of America is suffering through a depression so big that it rivals the Great Depression of the 1930's. The current Presidential administration's deliberate policies of deflation and devaluation have nearly

destroyed the extractive industries of agriculture, mining and oil.

On both coasts of our Nation, the economy is healthier. However, the people are not. While middle Americans are choking economically, Americans in the great cities of the east and west coasts are literally choking because their communities have failed to meet the air quality standards set by Congress 10 years ago.

There is a way out of these dilemmas. There is a clean air solution that will revitalize the agriculture, oil and coal industries, clean the air we breathe, and save money for the taxpayer and the consumer.

My legislation would amend the Clean Air Act to require that half the gasoline sold in the United States contain 10 percent ethanol and the other half 5 percent methanol and 2.5 percent ethanol.

Ethanol is made from feed grains and methanol from natural gas and coal. My proposal would result in environmentally acceptable market expansion for all of these products, thereby creating jobs and making the producer's efforts profitable.

We can do all of this without taking money away from the taxpayer or the consumer. For ethanol alone, the clean air solution would create a new demand for 2.5 billion bushels of feed grains a year, raising market prices above the Government loan rate and saving taxpayers billions of dollars in price support, storage, and other payments.

At the pump, the 6-cents-per-gallon tax credit for alcohol blended fuels will keep the prices paid by motorists competitive with the prices they pay today. Budget savings from the agricultural program will be plowed back into the highway trust fund in order to keep the fund from losing money because of the mandatory use of alcohol fuels.

In this way, consumers will pay for consumption of products—surely a healthier practice for the economy than forcing taxpayers to pay for storage of unneeded surplus.

The beauty of the clean air solution is that it will significantly reduce toxic pollutants in the air we breathe at the same time it revitalizes the extractive industries.

According to a study by the Colorado Department of Health, the use of 10 percent ethanol in gasoline reduces carbon monoxide emissions from automobiles by at least 16 percent. Similarly, gasoline containing a methanol-ethanol blend yields a reduction in ground-level ozone levels.

Just this week, the Governors of 41 of the 50 States received notice from the Environmental Protection Agency that areas within their States are out of compliance with national standards for carbon monoxide and ground-level ozone.

Eighty-one metro areas in the case of carbon monoxide and 76 in the case of ground-level ozone now have to go back to the drawing boards after 10 years of effort and devise costly and complicated plans to clean up their air—unless we adopt the clean air solution.

The clean air solution improves our national energy security, as well. My proposal would displace 250 million barrels of imported oil a year. In 3 years, the clean air solution would displace an amount of foreign oil equivalent to the oil the administration proposes to use to fill the strategic petroleum reserve.

Additionally, the clean air solution would provide the alcohol fuels industry with the incentive to build an infrastructure big enough to provide even more of its product in the years to come.

We'll need that added alcohol fuels production capacity as part of our quest for true energy independence in the first years of the 21st century.

Every barrel of oil we do not import improves our balance of trade, saves American jobs, and decreases the possibility that we will once again be held hostage by foreign oil potentates who decide to cut off our supply.

In closing, let me state that this proposal is not the last word in alcohol fuels proposals. It is merely the latest. I invite all of my colleagues to join with me in exploring ways to modify, improve, and advance this proposal.

However, I am convinced the time has come to require the use of alcohol fuels. We have waited too long for clean air. We have waited too long to create new markets for farm products. We have waited too long to create new jobs in the extractive industries. And we have waited too long to provide for our energy security.

The clean air solution gives Congress the opportunity to make strides toward solving some of the Nation's most intractable problems by enacting one piece of legislation. I hope we will not let this chance pass us by, for we do not know when it will come again.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the record a copy of the final report of the U.S. National Alcohol Fuels Commission on which I served as a member, together with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] who is also an original sponsor, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE], who was vice chairman of that commission. Since it has been more than 6 years since the issuance of that report, it is entirely appropriate to resubmit it at this time for the consideration of the Members.

The report referred to follows:

FUEL ALCOHOL—AN ENERGY ALTERNATIVE FOR THE 1980'S

THE COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commission was established to advise the Congress and the President on the near- and long-term potential for alcohol fuels to contribute to the Nation's liquid fuel needs.

The Commission's recommendations primarily address the need for public policies to encourage alcohol use in the transportation sector, which now accounts for more than 50 percent of national petroleum use. During the next decade, markets will also develop in petrochemical and utility-industrial stationary power applications. This will occur because biomass and coal-based alcohols will become economically competitive and will not need any public sector support for penetration into these markets. The transportation market differs; there probably will be no such spontaneous growth in the manufacture of pure-alcohol vehicles until automakers see a potential market. Limited public sector intervention is required to create this market; the Commission therefore calls for a Federal program to encourage the production and use of pure-alcohol vehicles and for the creation of the distribution system necessary to support those vehicles. The Commission's recommendations address the level and scope of that involvement.

A second category of Commission recommendations deals with financial incentives enacted by the Congress within the past year to promote the production and use of alcohol fuels. The administration of these incentives can be improved, as outlined in the Commission's Federal program acceleration recommendations.

A number of other statutes, policies, and programs—some enacted prior to the growing recognition of the need to increase alcohol fuels production and use—could profoundly affect or be affected by the development of the alcohol fuels industry in this country. The Commission recommends changes in a number of statutes, policies, and programs to remove unnecssary impediments to accelerated alcohol production and use, and to make sure that in seeking increased use of alcohol, the Nation does not needlessly contravene other important national goals and objectives.

Commissions serve a valuable role in raising before the public critical issues that are not being addressed adequately in the policymaking process. However, the continuing responsibility for program execution and oversight remains with the duly constituted bodies of the Federal Government—the Executive and the Congress. The Commission especially urges that the committees of the Congress exercise active and critical oversight of the progress toward the policy and program recommendations contained in this report. For it will be only through such diligence that an accelerated alcohol fuels program will be realized.

Finally, while the overall report enjoys the Commission's support, the language that follows embodies the Commission's desire to set forth specific policy recommendations. In each instance, the recommendations represent the views of a majority of its members.

ALCOHOL VEHICLE FLEET

The United States should develop vehicles to run on pure alcohol, and encourage the conversion of existing gasoline- and diesel-powered vehicles to alcohol, in order to diversity transportation fuel sources and to protect against an abrupt disruption in oil imports.

The basic elements of any pure-alcohol vehicle program would include:

Federal purchase guaranties to U.S. automakers of a least 50,000 vehicles in 1983,

with that figure increasing at a constant rate to 250,000 vehicles per year by 1987.

Transitional Federal support and tax incentives to place the vehicles in Federal, State, and local government fleets, as well as private sector fleets; incentives should also be directed at converting gasoline- and diesel-powered vehicles to pure alcohol in the public and private sectors and among individual owners.

A geographical distribution of the vehicles to provide the widest possible demonstration of their capabilities and performance in a variety of circumstances, and to expose the greatest segment of the population to the benefits of alcohol vehicles.

Vehicle fleet operations account for 6 or 7 percent of all vehicles in the United States and approximately 10 to 13 percent of new registrations. They offer the most likely prospect for introducing large numbers of new pure-alcohol or other alternative-fuel vehicles. Many fleets are serviced and fueled from central locations, facilitating the use of a fuel not readily available through the current petroleum-based fuel distribution system.

The use of pure-alcohol vehicles in the United States today is limited to a small number of fleet operations. The vehicles are modified versions of mass-produced automobiles. Modification can cost $750 or more per vehicle.

Current fleet use of pure-alcohol vehicles is so limited that it fails to achieve the economies of scale that can be realized through mass production of vehicles and bulk distribution of fuel.

A large-scale program would demonstrate the technical and economic feasibility of pure-alcohol vehicles and achieve the necessary economies of scale in vehicle production and fuel distribution. An important additional benefit would be to put the U.S. auto industry into the forefront of alternative fuel vehicle production interest in alcohol fuel production and use is increasing worldwide. Establishing the capacity in the U.S. auto industry would go far toward protecting American jobs in the industry and preparing for an expanded world demand for such vehicles.

In addition to fleet vehicle applications, other promising and important sectors are attractive for the introduction of pure-alcohol vehicles. Interest is increasing in the production of high-proof ethanol in on-farm or rural small-scale distilleries. Some produce the fuel for market, others for personal or agricultural vehicle use. A high degree of interest exists in converting vehicles to use ethanol from small-scale distilleries. Any national program offering incentives for conversion or production of pure-alcohol vehicles should take this interest into account. Because U.S. agriculture is so important not only to this Nation's balance of payments but also to world food supplies, nonpetroleum alternative fuels must be made available to American agriculture in the event of massive oil import disruptions.

Finally, public and emergency service vehicles should be considered. The production or conversion of transit, police, fire, ambulance, and similar vehicles should be encouraged through incentives similar to those for private fleet operators.

Provisions in the fiscal year 1981 Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriation Act (Public Law 94-400), which will finance the conversion of existing diesel buses to methanol use, should serve as a model for an expanded program of incentives.

At the proposed 1983 level of vehicle production, the additional manufacturing cost of producing pure-alcohol vehicles—rather than similar gasoline-powered vehicles—is small, approximately 5 percent of vehicle cost. This would permit recouping of retooling costs by the manufacturer. At the 1987 level, there may be no such cost penalty. The only significant cost to the public in undertaking this program would arise in establishing a fuel-distribution system (or altering the existing system) and a maintenance program for the vehicles. This cost would be justified by increased availability of non-petroleum fuels, and much of it could be recovered over the long term as price increases of gasoline and diesel fuel continued to outpace that of alcohol as a vehicle fuel.

FEDERAL PROGRAM ACCELERATION

Existing national programs to encourage alcohol fuel production and use must be fully and expeditiously implemented to provide the needed fuel for an expanded market. The administration of Federal support programs must be improved to remove much of the confusion, delay, and ineffectiveness now encountered.

The Energy Security Act and the Crude Oil Windfall Profit Tax Act of 1980 are the two principal instruments of Federal policy that encourage the production and use of alcohol fuels. The Commission directs specific recommendations to four primary areas under these two Acts:

The need for the U.S. Synthetic Fuels Corporation, created under Title I of the Energy Security Act, to give priority consideration to projects producing methanol from coal.

The need for the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Energy to execute fully all provisions for financial assistance to biomass-to-alcohol projects under Title II of the Energy Security Act.

The need for the Internal Revenue Service to issue expeditiously regulations under the Crude Oil Windfall Profit Tax Act to provide a greater degree of certainty for investors in alcohol fuel projects, and the need for the Congress to amend the Internal Revenue Code to remove disincentives to alcohol production.

The need to expand the ethanol raw material base beyond its present emphasis on livestock feed grains, and to assure that, to the degree the United States does use such grain for ethanol production, adequate grain reserves are maintained to meet both livestock feed and fuel requirements.

A fifth recommendation addresses the need to ensure that, as alcohol and other alternatives transportation fuels enter the marketplace, marketers and consumers are aware of the characteristics of these fuels and the precautions necessary in their handling and are guaranteed uniform product quality.

Coal-to-methanol

The U.S. Synthetic Fuels Corporation, established under Title I of the Energy Security Act, should give priority for financial assistance to construct coal-to-methanol plants in order to ensure an adequate supply of that fuel by the late 1980s for growing fleet and private transportation uses as well as for expected industrial and utility markets. Prior to full operation of the Corporation, the Department of Energy, acting under its authorities in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended by the Energy Security Act (Public Law 96-294), and the Federal Non-Nuclear Research and Development Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-577), should move rapidly to make the first commitments to plant construction.

Title I of the Energy Security Act establishes the U.S. Synthetic Fuels Corporation as an independent Federal entity to carry out the national nonbiomass synthetic fuel development program created by the Act.

The Corporation is charged with achieving a daily production rate equivalent to at least 500,000 barrels of crude oil by 1987 and 2,000,000 barrels of crude oil by 1992.

To achieve these goals, the Corporation may provide synthetic fuel projects with financial assistance in the form of loans, loan guaranties, price guaranties, purchase agreements, and joint ventures.

The Congress expected the Corporation to be in full operation no later than 15 months after passage of the Energy Security Act. To avoid delays during this interim period, Title I authorizes the President to provide financial assistance for synthetic fuel development under the Defense Production Act of 1950. In addition, the Department of Energy has authority under the Non-Nuclear Energy Research and Development Act to support such projects. Once the Corporation is in full operation, the interim authorities become standby powers of the President for possible use in emergencies.

Under the President's authority for an interim synthetic fuels program, the Department of Energy is accepting applications for financial assistance for synthetic fuels projects, including coal-to-methanol projects. Once the Corporation is in full operation, projects financed by the Department of Energy may be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Corporation.

The Congress has appropriated $17.5 billion to the Corporation for financial assistance during its first 4 years of operation. The Energy Security Act gives no specific direction to the Corporation about which synthetic fuels should receive priority. The Act does require consideration of certain factors in awarding financial assistance. These include: (1) diversity of technology; (2) overall production potential of the technology, taking into account its potential for replication, the availability and geographic distribution of its feedstock and potential uses of the fuel produced; and (3) unit cost of energy produced. Methanol-from-coal technology ranks high on all of these criteria.

If sizable numbers of pure-alcohol vehicles are to be introduced in the coming decade, methanol—as well as ethanol—must be available. Fuel requirements of these vehicles dictate that priority treatment be given to projects that produce methanol from coal.

Biomass-to-alcohol

All programs—including purchase agreements and price guaranties—established under Title II of the Energy Security Act should be fully implemented to ensure the maximum production and use of alcohol fuels from biomass.

Title II authorizes the Department of Agriculture and Energy to enter into product purchase agreements and price guaranties, in addition to providing loans and loan guaranties to build plants, for projects involving large- and small-scale production of alcohol fuels from biomass.

Neither Department has promulgated regulations to institute the purchase agreement and price guaranty programs, although both have implemented the loan guaranty authorities and the Department of

Agriculture, its loan authority. This restrained approach dampens the fullest private sector involvement in the program. Many potential biomass-alcohol producers believe that purchase and price guaranties are even more effective incentives to production than are loans and loan guaranties.

Tile II of the Energy Security Act also requires the President to issue an Executive Order requiring all Federal agencies that own or lease motor vehicles capable of using gasohol to use gasohol where it is available at reasonable prices and in reasonable quanities. This is the latest and most specific of a number of directives intended to increase gasohol markets through Federal Government purchases. It was signed on January 6, 1981.

The Federal fleet gasohol program has not been widely implemented, however. In fiscal 1979, only 13 million gallons—4 percent—of a total of 347 million gallons of motor fuel purchased by the Federal Government were gasohol. With few exceptions, Federal agencies have not set goals for increased gasohol use. The Congressional intent in the program is clear and should be fully executed.

The Department of Energy and the Department of Agriculture have further responsibility (in Title II of the Energy Security Act and a number of pre-existing authorities) to undertake alcohol fuel research and development, demonstration, and technical assistance programs. This will be especially important to the future growth of the Alcohol fuels industry. Not only is research needed in cellulosic technology and plant genetics (see Raw Materials Policy Recommendations), but also in a number of other important areas. Increases in energy efficiency in production of ethanol, advances in small-scale technology, and research into vehicle conversion and design of new vehicles to run on pure alcohol fuels are but a few of the significant areas in which additional research and technical assistance are needed.

Finally, the Department of Agriculture, because of its authority to finance smaller-scale alcohol production projects, should also exercise its responsibility to provide technical assistance and guidance to potential small-scale ethanol producers so that advances in this technology may be realized. This could be accomplished by financing research and demonstration projects directly, or by financing land grant and technical school research programs. A mix of these approaches is perferred.

Tax policy

The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) should immediately promulgate regulations under the Crude Oil Windfall Profit Tax Act. The Congress should amend the Internal Revenue Code to remove specific provisions that impede the development of the alcohol fuels industry.

The tax provisions of the Energy Tax Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-618) and the Crude Oil Windfall Profit Tax Act provide significant incentives for production and use of alcohol fuel. The provisions of these Acts have to be implemented by IRS regulations. The IRS generally is slow to write such regulations, preferring to wait to see what problems arise and what provisions need to be amplified. Many potential investors in the alcohol fuels industry are concerned about how the provisions of the Crude Oil Windfall Profit Tax Act will apply in specific situations or how particular terms in the Act will be defined.

Without IRS regulations, investors must guess at what final IRS determinations will be. Guessing wrong can mean loss of a tax credit that could make a project economically viable. The lack of regulations has a chilling effect on would-be investors. Therefore the IRS should move quickly to promulgate regulations, in order to carry out the intent of the Congress to provide strong incentives for alcohol fuels.

In addition to this administrative action, several changes are needed in the Internal Revenue Code: the Congress is urged to address these issues. These changes include the income tax credit for farmers and other who use alcohol fuel they have produced, the "still tax," and the 10 percent Energy Investment Tax Credit.

The Crude Oil Windfall Profit Tax Act provides an income tax credit of 40¢ per gallon of alcohol fuel of at least 190 proof (30¢ per gallon of alcohol fuel of at least 150 proof but less than 190 proof) for persons who use alcohol that they produce as a motor fuel. This was thought to be especially attractive to farmers interested in energy self-sufficiency. The Act states that this tax credit is both taxable and nonrefundable. Taxable means that the dollar amount of the tax credit must be included in one's annual income for tax purposes; this treatment results in raising the farmer's or other user's tax liability. The net effect is that the dollar value of the tax credit is reduced by as much as 40 percent. Because the tax credit is nonrefundable, farmers and other users are not allowed to claim tax refunds if the tax credit should exceed the amount of their tax liability.

The tax credit was intended to provide those persons, especially farmers, who wish to use the fuel alcohol they produce with an incentive equal to that offered to the general public to use gasohol; the tax credit as presently constituted does not do this. To correct this, the user's income tax credit should be made nontaxable and refundable.

The Internal Revenue Code imposes an annual tax of $55 on manufacturers of alcohol stills and a tax of $22 on each still or condenser manufactured. The cost of administering this so-called "still tax," originally enacted to aid the Department of the Treasury in keeping track of alcohol stills, now exceeds the approximately $6,000 it generates annually. Additionally, the Department of the Treasury, through its Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, now has other means of keeping track of stills. The still tax unnecessarily escalates the cost of alcohol fuel stills, especially to small-scale producers, and imposes needless paperwork and reporting requirements on private businesses. These taxes should be repealed.

Finally, alcohol fuel production equipment that is financed by "subsidized energy financing" does not qualify for the 10 percent Energy Investment Tax Credit provided by the Crude Oil Windfall Profit Tax Act. Loan guaranties are not considered subsidized energy financing, and therefore do not make the borrower ineligible for the Energy Investment Tax Credit. However, the Act does not specify whether price guaranties and purchase agreements are to be considered subsidized energy financing. The Congress should eliminate this uncertainty.

Raw materials policy

The biomass resource base for fuel alcohol production must be expanded beyond its heavy reliance on livestock feed grain to include the full range of cellulosic materials as well as alternative starch and sugar crops. To the extent that grains are used as a raw material for ethanol production, U.S. grain reserves must be expanded to meet the increased demand.

Any long-term competition between fuel and animal feed uses of grains resulting in high food price inflation can be avoided if concerted efforts are made to expand research on technology for production of ethanol and methanol from cellulose materials and on plant genetics to develop new sugar, starch, and cellulose energy crops. In addition, means must be found to review, through normal policymaking processes, national needs and priorities for energy, feed, and exports of agricultural products in light of the overall necessity to reduce oil imports.

The expected level of ethanol production from animal feed grain over the next five years will not be sufficient to bring about significant food price increases, nor to affect adversely the ability of the United States to provide food grains for humanitarian purposes. However, over the longer term, if significant amounts of alcohol fuels are to be produced from biomass, the raw materials base must be expanded to include cellulosic materials such as municipal garbage, wood, forestry and wood product wastes, and crop residues as well as potential new sugar, starch, and cellulose crops.

Federal support for cellulosic research, development and demonstration has been minimal. The Department of Energy estimates that less than $5 million has gone into cellulosic research. The Energy Security Act contains no specific goals or targets regarding cellulose-derived alcohol and no specific priorities for cellulosic technology. There is no program for ensuring comprehensive research on and demonstration of all promising technologies to determine which is most promising for commercial production of cellulose-derived ethanol. This situation is unacceptable in light of the small cost of a cellulose-to-alcohol demonstration effort reltive to the long-term benefits to be derived.

The state of cellulose-to-alcohol technology requires pilot plant testing of the technology, proof-of-design, and verification of production costs before full commercial operation will attract private sector investment. The Commission recommends that a cellulose-to-alcohol demonstration program be undertaken that would prove the commercial feasibility of fuel alcohol plants using cellulose from municipal waste, silviculture, and agriculture. This program should receive high priority from the Departments of Energy and Agriculture and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), with a target date for commercial operation by 1985.

One aspect of the effort is authorized in existing law. The Energy Security Act established within the Department of Energy a new Office of Energy From Municipal Waste, with responsibility for implementing a comprehensive energy-from-waste financial support program. The Act provides priority financing for any municipal solid waste project producing liquid fuel (such as ethanol or methanol). If this provision were fully executed, it would provide substantial benefit to urban areas beyond the production of fuel. A pressing environmental concern—the disposal of municipal solid waste—would be reduced, and new jobs would be created in areas suffering from high unemployment. The Commission recommends that the Energy From Municipal Waste provisions of the Energy Security Act be fully implemented with emphasis on producing liquid fuels.

Over the next 5 to 10 years, during which U.S. ethanol production will rely on livestock feed grain as a primary raw material, the role of grain reserves will take on added importance. The farmer-owned livestock feed grain reserve has been popular with most farmers and has stabilized prices. However, total U.S. grain stocks, including reserves insulated from the market under the existing program, are not large enough to provide consistently assured supplies for all uses at reasonable prices. Expanded reserves will be needed over the next few years in order to meet export, feed, and fuel needs as ethanol production creates an expanded new market for livestock feed grains.

The Commission recommends that the Department of Agriculture seek to ensure adequate grain supplies by providing that farmers are given incentives to produce and make available grain in the quantities needed. The Congress should continue an adequate farmer-owned grain reserve program to meet food, feed, and fuel needs when the program comes up for reauthorization in the 1981 farm bill.

Providing adequate incentives to farmers to produce and make available these grains in the quantities needed is the best approach to ensure that there are supplies of these grains to meet all uses and to keep consumer prices within reasonable bounds.

Finally, the Commission recommends that the Department of Agriculture aggressively pursue research on the potential for converting the protein and other byproducts from ethanol production to human use, and on enhancing their marketability as animal feed both domestically and overseas. It must be recognized that the production of ethanol from livestock feed grain does not remove the entire nutritive content of the grain. Depending upon the milling and fermentation processes used, a variety of valuable byproducts—including high-protein concentrates, oils, and carbon dioxide—are produced. These can contribute to the production of human food and animal feed and are expected to find an expanding market in the years ahead.

Increased use of the byproducts will reduce demand for soybeans, the most widely used source of plant protein. This will result in an overall reduction in energy required to plant, harvest, and process soybeans.

Consumer protection

The Federal Government should cooperate with the private sector to establish voluntary fuel specifications for all alternative transportation fuels, beginning with gasohol, and should assure that all consumer protection and truth-in-labeling provisions that apply to traditional fuels also apply to alternative fuels.

As the use of alcohol fuels increases, standard references for quality and performance that are used to judge traditional fuels such as diesel and gasoline will become meaningless. The different chemical makeup of the new fuels and their varying energy content and combustion characteristics will require a new set of standards, specifications, and labeling requirements to be used by the industry for the benefit of producers, blenders, and marketers as well as by the consuming public.

Gasohol provides a good case in point. There is presently no uniform national specification for gasohol. Automotive fuel specifications are developed by members of the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) representing the fuel and automotive manufacturing industries as well as the public sector. The specifications are adopted, and to some extent enforced, by individual State governments. This voluntary approach to standards-setting, which has succeeded in providing the consumer with good quality fuels, is desirable for setting gasohol specifications.

ASTM has developed an information document on gasohol that is to be followed eventually by a specification. In the absence of such a standard, however, several States have developed their own standards and quality control procedures. In addition, the Federal Government has developed a specification for its purchases of gasohol. The possibility exists that a number of standards, varying from location to location, may evolve. This is contrary to how other fuel standards have been set and it complicates gasohol marketing. If such a trend continued for other alternative fuels, serious problems could arise, creating an impediment to the development of nonpetroleum transportation fuels.

In order to rectify the situation, the Commission recommends that the U.S. Department of Defense (which has developed the Federal gasohol specification) work closely with the ASTM to develop voluntary gasohol standards and adopt those as the standards for all Federal gasohol purchases. This will help to encourage a nationwide adoption of a uniform standard without having to implement mandatory national standards.

Gasohol is also exempted from Federal Trade Commission requirements that gasoline octane be posted at all retail gasoline pumps. This exemption was originally granted because it was believed to be a burdensome requirement given the low level of gasohol consumption. With gasohol marketing increasing, the reason for the exemption no longer exists. It is important that gasohol's octane be posted to reflect its value as a high-octane gasoline. In order to provide consumers of gasohol with the same protection enjoyed by consumers of gasoline, the Commission recommends that the Federal Trade Commission require gasohol retailers to post fuel octane on all pumps and that the practice be extended as appropriate to all liquid alternative fuels.

PROGRAM RECONCILIATION

Existing Federal laws, policies, and programs that may impede or be adversely affected by increased alcohol fuels production and use must be evaluated and revised to ensure that potential problems are resolved prior to achievement of significant levels of alcohol production and use.

A number of Federal laws set national policies and goals that are seemingly unrelated to alcohol fuels production and use, but in fact are related. In enacting these laws, the Congress did not—and had no reason to—address how such programs and goals would relate to the need to increase production and use of alcohol fuel. In the absence of corrective actions, conflicts could affect the degree to which alcohol fuel will succeed as a petroleum replacement. The Commission recommends a thorough and periodic review and evaluation of several policy and program areas to determine how they affect or are affected by an expanded alcohol fuels program.

The Commission sees no innate conflict between increased reliance on alcohol fuels and the policy areas discussed below. The Nation can achieve the policy goals of all the indicated programs with moderate adjustments to either the alcohol fuels program or the other programs. But these problems must be addressed now, or they could overwhelm political and policymaking institutions in future years.

The Commission has identified two primary policy areas that will have a significant effect on, and in turn be affected by, increased reliance on alcohol fuels: environmental policies, primarily under the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-95) and the Clean Water Act Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-217); and transportation policies affecting vehicle fuel economy requirements and the Highway Trust Fund.

Motor vehicle emissions

The Congress should amend the Clean Air Act to:

Provide alcohol fuels and fuel blends a limited exemption from rules governing the introduction and use of new automotive fuels;

Allow modification of engines being converted from gasoline or diesel use to pure-alcohol use (which is now prohibited by anti-tampering provisions of the Act); and

Permit waiver of vehicle engine emission certification requirements involving restricted production engines designed to run on alcohol fuels.

Ethanol and methanol are both environmentally attractive automotive fuels. Both are clean-burning fuels that show reductions in total regulated emissions compared with those of gasoline and diesel fuel. However, several provisions of the Clean Air Act could prevent the introduction into commerce of these fuels as well as the new vehicles to burn them.

Section 211(f) of the Act effectively bans commercial use of new fuels that are not substantially similar to gasoline. A fuel manufacturer can apply for a waiver of this prohibition, but must supply the Administrator of EPA with extensive evidence to prove that the fuel does not cause air quality problems or failure of vehicle emission control devices. The procedure is costly and time-consuming and would be particularly so for new fuels such as alcohols that are introduced initially in small volumes.

The Commission recommends that the Congress amend the Clean Air Act to exempt alcohol fuels from this requirement during their initial limited use. Notwithstanding this exemption, if the EPA found an imminent and substantial endangerment of public health, the Agency could commence action under Section 307 of the Act to ban the fuel. The proposed Commission change simply would provide the flexibility to help introduce alcohol fuels more quickly into commerce, while retaining the necessary and adequate safeguards for public health.

Sections 203(a)(3)A and B of the Clean Air Act prevent a vehicle manufacturer or dealer, or persons engaged in the business of repairing, servicing, selling, leasing, or trading vehicles or vehicle engines from altering vehicles so that they do not meet certification-approved manufacturer specifications. At present, therefore, an existing vehicle cannot be legally modified by any of these groups to operate on pure alcohol or any other synthetic alternative fuels. At least 39 States extend this anti-tampering prohibition to individual owners.

The Commission recommends that the Clean Air Act be amended to allow vehicle manufacturers and dealers to modify existing vehicles to operate on alternative fuels, provided that the controlled emissions of the modified vehicle are not substantially different from those of the unmodified vehi-

cle. The Commission also urges State legislatures to consider similar modifications to State anti-tampering requirements.

Section 206 of the Clean Air Act requires that vehicle manufacturers provide the Administrator of EPA with extensive information and automobiles for testing to determine engine emissions for vehicles to be offered in the market, in order to certify that the emissions are within allowable limits set by the Act.

Once the vehicle engine is found to conform to regulations, its manufacturer is granted a certificate of conformity. The certification process takes up to 1 year and rests on data obtained from a test fleet of about 100 vehicles.

Test data suggest that alcohol vehicles could survive such a certification procedure and meet all regulated Federal emission standards. However, requiring standard certification would mean a built-in one-year delay in the introduction of new vehicles and fuels. In addition, this certification procedure is costly for a limited production volume of vehicles.

The Commission recommends that the Clean Air Act be amended to permit a temporary engine certification waiver for alcohol engines to expedite the introduction into the marketplace of engines capable of using the new fuels. The period of the waiver should be based on production volume. Once the production of alcohol vehicles exceeds 0.5 percent of new vehicles produced, certification procedures would again become effective. This approach is environmentally acceptable and is cost-effective for the automobile engine manufacturer.

Synthetic fuel plant standards

The Environmental Protection Agency should move expeditiously to establish environmental standards for first-generation synthetic fuel plants—including ethanol and methanol plants—to provide the certainty necessary to encourage private sector investment.

Federal environmental laws—the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977, the Clean Water Act Amendments of 1977, and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-580)—establish performance standards for regulated pollutants from categories of facilities such as refineries and coal-fired power plants. However, EPA has not set standards for emissions, effluents, and solid wastes that will be generated by synthetic fuels facilities using new processes to manufacture new products. In the case of ethanol distilleries and methanol plants, more is known of their processes and emissions than for other synthetic fuel processes because the technologies have been employed by industry. Even for these relatively well-known technologies, however, EPA has not set performance standards.

Although EPA is compiling Synthetic Fuel Pollution Control Guidance Documents, the Agency is hesitant to issue any new regulations without plant performance information. Yet, private investors are not willing to construct new facilities without the certainty that environmental standards will remain unchanged during the life of the plant. The Commission recommends that EPA set standards for first-generation plants, working with industry on the understanding that standards would remain unchanged for those plants in the absence of proof of a clear public health hazard.

Data collected from this first generation of plants could be used as a foundation for any new regulations (either more or less strict) found to be warranted. Only new plants constructed after the issuance of the regulations should be required to comply with the new regulations.

Motor vehicle fuel economy

Motor vehicle fuel economy measurements, used as the basis for judging whether auto manufacturers meet federally required economy standards, must be modified to allow a fair comparison between petroleum-based and alternative automotive fuels. A fuel economy credit should be given to manufacturers that produce vehicles capable of running on pure alcohol or other nonpetroleum fuels.

Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards were established by the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975. The CAFE standards require an automobile manufacturer to achieve a minimum of miles-per-gallon performance, on average, for all vehicles that it produces. If a manufacturer produces vehicles that perform below the minimum, it must also produce vehicles that exceed the minimum. The CAFE standards went into effect in 1978, requiring an average performance of 18 miles per gallon; they will require an average performance of 27.5 miles per gallon by 1985.

Whether a company meets the CAFE standards is greatly affected by sales. In general, CAFE standards are being met fairly easily because buyers are demanding smaller and more fuel-efficient cars.

In addition to the CAFE standards, improved fuel economy is encouraged in the Energy Tax Act of 1978 by the "gas guzzler" tax. Manufacturers pay a tax on any new car that fails to achieve a certain miles-per-gallon performance. The cutoff point in 1980 is 15 miles per gallon; by 1986, new cars achieving less than 21 per gallon will be taxed.

The legal measure of vehicle fuel economy now is in miles per gallon. This measure fails to reflect the fact that alternative fuels may contain more or less energy per unit of volume than gasoline or may not even be measured in the same units. For example, alcohol contains less energy per gallon than gasoline, and its fuel economy is less if measured in miles per gallon. This method of measurement would penalize unfairly manufacturers building pure-alcohol vehicles.

A simple unit of measurement exists that can greatly clarify the real energy consumption of vehicles. This unit is the British thermal unit (Btu), which is used in measuring energy expenditure. (A Btu is the amount of energy required to raise 1 pound of water 1 degree (F) in temperature.)

The Commission believes that all liquid fuel economy measurements for vehicles should be made in miles per million Btus. This more accurately represents energy use rather than quantity of fuel. On a miles per million Btu basis, alcohol is more efficient than gasoline.

The purpose of fuel economy standards is to conserve petroleum fuels. Alternative fuels help to achieve this goal, and they ought not to be unfairly penalized by fuel economy measurement methods. A simple and realistic method of measuring energy used in the transportation sector will benefit more than just a pure-alcohol vehicles program; it will aid in greater public understanding of the qualities of synthetic and other alternative fuels in all respects.

The Commission also believes that in order to encourage the production of vehicles designed to operate on nonpetroleum fuels, manufacturers of such vehicles should be allowed to factor the actual petroleum savings of such vehicles into the CAFE standards compliance. This would put such vehicles on equal footing with electric vehicles, which were given such treatment as a result of action by the 96th Congress.

Finally, the testing procedures and fuel economy reporting methods should also be modified to provide the public with fuel economy performance information that more clearly reflects actual on-road use of the vehicle, rather than an idealized figure fathered under laboratory conditions. This would be an improvement over the current system, which is inaccurate and misleading.

Highway trust fund

The Commission recommends that the Congress (in examining financing mechanisms during reauthorization of the Highway Trust Fund) recognize that the 4¢ per gallon gasohol exemption from the Federal motor fuel excise tax is important to the development of this alternative fuel, and that adequate revenues are necessary to ensure the solvency of the Trust Fund and a system of well-maintained highways. The Commission strongly urges the Congress to consider these points during reauthorization of the Trust Fund so that alternative funding methods are found that will accomplish these ends.

The Energy Tax Act of 1978 exempted gasohol from the 4¢ per gallon Federal motor fuel excise tax. The Crude Oil Windfall Profit Tax Act of 1980 extended gasohol's exemption through 1992. The revenue generated by the motor fuel excise tax goes to the Highway Trust Fund. To the extent that the use of gasohol increases, the revenue going to the Trust Fund decreases. The Department of Transportation estimated in January 1980, that for the period 1981 through 1990, the Fund would lose tax revenue of between $2.7 billion and $4 billion—a loss of 3 to 5 percent—because of the gasohol exemption. The Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation estimated in February 1980 that, for the period from January 1, 1979, through December 31, 1992, the Fund would lose revenue of $4 billion because of the gasohol exemption. Some industry estimates of revenue loss for the period 1981 through 1990 reach $7.4 billion.

Legal authority for the Trust Fund expires in 1984, and statutory authority for gasohol's exemption will be in question. The 97th Congress is expected to consider extending the Trust Fund beyond 1984, and possibly to restructure and increase the taxes that support the Trust Fund. This action is anticipated because the tax revenues going to the Trust Fund have now stabilized, while highway construction costs continue to climb. The increasing use of exemptions, of which gasohol is only one, has compounded an already deteriorating situation for the Trust Fund. Improved vehicle fuel efficiency, a slowing rate of travel growth, and reliance on a constant fuel tax rate all contribute to the problem.

The Energy Security Act establishes a national production goal for 1990 of enough biomass-based alcohol fuel to equal 10 percent of the gasoline consumed within the United States. If that goal were achieved solely through the use of gasohol (that is, if all gasoline in 1990 were gasohol), the Trust Fund's revenues would be reduced by about 67 percent from what they would have been at that time. To the degree that the goal was not completely achieved, or was achieved in part through the use of biomass-derived alcohol in pure-alcohol vehi-

cles (which would not qualify for the exemption), the Trust Fund revenue loss would be less. The remainder of the Fund's tax revenues come from other non-fuel excise taxes (such as the excise tax on tires and on new vehicles). Additionally, the Fund receives interest income from the U.S. Treasury on its balance.

The Congressional Conference Committee for the Crude Oil Windfall Profit Tax Act attempted to soften the potential effect of the gasohol exemption on the Trust Fund revenue. Recognizing that the Trust Fund's revenue base would soon be reconsidered by the Congress, the Conference Committee stated that "the exemption for alcohol fuels should not apply to any future increases in the taxes on gasoline or other motor fuels to the extent that such increases result in the taxes being imposed at a rate in excess of 4 cents per gallon."

The Department of Transportation is considering different new highway user taxes and tax changes in anticipation of Congressional consideration of these issues in 1981 as required by the Crude Oil Windfall Profit Tax Act.

Among the types of taxes being considered and analyzed are varying fuel taxes and tax determination methods, weight and distance taxes, computed on the basis of vehicle size and load as well as miles traveled, and various new or reconstituted non-fuel taxes that generally appear as excise taxes on equipment or vehicles.

The Congress should give careful consideration to these and other alternative financing mechanisms—including such other options as revenues from the Crude Oil Windfall Profit Tax.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communications from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 8, 1987.

Hon. JIM WRIGHT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule L(50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena duces tecum issued by the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. After consultation with my General Counsel, I will notify you of my determinations as required by the House Rule.

With great respect, I am,
Sincerely yours,
DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 8, 1987.

Hon. JIM WRIGHT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule L(50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. After consultation with my General Counsel, I will notify you of my determinations as required by the House Rule.

With great respect, I am,
Sincerely yours,
DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND TITLE XI AND XVIII OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would make the prospective payment system more equitable for the providers under the Medicare Program.

The prospective payment system of reimbursement for hospitals was a radical change from the retrospective cost-based system. Since we adopted this complex proposal in the 1983 Social Security Act amendments, Congress has been refining the system each year by amendments designed to improve both the policy and the payments to hospitals. Amendments have adjusted payments to hospitals which serve a disproportionate share of low income patients, sought to improve the quality of hospital care, and recalculated payments to improve reimbursement for rural hospitals among other things.

I believe that it is time for Congress to make an additional change in the law to resolve the disparity that exists in the appeals process. Under the current system, if a hospital claim is denied by the peer review organization (PRO), the beneficiary and the provider have the right to appeal that decision. If the claim is denied at the reconsideration level, however, only the patient has the right to pursue an appeal to the administrative law judge (ALJ) and, if necessary, for judicial review. Under my bill, providers and practitioners would have the same rights to appeal as beneficiaries.

It is important to remember that patients have little incentive to pursue an appeal because they are not legally responsible for bills incurred—unless told at the outset that the hospital services would probably not be covered. Moreover, many elderly patients who are just released from the hospital do not have the stamina to undertake an appeal. Many older persons are unfamiliar with the legal process and reluctant to initiate legal proceedings. These conditions, coupled with their lack of financial responsibility, explain why patients often lack the incentive to pursue an appeal through the rigors of the multilevel appeals process.

Many physicians and hospital administrators feel that because it is the providers and practitioners who bear the financial burdens when a claim is denied, they should have the right to pursue a hearing before an ALJ and judicial review. Many feel that the current statutory provision excluding providers and practitioners from appealing adverse determinations by the PRO beyond reconsideration is a violation of their right to due process guaranteed by the Constitution.

Although there are other concerns with the prospective payment system that need to be addressed, I believe that this bill would make the system more equitable for all those who participate as providers and practitioners. I urge my colleagues to review the bill and become cosponsors.

H.R. 2058

A bill to amend titles XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to provider appeals of adverse determinations by peer review organizations

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

SECTION 1. PROVIDER APPEALS OF ADVERSE DETERMINATIONS BY PEER REVIEW ORGANIZATIONS UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Section 1879(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395pp(d)) is amended by inserting "or under section 1155 (when the determination is under part B of title XI)" after "applicable)".

(2) The second sentence of section 1155 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1320c-5) is amended by inserting ", practitioner, or provider" after "beneficiary" each place it appears.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to determinations made by a contracting peer review organization on or after the first day of the first month that begins more than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

THE SQUARE DANCE: THE AMERICAN FOLK DANCE OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill that would designate the square dance as the "American Folk Dance of the United States of America." In the 97th Congress, a resolution (Public Law 97-188) was adopted designating the square dance as the National Folk Dance for 1982 and 1983. Two hundred sixty-five Members of Congress supported that legislation. I am pleased to be joined today in introducing this resolution by Representatives LARRY SMITH, TONY COELHO, CLAY SHAW, and 13 other Members.

Square dancing is defined as the American Folk dance that is called, cued, or prompted to its participants. The variations in square dancing styles include squares, rounds, contras, clogging, line and heritage dances. Square dancing is easy to learn and participate in, and an activity in which it is easy to meet and make friends with others. In addition, Americans appreciate the display of etiquette that is a major element of square dancing.

There are numerous historical and other reasons that square dancing deserves permanent recognition by Congress. This form of dancing has been a popular tradition in this country since the earliest part of our colonial history, and it has attained a lofty status as a significant part of our country's folklore. As a traditional, wholesome form of family recreation in which people of all ages can take part, square dancing is an activity that symbolizes one of this country's basic strengths: The unity of the family. It also epitomizes the egalitarian spirit that is at the heart of our democracy because it pays no attention to arbitrary social or other distinctions—people from all

walks of life equally enjoy square dancing. In addition, square dancing is an activity in which the elderly, as well as the physically and mentally handicapped, can fully participate, thereby greatly enriching their lives. Square dancing truly expresses the vibrant, egalitarian spirit of the people of this country.

This bill would give permanent recognition to the great American tradition. Today, there are almost 8,000 square dance clubs throughout the United States with over 1 million active dancers spanning two generations. All of these are nonprofit, self-supporting groups, none of which seek support from Congress or any other branch of government. In addition, 8 million other adults know how to square dance, and millions of school children regularly participate in this activity in their schools.

No other type of American folk dance has such broad appeal or represents such an amalgamation of various folk dance traditions. Seven States (Alabama, New Jersey, Oregon, Tennessee, Washington, Florida, and West Virginia) and 49 nations around the world have already designated the square dance as the American folk dance for their own territories. The wording of the resolutions of these States and nations is identical or very similar to that of the resolution being submitted today. If almost one third of the world's nations have so recognized the square dance, does it not seem most appropriate to do so in the United States, the country where it originated and is most practiced?

The square dance continues to thrive across this Nation and deserves the permanent recognition that this legislation would provide. I thank my colleagues for their support of previous square dance resolutions, and urge you to continue and extend this support by sponsoring the bill before you today.

SECRETARY SHULTZ SHOULD BE FIRED IF HE INSISTS ON GOING TO MOSCOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, my special order today is entitled: "Secretary Shultz should be fired if he insists on going to Moscow."

Today a considerable number of Congressmen signed a letter to President Reagan calling on him to change the proposed visit by Secretary Shultz from Moscow to a neutral site. The letter reads as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 9, 1987.

Hon. RONALD REAGAN,
The President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We strongly support Congressman Broomfield's request that Secretary Shultz visit to Moscow next week be moved to a neutral country where confidentiality of communication can be assured.

We cannot pretend to continue business as usual with a Soviet dictatorship which systematically violates diplomatic principles and ridicules the United States in the process.

If our Secretary of State and Ambassador cannot communicate securely, we should refuse to participate in a charade of "normalcy." It is vital that the new Soviet leadership learn now that we have the self confidence to reject phony relations built on false assurances.

We respectfully request your consideration of our recommendation.

Sincerely,

Jack J. Duncan, Olympia Snowe, Dan Mica, ——, ——, Frank Horton, Jerry Lewis, Manuel Lujan, Jr., Hank Brown, Guy Vander Jagt, Bob Michel.

□ 1650

I have been told over 150 Members have signed that letter. This letter, which I signed, and many of my colleagues signed, frames the choice for President Reagan. Congressman BROOMFIELD is correct in noting that a trip to Moscow in these circumstances would be a major error.

Secretary of State Shultz is reported in today's New York Times to have said,

They invaded our sovereign territory and we are damned upset about it. We are upset at them and we are also upset at ourselves and we intend to do everything we can to correct our problems.

Nevertheless, he said he would not accept suggestions that he postpone the trip. The administration, he explains, remains committed to creating "a more constructive and stable relationship with the Soviet Union." Note the Secretary of State says the Soviets have invaded "our sovereign territory" and then says we are going to have a "more constructive and stable relationship with the Soviet Union."

Two Representatives from the House, Congresswoman OLYMPIA SNOWE from the State of Maine and Congressman DAN MICA of the State of Florida, have visited the Soviet Union and have seen the current and future embassies. They are quoted in the New York Times as urging "Mr. Shultz to reconsider his decision to go. We question whether he can conduct substantive diplomacy in this kind of atmosphere." Now, that is what Mr. MICA said.

Frankly, the United States has not looked this inept and this humiliated since Jimmy Carter left the White House.

Consider the facts: the Soviets seduce our guards, infiltrate our current embassy with listening devices, build our new embassy with so many electronic bugs it will probably be unusable; faced with American outrage, the Soviet foreign ministry spokesman has been laughing, mocking and ridiculing the United States.

Faced with this outrageous behavior, Secretary of State Shultz uses strong language. The Washington Times reports:

We didn't break into their embassy, they broke into ours, Mr. Shultz said. They invaded our sovereign territory. They can't expect to continue to incessantly massively work to create a hostile environment for our people overseas without a cost to themselves in their relation to us.

Yet Secretary Shultz' behavior encourages the Soviets to believe they can, I repeat, can expect to continue to incessantly massively work to create a hostile environment in our embassy.

Secretary Shultz's words of "invading our sovereign territory" are the words of Churchill. His actions of proposing to go to Moscow despite everything is an appeasement action worthy of Chamberlain.

When asked yesterday if he would take steps to force Soviet changes in our embassy, Secretary Shultz replied, according to the Wall Street Journal:

The United States is presenting to an arbitration process claims for jobs that weren't done in accord with what we contracted for. He said it is a hard, difficult, delicate process.

It is like suggesting, after being mugged, that the mugger be taken to a local arbitrator.

President Reagan, which is it to be? Is this incident just a minor problem as Secretary Shultz asserted? Or is it an invasion of our sovereign territory, as Secretary Shultz assserted?

The new U.S. ambassador to Moscow, Jack Matlock, Jr., has filed a formal protest in Moscow, accusing the Soviet Union of a breach of the "norms of diplomatic conduct."

Let me suggest several principles. First, at a minimum, Congressman BROOMFIELD's request that we move the meeting to a neutral country is right. It would send the signal that we want to meet but we want to meet fairly, honestly, on our terms, with security. We would be leaving Moscow because the Soviets force us to leave Moscow. If they want to come halfway, Helsinki or Vienna would be fine.

Let me say to the President: if the State Department has now so co-opted Secretary Shultz that no matter what the outrage, no matter what the activity, no matter what the violation, no matter what the Soviets do or what they say, no matter how they mock or humiliate us, he is determined to go to Moscow, then I would strongly urge that he return with his resignation in hand or that the President fire him.

The simple fact is this State Department has mismanaged the Marine Guards, the State Department mismanaged the security, the State Department mismanaged the negotiations for the embassy, the State Department mismanaged building of the embassy. We are now being laughed at by the Soviet Union. For us to crawl to Moscow to accept a meeting under circumstances where there is only one tiny room in the entire embassy that is secure would be a humiliating act of self-flagellation unworthy of the United States of America. I hope the Secretary will change his mind. I hope

the President will, if necessary, force him to change his mind.

But if this trip should go on in these circumstances, I would strongly urge President Reagan to fire Secretary Shultz, to appoint a rigorous committee to thoroughly overhaul the State Department and to come to Congress for substantial legislative authority to review and reexamine the entire security process of the U.S. State Department.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

Washington, DC, January 21, 1987.

Hon. JIM WRIGHT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule L(50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. After consultation with my General Counsel, I will notify you of my determinations as required by the House Rule.

With great respect, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Hon. WALTER E. FAUNTROY:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 20, 1987.

Hon. JIM WRIGHT,
Speaker of the House,
U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule L(50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that a former member of my staff has been served with a trial subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with General Counsel to the Clerk, I will make the determinations as required by the House Rule.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER E. FAUNTROY,
Member of Congress.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). The Clerk will suspend.

The gentleman from Michigan will state his point of order.

Mr. CONYERS. Is it not appropriate that the special orders entered into from the previous day be issued before all of these other important communications be put into the RECORD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a matter that is at the discretion of the Chair, and they have to be reported today. We were trying to accommodate all Members. This is a matter at the discretion of the Chair. The Clerk was about to conclude. We have one additional one and the Chair asks that the gentleman bear with us.

Mr. CONYERS. Well, I thank the Speaker for the Speaker's response, and I appreciate his discretion. He has always operated the special orders with nothing but more than fairness to me and to everybody else in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I appreciate the comments of my distinguished friend from Michigan.

The Clerk will report the communication.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SERGEANT AT ARMS OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 16, 1987.

Hon. JIM WRIGHT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule L(50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee. After consultation with the General Counsel to the Clerk, I will notify you of my determinations as required by the House Rule.

Sincerely,

JACK RUSS,
Sergeant at Arms.

RELEASE GENERAL REVENUE SHARING TRUST FUND MONEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ECKART] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of an action brought by the National Association of Counties against the Treasurer of the United States. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues are painfully aware, the General Revenue Sharing Program [GRS] is no longer in existence to assist localities in meeting the most basic needs of its citizenry. But, what my colleagues may not be aware of, is that when GRS was terminated at the end of last year, there remained in the trust fund approximately $180 million. While those funds were sequestered under the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act, the sequestration was not to be permanent. Section 256 of the act provides that:

> Any amount of new budget authority, unobligated balances, obligated balances, * * * spending authority or obligation limitations which is sequestered or reduced pursuant to an order issued under section 252 is permanently cancelled, with the exception of amounts sequestered in special or trust funds, which shall remain in such funds and be available in accordance with and to the extent permitted by law, including the provisions of this act.

There is no statutory provision preventing disbursement of the sequestered revenue sharing funds. Indeed, the Revenue Sharing Act itself provides that the funds in the trust fund "remain available until expended." The act further provides that "each unit of general local government is entitled to an amount equal to any amount allocated to the Government" under the revenue sharing formula.

Under the State and local government fiscal act, the Secretary of the Treasury personally is the trustee of the trust fund. It appears to me that to fail to distribute the full amount of the trust fund would be a breach of his fiduciary responsibilities to the trust fund and its beneficiaries, the local governments across the country. This trust responsibility has been reaffirmed in a statutory mandate under the consolidated Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1985 that reversions to the Treasury's general fund from the trust fund only be made "after all of such entitlement payments are completely made" in accordance with the law.

Mr. Speaker, colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I ask you to join me in supporting the National Association of Counties in their fight against this injustice. If the whole of the General Revenue Sharing Program is gone, the least that can be done is to provide the trust fund moneys that lawfully belong to the local governments of our Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DIXON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

MIAMISBURG TRAIN DERAILMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last summer on July 8, a train carrying hazardous materials, white phosphorus and sulfur, derailed in my congressional district in Miamisburg, OH. Today I am introducing legislation that responds to some of the problems we saw in our policies, or lack thereof, that govern the safe transportation of hazardous materials by rail.

Mr. Speaker, every day 3,000 carloads of hazardous materials are shipped by rail. These loads travel over farmland and into populated communities all over the country. The safe transportation of these materials must be a top priority for us in Congress.

During the Miamisburg derailment, a tanker containing 12,000 pounds of white phosphorus exploded and burned, emitting poisonous fumes, for 5 days. Over 30,000 people in the cities of Miamisburg, Moraine, West Carrollton, as well as Jefferson and Washington townships were evacuated and spent up to 5 days in high school gyms and convention centers. Nearly 600 residents were treated at local hospitals for respiratory and eye problems.

Local taxpayers spent nearly $500,000 responding to the accident, and are still negoti-

ating for the reimbursement of these expenses.

Although the accident happened last summer, approximately 2 weeks ago some pockets of phosphorus ignited on contact with air and burned again.

Mr. Speaker, our local officials coordinated over 30 jurisdictional bodies and demonstrated outstanding leadership in resolving the crisis and saving lives. However, the Miamisburg case raises some questions about our Federal policies as they pertain to the transportation of hazardous materials by rail. My legislation, which is cosponsored by Representative TOM LUKEN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism and Hazardous Materials, addresses those concerns.

First, our bill requires the Department of Transportation [DOT] to develop emergency response procedures for railroads to follow when these accidents occur. Miamisburg firefighters and other emergency officials had trouble getting information about the types of hazardous materials on the train, and where they were located. The bill requires the train personnel to turn over this information and work with local emergency firefighters and officials in responding to the situation.

Second, the bill will retire old tank cars, like the one that carried phosphorus through Miamisburg. That car was over 20 years old and, according to the National Transportation Safety Board [NTSB], would not meet current design standards. However, because the car was already in operation when the new regulations came into effect in 1971, it was "grandfathered" in. Our bill would eliminate the "grandfathering" and not allow these old cars to carry hazardous materials like phosphorus.

Finally, the bill requires the National Academy of Sciences to take a look at the whole design process of tank cars particularly with respect to public safety. Right now, DOT has delegated its authority to the Association of American Railroads [AAR] which designs tank cars. According to the Office of Technology Assessment [OTA], DOT is not involved in the design approval activities and does not attend sessions where designs are analyzed and evaluated. Our bill requires the Academy to take a look at this process and to determine whether public safety considerations require greater control by the Secretary of Transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this legislation will help avoid accidents in other communities across the country and save our local taxpayers' money as well as good health. I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in supporting this measure.

H.R. 2056

A bill requiring the development of hazardous materials emergency response procedures, prohibiting the transportation of hazardous materials in certain obsolete railroad tank cars, and requiring a study of railroad tank car design procedures

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Hazardous Materials Rail Safety Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) according to the Department of Transportation, about 4,000,000,000 tons of regulated hazardous materials are shipped each year;

(2) the National Transportation Safety Board estimates that approximately 250,000 hazardous materials shipments are made every day;

(3) approximately 3,000 carloads of hazardous materials are shipped each day by rail;

(4) accidents involving the release of hazardous materials are a threat to public health and safety;

(5) rail accidents are particularly dangerous, because railroads were historically designed and planned to go through populated areas;

(6) the Department of Transportation has failed to issue regulations requiring information pertaining to hazardous materials to be shared with local firefighters and emergency responders, and has developed no uniform criteria directing train crews on proper procedures for communicating with local and other appropriate officials in the event of rail accidents involving hazardous materials;

(7) investigations by the National Transportation Safety Board have shown obsolete tank cars to be the cause of accidents involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; and

(8) the Office of Technology Assessment has determined that while the Department of Transportation prescribes railroad tank car design specifications, it is not sufficiently involved in the design approval activities of the industry-based Association of American Railroads Tank Car Committee, and is not permitted to attend sessions where the designs are analyzed and evaluated.

SEC. 3. EMERGENCY RESPONSE.

The Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (49 U.S.C. App. 1801 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end a new section as follows:

"EMERGENCY RESPONSE

"SEC. 117. Within 18 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall, by regulation, issue emergency response procedures for rail carriers in accidents or other emergency situations involving the transportation and storage of hazardous materials, including requirements that—

"(1) copies of written information detailing the type and location of all hazardous materials carried on a train be carried on the train and be immediately provided to local emergency personnel responding to such accidents or emergency situations; and

"(2) employees on any train carrying hazardous materials, and other personnel of the involved carrier, that is in an accident or emergency situation provide technical assistance to local emergency personnel and other appropriate officials responding to the accident or emergency situation.".

SEC. 4. RAILROAD TANK CARS.

The Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, as amended by section 3, is further amended by adding at the end a new section as follows:

"RAILROAD TANK CARS

"SEC. 118. (a) No railroad tank car built before November 6, 1971, may be used for the transportation in commerce of hazardous materials unless such tank car meets all safety and design requirements imposed by the Secretary on railroad tank cars built after such date through regulations issued under this Act, the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970, or any other law.

"(b)(1) The Secretary shall enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences for the performance by such Academy of a study of the railroad tank car design process, including specifications development, design approval, repair process approval, repair accountability, and the process by which designs and repairs are presented, weighed, and evaluated. Such Academy shall also make recommendations as to whether public safety considerations require greater control by and input from the Secretary with respect to the railroad tank car design process, especially in the early stages, along with such other recommendations as the Academy considers appropriate.

"(2) The Secretary shall report the results of such study and such recommendations to the Congress within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section.

"(3) There is authorized to be appropriated for carrying out this subsection not to exceed $500,000.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mrs. COLLINS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TODAY'S AGRICULTURE CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today's agriculture crisis is far more than a farm problem. It is a rural community crisis that demands comprehensive solutions beyond the scope of traditional agricultural programs. Congress, unfortunately, has expended so much time and energy trying to devise programs for family farms that almost overlooked are the farm families themselves who are trying to cope in this difficult transition period. Farm families and entire rural communities are in trouble and need immediate assistance that higher price supports and production controls simply cannot address with the urgency required.

Declining farm income, and massive farm and bank failures are bleeding the rural economy. With farm land values plummeting 50 to 800 percent in the last 5 years, local tax bases are evaporating and are insufficient to fund even basic community services. Consequently, boarded up stores and empty plants have become as familiar as farm foreclosures throughout the Farm Belt.

The rural population of America comprises only 24 percent of the Nation's population. However, it holds 38 percent of the Nation's poverty, 67 percent of the Nation's substandard housing, and has a 9.2-percent unemployment rate compared to the 7.2-

percent unemployment rate of urban areas.

For rural communities to sustain themselves in the 1990's they must begin now to diversify their economic base. In order for many farm families to sustain themselves just in the next 12 months, Federal and State governments must provide immediate rural economic development and emergency assistance.

To address this crisis, Congress must act boldly and quickly. Today I am introducing the rural development initiative [RDI], legislation I believe can serve as a government blueprint for revitalizing rural communities. I am supported in this legislation by 50 colleagues as cosponsors.

The first step under RDI is to reorganize the U.S. Department of Agriculture to streamline existing rural assistance and development programs currently scattered throughout some 20 agencies of the Federal Government.

The Rural Development Reorganization Act of 1987, would transfer rural development and assistance programs within USDA to a newly created Rural Development Administration [RDA]. This should ensure better coordinated and more efficient management of those programs. This bill would also rename USDA the "Department of Agriculture and Rural Development" to accurately reflect its new comprehensive mission.

The General Accounting Office is currently conducting a review of all Federal rural oriented programs outside USDA to determine which would function more effectively under the new RDA.

Before the Federal Government can expect private sector investment in rural communities it must be willing to invest in rural America. By creating a Rural Investment and Incentive Block Grant Program, we can provide the seed capital for rural economic development and encourage private sector investment. Through a Rural Infrastructure Block Grant Program we can provide resources for rural roads and bridges, utilities, schools, and other important services communities need to attract new business and economic development.

We can further expand rural economies and create new jobs by requiring that rural suppliers be given priority consideration on Government contracts and procurement programs. Rural priority on the location of new Federal facilities should also become Federal policy. If Citibank of New York can move its entire credit card operation to South Dakota, surely the Federal Government can place new computer, communications, or administrative operations in rural communities. To develop new products, processes, and marketing techniques tailored for use in rural areas, local institutions of higher education can serve as centers for rural technology and training.

Just as the crisis in rural America did not happen overnight, we cannot expect the renewal of these communities to occur spontaneously. Therefore, it is critical to provide immediate counseling, informational and job training services for troubled families and displaced workers. These emergency services can be provided through the creation of regional agriculture action centers.

One of the most invaluable rural resources we cannot afford to lose is our youth. But with more and more young people leaving rural communities for jobs and a future in urban areas, the face of rural America is rapidly growing older. To encourage youth to remain in rural communities and prepare for leadership positions in a changing agricultural economy, we must expand educational opportunities available to them today.

Therefore, I am proposing the creation of a rural education program [ACCESS], based on a successful urban scholarship program in Cleveland, OH. This program should include systematic guidance and counseling from private sector professionals in career choices, academic preparation, technical training, and entrepreneurship.

Some 60 million citizens live in America's rural communities. The stabilization and prosperity of these communities must become a national priority for Congress and the adminsitration. This rural development initiative can provide the strategy and some of the tools necessary to insure the future of our rural and farm communities. I urge you to join me in a bipartisan effort to adopt this legislation and work together to rebuild rural America.

□ 1700

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to my colleague TOM COLEMAN for arranging for this special order. Rural development, the issue we are addressing today, is an issue whose time has come.

Throughout this great country, rural communities are suffering terribly from an economy that is poor at best. Some of that results from the weaknesses in the farm economy. Some of it comes from loss of jobs due to plants closing because they can no longer compete with the flood of imported goods that have come into this country.

Whatever the reasons, rural people are not sharing in the recovery that has helped so many others. It is time now that the Federal Government turn its attention to business in rural America.

Mr. COLEMAN and I have begun working together in a bipartisan spirit to fashion rural development legislation that will better address the needs of rural communities.

Make no mistake about our intentions. We are still experiencing serious weaknesses in the agricultural sector of our economy. We should not and cannot discontinue our efforts to make sure that we have farm policy that is effective and being administered properly. However, we must also begin the process of developing a rural development policy that complements the agricultural component of our rural economy, and that will diversify that economy to the extent possible.

This is a big task and a long-term one at that. The answers to the problems of a rural economy are not short term ones.

But in my mind, there is no time like the present to begin assessing the needs of rural America, its resources, and it economic development capability. Rural people continue to be resourceful and resilient. I am confident that with the help and awareness of the Federal Government, local officials can develop strategies that will provide their people with economic opportunity and economic progress.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JONES] for joining with me today in the spirit of bipartisanship. With the 50 cosponsors that we have, we have, I think, 20 Members of his party and 30 Members of mine, and we are going to encourage others to endorse this and sponsor it after we get back from the break.

I think it shows true bipartisanship, and I think we can be the driving force to lead the administration and others into an area of concern for economic development.

I look forward to working with the gentleman as we have hearings and try to move these economic development proposals that we are introducing.

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is for me a unique opportunity to share these remarks with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN], who is truly our leader in terms of rural economic development on the Republican side, and of course, the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JONES], who has such a long and distinguished record in support of rural economic development.

There is not one Member of the House or the other body's Committee on Agriculture, and I suspect there is

not one Member of Congress who enjoys the reality and the statistics which show us that farmers across this country in every State and in almost every congressional district are disappearing.

We are seeing a reduction in the number of people in agriculture and frankly, agriculture is a new technology, new productivity that is allowing equal, if not more food, to be produced by less people.

We can debate all we want that farm policy ought to be a response to the problems in American agriculture today, but regardless of that debate, we are focusing this evening, I think, on an equally important debate, totally opposite, totally complimentary to the farm bill debate.

□ 1710

And that is: how do we respond to the transition that is occurring in rural America today? As a product of that rural America, I have seen my small two-room country school closed. I have seen a lack of economic development in our small towns, and I have seen our main streets lose store after store because there are not enough farmers to come into town and there is no economy for that town to exist in.

That is really the whole concept behind what we are trying to do here today on a bipartisan basis, to begin to focus this country's national leadership on the whole issue of rural economic development.

So many people have asked me questions about this recently. I just had someone yesterday, as a matter of fact, from the Department of Agriculture in my office, and he asked, "do you really think you people in Congress are serious about this rural economic development, or is this just some kind of political rhetoric?"

I said, "I think I can tell you that the Congress of the United States is not about to allow those in the Department of Agriculture and the administration or anyone across this country to be a hindrance to our efforts to provide some economic development tools for rural America."

That is exactly what the focus of this farm bill initiative is. I guess that is what it is called, the bill of which the gentleman from Missouri is our major author. No. 1, it is to change part of the focus of the Department of Agriculture, not to eliminate the focus on agriculture but to enhance the focus on rural economic development and to go over and above that, to begin providing some funds for the infrastructure of rural economic areas.

I happen to have had just a wonderful meeting this last week with all the university chancellors in my congressional district, and while I sat there and met with the five of them and we talked about rural economic development, we talked about how small towns have an inability to put together the applications to get those economic plans, and what we really need to do is we need to find a method and a way to provide a bigger capability to pool those small initiatives and not deal with this just as one municipality versus another but to deal with it from a regional perspective.

I think that is really what we are talking about, finding a way to find some capital funds so that these small communities can get together. Believe it or not, for us it is a big deal to even hire a planner, to say nothing about going above and beyond that and actually putting into place an economic development plan and getting the competition for the economic infrastructure, the block grants, the sewer and water facilities, and whatever else might be needed to bring about some type of economic development to those areas.

The third area about which I am very much encouraged is the whole focus we are beginning to make in the old formula process. The fact is that as we look at everything from job training to highway funds to our educational programs, we find, to be quite honest, that the rural areas are discriminated against in these programs. They are discriminated against because the formulas focus only on one man, $1, in terms of need regardless of the fact that in rural areas, No. 1, you have much higher capitalization costs to serve and provide any kind of a basic program, first and foremost, and, second, there is the recognition that many of our rural programs, particularly when we are dealing with displaced farmers, do not even count the farmer or the farm wife or the farmer's son or the farm daughter as people who are unemployed. So the statistics in the formulas do not even allow us to get a chance to get our opportunities in rural America to provide programs and begin building the training and retraining programs that are necessary to begin to bring in those businesses in industries that are necessary to begin bringing in those jobs that are so necessary to simply restore economic vitality to rural America.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that the work of the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. COLEMAN], is just so significant, because what he is talking about here is really maintaining the moral fiber and the moral infrastructure of rural America, and what we really call that, I guess, is the quality of life throughout this country.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. GUNDERSON], and I appreciate his remarks about this Member and, more importantly, his involvement with this issue. We serve together on both the Agriculture Committee and the Education and Labor Committee. We have seen how these interact with each other, and what we are really establishing here and I think what is semirevolutionary about this package that we are introducing is that it is not traditional approaches we are taking. These are nontraditional approaches.

We are looking beyond just agricultural issues. We are looking to job training, we are looking to education, we are looking to health and human services, we are looking at the whole gamut of services that are provided to rural areas and trying to focus and better present an advocacy voice for rural America in the U.S. Government.

I think by looking at this with a broad-brush approach—interagency, if you will—we find that there is something unique and different here, and that is why this package, I think, deserves the support of many of our colleagues in this House who may or may not even represent rural communities. But not only are we trying to provide opportunity in rural areas, we are also trying to say that we have got to diversify, that we have seen an agricultural economy that has gone into a tailspin, and for too long we have put all our eggs in one basket, if you will, and that economic basket is breaking with the agricultural economy.

We need to diversify; we need to provide opportunity for other people in other jobs and businesses to come into these communities, because there are so many people who lack that quality of life that the gentleman mentioned and who would love to stay in these small communities. But these small communities are going to continue to be boarded up and simply blown away and become a part of history if we do not do something now. Small towns of 1,000 people or less do not have a bright future in much of the agricultural belt.

There is a relationship between the small community and the small town. If one suffers significantly, the other is going to suffer significantly and both of them will decline. What we are saying today is that it is time to address this issue much like we addressed the issue of cities and urban areas in the 1960's and the 1970's. We have been able to turn around areas like Boston, MA, and make them into areas of high technology and in the forefront and on the cutting edge of what is happening in the economy worldwide. We would like to provide some of these basic concepts to rural areas and provide the effort there that we have all supported in the past in our urban communities.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the things that is impor-

tant to point out in all of this is that we are not talking about handouts. What we are talking about is simply providing and responding to the intitiatives of the local people. Under any of these programs that the gentleman is introducing here today, none of these provide automatic formula distribution of funds to rural communities regardless of what they are doing.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. GUNDERSON. What it says is "if you take the initiative in your local community, we will provide the helping hand."

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. The gentleman makes an extremely important point, and that is that regardless of what programs are in place, it takes strong local leadership. We have to accentuate that. What we are also saying is, if you have strong leadership, there is a role for the Federal Government to play, and we need to be able to play a constructive role.

No, there are no magic formulas here, and there are no definite earmarks, but it is a new awareness of what we can do through the procurement process, the employment process, and the location of Federal facilities and looking down to see how we can help on main street.

This point has got to be made: that when everybody thinks about having problems in rural America, they think it is the farmer who is having problems. It is not just the farmer; it is the people on main street and the town squares; it is the people who supply the farm communities, those who are there to train the youngsters in the schools, and those who are in business. Those people are suffering just as much as the farm families themselves.

So what we are talking about is trying to help families and trying to save families on farms and in towns and restore the quality of life and keep the economic underpinning, with the diversification, in place.

I so much appreciate the 49 or 50 colleagues who have joined in this cosponsorship because it represents, Mr. Speaker, areas from Massachusetts and California and from Minnesota to Mississippi. We have cosponsors from both parties, and I must say there is a lot of political philosophy in between as well. Some of our colleagues who sponsored this bill are from urban areas. Some do not represent one farmer or any rural constituency. I am glad they are with us. We want to encourage a lot more Members to go on this legislation with us after the Easter break.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, the people of rural America are caught up in stressful times. In an era of surpluses and falling world and domestic prices for farm products they are being forced to leave their business and homes in ever increasing numbers.

These people should be helped in the same manner and with the same dedication extended to persons displaced in other basic industries as the result of world and domestic market conditions.

The rural development initiative recognizes that America's farm crisis doesn't stop at the barn door. It recognizes that entire rural communities have been shaken and shattered by this crisis and must be rebuilt.

With this in mind the Education and Labor Committee of which I am a member, has reported as part of its trade bill a worker readjustment package that addresses the special needs of farmers, ranchers, one person businesses and rural areas.

This bill provides for rapid response capability at the State level. It includes worker readjustment centers in rural areas that can aggressively reach farmers with counseling and early adjustment assistance.

In addition, it authorizes up to 10 special demonstration projects directed to the issue of rural dislocation. Up to one-fourth of the funds could be used in dealing with farmers and ranchers who have been forced off their land by farm failures.

We need to aggressively tackle the problems of rural businesses and farms in order to preserve the very fabric of rural America and its' people.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of the rural development initiative I wish to express my complete support for this legislation. It will help to bring stability back to rural areas. The bill aims at keeping more people in these areas where they've established a way of life and can continue to contribute their time and talents to their communities.

As responsible legislators, it is our duty to help those facing hardship as a result of the present problems in the farm economy. This bill does just that and I am pleased to have worked with my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee in drafting this legislation.

In addition, I would like to take 1 minute to address a companion piece of legislation that I introduced this week regarding rural enterprise zones. These zones are badly needed in rural America. My bill would create these zones and provide incentives for new businesses to locate in rural areas. Targeted to ag-businesses, the system of tax incentives and investment opportunities would complement the rural development initiative to a great extent.

If these pieces of legislation were to pass—and I hope they do—an economic vitality would be brought back to rural America. Furthermore, entire communities would have the chance to rebound, with more jobs, opportunities, investments, and, most important of all, confidence and hope. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor and support this bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION CONVEYING THE LIBERTY SHIP U.S.S. "PROTECTOR" TO A NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation giving the Secretary of Transportation the authority to convey the liberty ship U.S.S. *Protector* to a nonprofit organization for use as a nonprofit merchant marine memorial. My legislation would permit the U.S.S. *Protector* which is currently docked in the James River as part of the U.S. Ready Reserve Fleet, to be transferred to a nonprofit organization. This legislation would not allow the vessel to be used for commercial transportation purposes, and would require that the conveyed vessel be available to the U.S. Government when the Secretary of Transportation requests its use for a wartime emergency or for some other essential national purpose. Moreover, my bill would not require the Secretary to retain the U.S.S. *Protector* in the reserve fleet for a period longer than 2 years.

Although the legislation I am introducing today does not designate title of the ship to one nonprofit organization by name, the U.S. Merchant Marine Veterans of World War II organization plans on acquiring the vessel for the establishment of a merchant marine memorial. I personally have held many discussions with officials from this important nonprofit organization regarding the considerable time and effort they have spent in trying to obtain a liberty ship in order to turn it into a "living memorial" vessel that would be manned by former U.S. merchant mariners of World War II. I believe it is appropriate, and I believe that it is a special touch to designate a ship memorial to our World War II merchant marine veterans rather than designating a stationary land memorial to this important group of individuals. I strongly believe that designating the U.S.S. *Protector* as a merchant marine memorial would not only demonstrate the necessary official appreciation for our merchant mariners of World War II, but such a memorial would provide an excellent opportunity for the public to gain a better understanding and appreciation of the heroic World War II efforts and significant historical role played by this country's merchant marine.

As you all know, the U.S. World War II merchant marine played an indispensable role in the winning of this war by supplying and supporting our Armed Forces in battle. Thousands of mariners lost their lives in the process and many others were left permanently disabled from injury. It is ironic that these heroic individuals have received little recognition and praise for their essential efforts. I am convinced that the legislation I am proposing is one important step in providing our World War II mariners, both the living and the dead, with the praise and recognition they rightfully deserve.

My colleagues, the legislation I am introducing today would not involve the expenditure of a single penny of U.S. tax dollars. To the contrary, it would require that the nonprofit organization be 100-percent responsible for the financing of the restoration, transfer, maintenance, and day-to-day operation of the U.S.S. *Protector*. This financing would be made possible by fundraising proceeds from the organization.

In closing, I respectfully ask my colleagues to support the legislation I am proposing today. I believe that this legislation is a noncontroversial and sensible approach in serving the belated national obligation of recognizing our merchant marine veterans of World War II for the critical and patriotic role they played in the winning of this war.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I requested time for this special order because there are many of us here in this Congress who know that it is time for us as a legislative body to focus attention and find solutions to the problem of unemployment and stop acting as though the problem does not exist.

□ 1720

Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 5 years since the Reagan administration declared that the current so-called recovery period began. President Reagan's messages to the American people have disguised the impact of the trade deficit and the Federal deficit. His economic reports have hidden the true facts on joblessness. They violate the mandate of the Hawkins-Humphrey Act to bring officially measured unemployment down to 4 percent. His latest budget conceals the big welfare given to chosen corporations through tax give-aways. It hides the fact that excessive military contracts are a way of laundering money into the political action committees that support the party of privilege. Unfortunately, the major media have allowed him to get away with it.

The Reagan administration boasts that more than 113 million Americans have jobs. That's a record, but it ought to be; our population and our economy are growing. In addition, about 75 percent of those people gaining employment got part-time jobs when they wanted to work fulltime.

The jobless rate is a full point higher then in 1979. Worse, it has gone up two points among blacks, who still suffer double-digit unemployment.

The Reagan administration has been reporting that our economy is growing. This is of little consolation to those who are still looking for work but cannot find it. These victims are living in the throes of a depression, and already some of them for several years now have been caught within its grip.

We are fully aware of our Nation's urgent need to adopt measures aimed at reducing the high rate of unemployment and putting those Americans who are looking for work back to work, and not continue to talk about how good things are or try to depict some of them as lazy, who do not want to work and are only looking for welfare.

We are all fully aware of our Nation's urgent need to adopt measures aimed at reducing the high unemployment and putting the American people back to work.

The national figures on officially measured unemployment for March 1987 show that 6.7 percent of Americans are unemployed which means that about 8 million Americans are looking for work. In addition, a million discouraged workers have stopped looking, and 5.7 million more who want full-time work are in part-time jobs. Today, unemployment lasts longer for people looking for work, about 15 weeks for last year, and about 11 weeks in 1979. Unemployment among minorities and minority youth is proportionately much, much worse. Black unemployment is 13.9 percent, Hispanic unemployment is 9 percent, and white unemployment is 5.6; while black youth unemployment stands at a staggering 37.6 percent.

The emphasis of the administration should be upon how to improve our most important human capital.

Back in the early forties, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt believed that the Federal Government had an obligation to its' citizens. His ideas resulted first in an "Economic Bill of Rights," which finally resulted in the "Employment Act of 1946." I was a recipient of benefits of President Roosevelt's philosophy of government. I worked in the Civilian Conservation Corps [CCC] planting trees to prevent land erosion. The experience has enhanced my life forever. We must have the collective wisdom to invest in our human capital again.

We need similar programs now in order to relieve the problem of unemployment among our youth. We also need to do something about protecting the environment. Not only in our cities but in our rural areas. Unemployment is not just limited to our urban community, it is prevalent in the rural communities.

We need to develop and renovate the infrastructure of most of our cities in the United States. We should have the collective wisdom to invest in our human capital.

In 1978 the Hawkins-Humphrey Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act was enacted for those who were stricken by poverty, homeless and hungry. We have the same problem today as we had then. These problems did not come from external sources but from the problems that our homeless face came from the fact that they do not have a job.

The rising rate of crime in many of our cities can be attributed directly to unemployment and joblessness. The trafficking of drugs in many areas, while not restricted to the poor communities, is going into the suburbs. Some of it can be directly attributed to the fact that people are unemployed and need jobs and some of them will resort to selling drugs in order to make money.

Without a decent income and providing jobs, it is impossible, we all know, to find a decent future, to plan a decent future. Our young have no future if we cannot help them find a job.

To provide for family security or to participate in the main stream of our society. We are now writing off some of the people who have been long-time unemployed and may not be trained for other jobs. Some of them who have been trained have found out they have been retrained, and the job they hoped to get does not exist.

If the private sector is not willing, and their sole motivation is going to be based on profit and not human beings and their survival, then I think the Government has a responsibility to begin to provide ways for people to have gainful employment and the kind of income that will help them have a decent life.

□ 1730

With all the debates that are going on now and are going to continue on deficit reduction and the questions being asked, have we done enough to call attention to decrease that which would be achieved by bringing down the official American unemployment rate, down by 1 percent, if we could just bring it down by 1 percent, the unemployment rate.

A recent Congressional Budget Office report in January of this year estimated that for every 1-percent reduction in officially measured unemployment, we could decrease the Federal deficit by $40 billion. A 3-percent reduction in the unemployment rate would reduce the Federal deficit by more than $120 billion.

What better way to reduce our debt than as we do in our homes. One of the best ways if we start running in the red in the House has always been if we can find a way to increase our income. This will help us to pay our bills. So it is with the Federal Government. If we would begin to enact programs that would help people to be gainfully employed, pay income taxes to the Federal Government, and, yes, some of those who are fortunate or unfortunate enough to be on some kind of federally supported programs, public aid or public assistance or something of that sort, this would enable them to get off those kinds of support programs and earn a decent living for themselves.

If more people were familiar with these estimates, perhaps we could begin to formally go to bringing the officially measured unemployment down to the Humphrey-Hawkins level of 4 percent over a number of years.

Now, the greatest threat to people who are stricken by poverty is hunger and homelessness. In every major city, almost, we could use additional housing. I know in Chicago we have more boarded up housing in my district I guess than any other district in the State of Illinois. This could be a source of employment if we could begin to set our priorities in this direction.

What our country needs today is a sufficient equivalent to our military spending. That means a total legislative package dealing with a shorter work year, with no reduction in pay, child care, health, housing, environment, Social Security, Public Works, progressive taxation, and all the other quality of life actions needed to attain the objectives of the bill which I have introduced, which will come before the Congress, I hope, before this year's end, entitled Quality of Life Action Act, H.R. 1398. When it was introduced on March 4 of this year, we had 30 cosponsors. That number has now grown to 46.

Let us be realistic. We may be able to take some steps in this direction if a better House and a much better city freely moves in the direction of caring for people who need help.

We might be able to force the White House to back down on a few of the issues that they say we cannot afford to spend on social programs.

I have received statements from several Members of the House of Representatives in support of the Quality of Life Action Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce into the RECORD statements of support from Congressman MARTINEZ of California and Congressman TRAFICANT of Ohio in support of this position.

I would like to wind up, Mr. Speaker, if I can, with this resolution that simply states:

H. CON. RES. —

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the continued unemployment of more than 8,000,000 Americans is inhumane and is a dilemma that must be treated as a national priority

Whereas the most significant issue of 1987 is not star wars but job wars;

Whereas the working men and women of America, through their labor, contribute to the economic and industrial strength of this Nation;

Whereas recently, because of a number of factors, unemployment has remained at approximately 7 percent, which has deteriorated the industrial base of the United States;

Whereas more than 8,300,000 Americans are unemployed; more than half of them do not receive unemployment compensation of any kind;

Whereas, because of this situation, the unemployed are losing their homes, their economic resources, their health, and their hope for the future;

Whereas, in response to this ongoing disaster, the Quality of Life Action Act (H.R. 1398) was introduced on March 4, 1987; the ultimate goal of such legislation is to promote a full employment society;

Whereas according to the Economic and Budget Outlook report issued during January 1987 by the Congressional Budget Office, a one percent reduction in the officially measured unemployment rate would reduce the Federal budget deficit by $40,000,000,000 dollars during fiscal year 1989; and

Whereas the Federal Government must play a leading role in helping the unemployed and in taking action to promote the standard of living of all Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the continued unemployment of more than 8,000,000 Americans is inhumane and is a dilemma that must be treated as a national priority.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from the First District of Illinois because he has taken up almost singlehandedly, not quite, there are more and more Members coming to rally around the issue of joblessness and unemployment in the Congress everyday, but it is around the gentleman's deep concern that began long before he arrived here in the Chamber of this great body that his concern for joblessness began. As a civil rights leader, as a vice president of his Amalgamated International Union, as one whose community concerns have now spread nationally, I just want to let everyone know that we are very grateful to the gentleman, our dear colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES], for the leadership he has given on this bill. The gentleman has rallied from where we left off on the Humphrey-Hawkins Income Act of 1978. The gentleman has moved us to the new present issue, which as the gentleman has pointed out is even deeper and worse than it was when we first focused our attention in the seventies on joblessness and the gentleman holds out the hope that the Congress may rally yet to deal adequately with the problem. For all of the hearings the gentleman has had across this country, we are very deeply grateful for the gentleman's statement today.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for his continued support for the plight of those who are looking for work.

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

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very distinguished colleague, highly esteemed and very much beloved and respected colleague from Illinois.

I also join my equally distinguished colleague of some seniority from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] in his tribute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES], and also to express my appreciation for the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois.

At this point the Members of Congress, the Members of the other House are getting ready to do likewise, are all taking off. I think it is very appropriate that the gentleman should kind of give a little prick to our conscience about so many millions of Americans who have lost all hope that they actually belong to any country.

□ 1740

They are at this point relatively invisible. They are not to you, they are not to Mr. CONYERS, they are not to me, and I am sure that they are not to our other colleague here, because our constituents in the main are in what we call the poor category, and therefore we inescapably must confront the reality of the situation, and that we have retrogressed to the point where even in the dim days—for instance, the gentleman mentioned what I think is a tacit acknowledgement that he and I were in the same generation, were the Depression-era kids.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. That is right.

Mr. GONZALEZ. He said that he was in that great, great host of civilian workers who so much built the resources of our country. In my area we still have functional facilities that were constructed with your labor. It

was the great idea of President Roosevelt to put to work in creative and constructive, not destructive, avenues this potential that is among us, among these millions.

At this point the official statistics—which we cannot rely upon any longer, as the gentleman well knows—as of the last 4 years, the statistical setup has been so eroded that we cannot depend on it for an actual, realistic picture of the numbers of unemployed. But I would say that even the official statistics admit to nearly 8 million unemployed.

Just a few years ago we used to consider that a shattering statistic. Today we shrug our shoulders. I think that the gentleman from Illinois does well. I think that we ought to realize that the promised stimulus of prosperity is lacking. At this point the growth rate of our economy is at most 1 percent, maybe zero. It is stagnant. It is stalled, if you want to say, because our country is still a dynamic, still a growing country. The only thing is that we have had a leadership of blight, a leadership of unconcern.

I cannot help but remember, and I am sure that my colleague remembers, those vibrant, thrilling words of Franklin Roosevelt when he said, in forging the leadership necessary under similar situations:

> Governments can err, Presidents do make mistakes, but better the occasional faults of a government that lives in a spirit of charity than the constant omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifferences.

I thank the gentleman for his humanity and for his fight to keep us from sinking into this frozen state of indifference as to the plight of these millions of fellow Americans.

I want to point out that yes, politically right now close to 90 percent of our fellow Americans are well off, so this is 10 percent, but it should not allow us to chloroform our conscience that we ourselves are not sunk in poverty, that within range of our distance of perception in our neighborhoods we do not see that, because we are fast approaching the time when indeed we will have our neighbors.

It is like the Vietnam war. You know that as long as it was that poor little draftee that could not afford to go to college who was being sent over to get shot at, nobody gave much of a hoot until the casualties started coming in, until the draft call had to dip into that middle-income bracket. Then you began to hear the alarms and the telegrams from the corporate executives saying, "Hey, Mr. President, we ought to cut it out."

I do not think that we ought to wait for that. I do not think that we ought to wait until we are really sunk in a desperate economic situation in order for us to show concern, and I want to just pledge my continued support of the gentleman's very brilliant proposition.

It is a new dimension. It is one that I want to thank the gentleman for, and am privileged that he has invited me, and also privileged that he has asked me to participate with him this afternoon.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for supporting the position, not just my position, but the position that we should take as a government, to help people who are crying desperately for help.

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

MR. HAYES of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to commend the gentleman on his initiative.

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

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, let me first commend my distinguished colleague from the State of Illinois for reminding us that there is no such thing as a comfortable level of unemployment and that one of the most fundamental of all Federal Government obligations is to protect and improve the right of all citizens to earn a living at decent wages.

Invariably, when this administration talks about its accomplishments, it points with pride to unemployment statistics which they claim are within acceptable limits. But to boast about 6.7 percent unemployment, representing some 8 million people who are out of work, is to ignore the tragic side effects produced by high unemployment, such as crime, drug and alcohol abuse, family disintegration, homelessness and hopelessness.

I suggest that we as a nation should never become complacent about such an unacceptably high underutilization of human potential and that instead of pointing at statistics we should be redoubling our efforts to further reduce and, yes, even eliminate unemployment altogether.

A close look at those statistics also reveals some disheartening realities. Unemployment really is a problem that has never been reserved for one racial or class segment of America. But the problem is being exacerbated by the Nation's rapid shift from a strong manufacturing base to a high-technology service-oriented economy. Plant closings and large-scale layoffs are almost daily occurrences, resulting in joblessness among a wider spectrum of the civilian workforce.

In my own home district, the Seventh Congressional District of Maryland, there are some 19,464 people out of work, and according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, unemployment for black males in Baltimore is running around 14 percent, for black women it is over 10 percent, and for black teens it is in the neighborhood of 30 percent. These are statistics that may not bother the administration, but they certainly are of grave concern to me and my constituents. And this is not an isolated example. Unemployment among urban blacks in this country continues to more than double the national average and continues to be, again, a tragic waste of human potential. To say that nothing can be done about it is both callous and untrue.

I support the efforts of the distinguished Congressman from Illinois to deal with this problem through this bill called the Quality of Life Action Act (H.R. 1398). This legisation recognizes the fundamental right of every adult American to earn a living through paid work, chosen from among a diverse pool of job opportunities and at a decent, livable wage.

Specifically, the bill sets up a program for carrying out the Employment Act of 1946 and the Hawkins-Humphrey Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978. The bill also proclaims that those unable to work also have a right to an adequate standard of living.

Perhaps, more than anything, the Quality of Life Action Act provides a workable framework for committing more of our national energies toward reducing unemployment and the host of social problems that result from joblessness. That is a noble cause and one which I wholeheartedly support.

□ 1750

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his support, and I certainly welcome it. I know I reflect the opinion of those who are out of work and who are looking for work.

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

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Illinois yielding to me, and I would like to open my remarks by congratulating him for seizing the initiative in the 100th Congress by introducing H.R. 1398, the Quality of Life Action Act. I am proud to note to my colleagues that I am a cosponsor of that act as well.

The gentleman, in communicating with our office regarding his bill, noted on April 3, that the national unemployment rate has remained unchanged in recent months and is now at about 6.7 percent. As he rightfully pointed out in his communication, every one of those people who are out of work representing that 6.7 percent nationally is a tragedy on an individual basis. In the district I represent in northwest Indiana, however, the pic-

ture is much bleaker than the national statistics would indicate. During the last month our unemployment rate in essentially Lake and Porter Counties in Indiana was at 12.9 percent, and it represents 28,134 individuals who could not last month find work in northeast Indiana.

People in our area have taken solace in the unemployment rate at 12.9 percent, which is down from previous levels. But I remind those people, however, that between the years of 1980 and 1985 we lost 30,000 workers out of our work force, and they are simply gone. So to be proud of the fact that we have an unemployment rate of only 12.9 percent in northwest Indiana, just east of our neighbor's district, that is double the national average and is unconscionable. We must as a government face this problem and we must act.

I congratulate the gentleman not just for his introduction of H.R. 1398, but also for his extra efforts on the House Education and Labor Committee. It was during the past week that the gentleman offered an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to improve the situation that we find ourselves in as far as those who are potential dropouts in our school system to ensure that everyone does have that equal chance for an education. And fundamentally, he also recognizes that aspect in his legislation that is before the House today.

We have in Gary, IN, high schools that will shortly be graduating approximately 3,000 students. This will now be the third graduation I have seen in Gary, IN. About 1,000 of those students will go on to college or to military service. Another thousand will potentially find some type of employment in northwest Indiana, albeit at a much lower wage rate than we have historically experienced in that area. But most importantly, approximately 1,000 of those young people, and I remind my colleagues that 98 percent of the Gary school system is nonwhite, are not going to find that first job come June. They are not going to find that first job come September, and they are going to be a drain not only on themselves and their self-respect, but on the entire community and on this Nation. We must act to solve this problem. We must act not just for those who are jobless, but also, as my colleague from Illinois, Mr. HAYES, has pointed on April 3, for those who are underemployed.

I had a conference in Washington, DC earlier today, and the question was raised about whether or not I supported the increase in the minimum wage. I said absolutely, I do. When you have 1.1 million people in the United States of America today who make the minimum wage and who live below the poverty level, that wage rate, that floor to protect the individuals in our society must be raised.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the concerns that I bring to this House today. Again, I wish to congratulate my colleague from Illinois for this tireless efforts on behalf of those in our society less able to defend themselves, and I join him again in trying to push this legislation.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana for his support and the statistical data that he brought forth, which is very informative to me in regard to the state of the unemployment situation for last month in the State of Indiana, particularly in the Lake County area and northwestern Indiana area.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank my colleague, Mr. HAYES, for calling this special order today to discuss the issue of unemployment—an issue which is of utmost concern to me and the area I represent, the 17th District of Ohio.

The issue of unemployment is one that my constituents and I are very familiar with. Since 1977, with the decline of the steel industry, the Youngstown-Warren area has lost over 55,000 jobs. Unfortunately, what was once known as the "Steel Capital" of the United States is now referred to as the "Rust Belt." Once-prospering communities are now fighting to survive.

The latest unemployment statistics show that some 7.85 million people are unemployed. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS] the current national unemployment rate stands at 6.6 percent. In the 17th District of Ohio, the unemployment rate is estimated to be hovering at almost 8 percent. Our present administration takes pride in announcing that the national unemployment rate has been steadily decreasing. Unfortunately, this does not hold true for hard-hit industrial areas such as mine. A recent study prepared for the Joint Economic Committee entitled "The Great American Job Machine," reports that recent employment records are not as accurate as we might think. The study reports:

> The civilian labor force—the number of Americans who are working or who *want* to work—grew at an even faster pace than the rate of job growth. This has left the overall unemployment rate essentially unchanged while the absolute number of unemployed workers has increased by nearly one-half million. (pg. 2-3)

I have spoken at every opportunity on the floor of this House, urging my colleagues to take a look at our current economic condition—to take a look at the high unemployment numbers in my district and other hard-hit areas throughout the Midwest, and to join in an effort to reevaluate current economic/trade policies. We are in dire need of national policies which will retrain and assist our unemployed workers in finding jobs. I commend Mr. HAYES for introducing the Quality of Life Action Act of which I am an original cosponsor. This measure seeks to protect and improve the quality of life in the United States by expressing national policy goals for protecting and expanding American wages and income. It offers workable suggestions on how the United States should address the ever-growing problem of unemployment.

Like Mr. HAYES, I have spent a great deal of my time here in Congress on efforts which seek to protect American jobs. I am a firm believer in "Buy American," and have introduced several pieces of legislation which reflects this very theme. My Foreign Subsidiary Tax Equity Act, H.R. 606, would discourage domestic corporations from establishing foreign manufacturing subsidiaries; another bill I've introduced, H.R. 905, would allow a deduction for State and local sales taxes on the purchase of an American-made automobile; and my 65 percent domestic content bill, H.R. 943, would reinstate the investment tax credit and deny an investment tax credit and accelerated cost recovery for property made outside the United States having less than 65 percent U.S. content. In addition, I have introduced the Truth in Import Advertising Act, H.R. 1382, which would establish requirements for the labeling of consumer goods indicating the foreign and domestic content of these commodities. This bill would make it much easier for the American consumer to be aware of goods that are American made. I am also in the process of working on a jobs bill which I hope to introduce in the near future.

Unemployment is still a problem even if our present administration chooses not to recognize it as such. America needs this Congress to treat the issue of employment as a national priority. America needs this Congress to support retraining and education programs which will enable the unemployed to once again join the work force. America needs this Congress to support economic and trade policies which look out for American workers interests. I urge my colleagues to join Mr. HAYES and myself in our efforts which would help all those men and women across this country who are fighting unemployment. We must work together on these and other efforts which would ensure jobs security, and a decent standard of living for all.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, a little while ago, during a nationwide factfinding mission for the Employment Opportunities Subcommittee which I chair, I was walking down a main street in a business district. I passed by a group of five men who seemed happy enough as they smiled and laughed while warming their hands over a transcan blaze to combat the chill of night. I casually commented on the cold weather. What was offered in response was far more than I had bargained for.

Among these men were a machine operator of 9 years, a community college graduate who had become an odd-jobber, a cash register repairman, a kid 8 months out of high school, and a factory worker employed at minimun wage. They had the fortune of being equipped with both jackets and comraderie, to shield themselves from the elements. But there was something which they admitted not having; its absence was the reason, they asserted, for their being street based on such an inhospitable night. Most of these men had been employed full time 2 years ago; some did temporary work and others had permanent jobs. Due to circumstances and recent trends, one had been told that the position which he filled

had been eliminated, as it became obsolete; the company where another had worked went belly up; one man was laid off indefinitely; the minimum wage worker could no longer pay his rent; and the high school graduate, who had so far only held a job making pizzas in a family pizzeria which went bankrupt, had not found a job since high school.

With brush strokes bleak on a canvas corroded, these men did paint a picture austere of urban life 6 years into the age of Reagan elitist-radicalism. Typically, the periphery of the tableau incorporates an image of an assembly line, toolbox, or some other apparition of production. This part of the illustration is spangled with color, and characterized by facial expressions of concentration and intrigue. Elsewhere in the outer cadres are depictions of loved ones: various combinations of spouses and children. Also occasionally present are sketches of small homes, small businesses, big cars. But eyes are ineluctably drawn to the cental figures in the paintings, under whose umbrage all lesser figures are besmirched. In some instances, this space is occupied by characterizations of a Wall Street corporate takeover or merger; in other cases it is a line around the block at the employment office; in still other cases it is a newspaper announcing price wars in which the oligopolies price the small businesses out of the market. But the commonalities are clear: the faces depicted with expressions of futility, frustration, defeat, deperation; the presence of other similarly situated; and the conspicuous absence of the Federal Government.

This group of men is by no means an aberration. As Members of Congress are recognizing with increasing frequency, many serious problems have been spawned from the sword of Reaganomics, and they impel imminent rectification. In the process of slashing away at the fat of the governmental body, the sword severed some muscles, and even punctured some of the vital organs. The predicaments faced by an overwhelming number of Americans vary from region to region; but the message—shouted by the young and old, men and women, descendents of all nations, educated and not—is shouted in unison.

Inherent in the economic system which we know and love is the risk that some individuals/companies who are better situated will avail themselves of the system's intricacies at the insidious expense of Americans who are less economically ambulatory. By receding into the coves of Government noninvolvement, the Reagan administration has absolved itself of responsibility for protecting the preponderance of Americans who do not have a warehouse of economic advantages. The risk has been actuated like never before in American history, as the middle class—the bastion of American society—continues to be polarized, toward wealth and, much more often, toward poverty. The cry is heard from every State for a Federal Government committed not to "the elite" but to the interests of the majority, for the basic of life: a place to live, decent food to eat, a job with a reasonable wage, et cetera. Employment restraining and placement programs would be similarly well received, by four of the five men who I met that evening, for example. The time when the Government wore earplugs has passed; the time when government dances to the popular song—and translates it into the language of legislation—has arrived.

A forward-looking approach to unemployment and underpaying is a significant first step toward assessing and ameliorating present economic conditions and their itinerant problems. For these reasons, I heartily encourage all Members of Congress to support H.R. 1398 and to offer additional responses to these unequivocal concerns.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our colleagues, Mr. HAYES, for giving us the opportunity to reflect on the state of employment in this country. It was not many months ago when this was a matter that was in the news every day. Now there is little notice in the media. But just because the press has turned its attention to other matters does not mean the problem has gone away. At the moment, unemployment in my district is not at an unprecedented high, and for that I am deeply thankful. But there are still more than 16,000 people out of work and actively seeking employment in my district. Sixteen thousand people. Statistically that comes to 5.6 percent of the work force. Of course it does not count those who have become so discouraged in their search for work that they have given up. It does not count those who once had full-time jobs and now have had to settle for part-time work, or for work that is less well paying than the jobs they formerly held.

While there has been a recovery on the coasts, there are still many areas of this country where people are devastated by unemployment. We must not allow ourselves to become complacent about the issue. The problems attendant on unemployment, problems such as the need to retrain, the need to see that the unemployed have what they need while they seek employment, the need to take care of the homeless and get those who are able to work back into the work force—those problems are still with us.

We have not dealt with the challenge to set up a training and retraining progam that will rountinely help us to cope with the changes in the job market. And until we face that problem, we are going to have distortions in the market: labor surpluses in some areas, labor shortages in others, people out of work, and jobs going begging. Congressman HAYES has shown leadership in this area not simply by calling this special order but by introducing legislation to deal with the constellation of problems attendant on unemployment. We are building into our Nation's human structure a permanent class of the dispossessed. That is not only cruel in this Nation of plenty: it is stupid. The health of the country itself is dependent on the health of those individuals who make us the country. And economic health is every bit as important as physical health. To the extent that we do not deal with the unemployment issue, to that extent are we weakening the fiber of the country. We should address this issue responsibly and with a good deal of investigation and thought. It is not a simple problem to solve, but it is necessary, nevertheless, that we move toward a solution, and that we do it now.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this concludes my analysis of the situation and my expression of the need for action. I would like to try to, and so would many others, impress upon what I know to be the most powerful legislative body in the whole world, 435 Members of this House of Representatives combined with 100 Members of the other body, totaling 535 persons, mostly men who could do something about this situation. I suggest that we need to change our priorities and begin to think about human life, think about the families, the little kids who suffer as a result of their parents, and some of them are single parents, not having a job.

We cannot afford to sit idly by and let the most important resource of our society just go down to nothing. We must fight against poverty, which is on the rise.

I see some boasting about the number of millionaires that are increasing today. But let me tell my colleagues, when you talk about the number of millionaires that are growing in our society, the number of people who are living in poverty is increasing in much greater numbers.

I would like to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the support that I have gotten from my colleagues who are cosponsors and those who have spoken here today in support of H.R. 1398. I want to see us drive forward and make this dream of a full employment legislation a living reality before this Congress adjourns.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of my special order today.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 782

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 782.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. LUNGREN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. PEASE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

□ 1800

THE URGENT SITUATION AT BOSTON CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a matter that I think is extremely important to this country and becoming more urgent as the days go by.

Today our subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Investigation and Oversight of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation held hearings on aviation and aviation safety. We had the Administrator of FAA, the Federal Aviation Administration, Mr. Engen, appear before us.

While he did admit there were some minor problems in the system, he painted a picture that our air traffic control system in this country is good today and, as a matter of fact, better than it ever has been. Nothing could be further than the true state of affairs that I found in traveling around the country.

Mr. Speaker, I have visited many facilities in the Nation over the past several years and at every facility I have heard men and women working in the system tell me of problems that they are facing. There is one facility that I was asked to go to time and time again, that was Boston Center. I am going to address primarily the situation at Boston Center tonight, but I do not mean to suggest that it is unique, the problems there are unique to Boston Center. In some cases I think they are a little worse. But for a number of months the controllers and supervisors, the airways system specialists and others, have asked Chairman OBERSTAR and me to visit Boston Center. For the sake of those viewing or reading this special order, you should know that Boston Center is actually located in Nashua, NH. We planned to visit Boston Center last December. Unfortunately, our schedules were such that we were not able to do so.

A couple of weeks ago I finally was able to make the trip myself. The day before I went I contacted the Federal Aviation Administration. I spoke to the Regional Administrator, Robert Wittington, and I offered to him that we hold a meeting, an all-hands meeting. That is, a meeting where everybody can attend who is available and they can speak what is on their mind, no holds barred.

To his credit Mr. Wittington was kind enough to accommodate my request.

I arrived at the Center the next morning at 8:30 a.m. and for the first hour or so I put on a headset and plugged in to some of the sectors that were described as problem areas. Even though I got there shortly after the morning rush was over, I observed a number of controllers very, very busy. They readily shared their concerns with me and explained to me the technical difficulties that they encountered in working these areas.

After touring the entire facility, we began our all-hands meeting with Robert Wittington, the Regional Administrator, and Acting Deputy Administrator of FAA as of late, Richard Hough, manager of the facility and other management personnel.

Over 150 people attended, controllers, supervisors, airway system specialists. And they are the skilled technicians responsible for repairing the outdated computers, radio equipment, and other equipment. Also, a number of other FAA employees were also present.

That session lasted 2½ hours and the only reason it stopped after 2½ hours was that I stopped it, because I wanted to try to get some promises from the management personnel that they would deal with the human problems that existed at Boston Center before we had a tragedy on our hands.

Last year I made a similar visit to New York Center and there again I spent the entire day from 8:30 in the morning until 5:30 at night. But unlike New York Center, there was not one single person that got up during the entire day and defended the management personnel at Boston Center. Also, there was not one single person who raised their voice in anger. I was amazed at that. They were very articulate, they were very concerned, and in many cases very disturbed. Some of the major complaints that they raised that day were: No. 1, low staffing, especially because of the transfer of a large amount of complex airspace from New York Center. And, No. 2, a severely inadequate training before the transfer of New York Center's airspace and particularly before the implementation of the expanded east coast plan.

No. 3, controllers required to one-hold sectors, that is to work sectors that are manned by only one controller rather than two as has been the custom over the years. No. 4, management of the facility does not have the final say on running the Center. The region is perceived as having a firm grip on the operations at the Center.

No. 5, a common complaint, management style is not responsive to controller needs. Controllers believe that management lacks respect and trust of their views.

No. 6, something that FAA knows about, that of all the centers in the country, Boston Center ranks next to last with regard to morale.

No. 7, a very serious and increasingly serious problem, equipment breakdown.

Now, what makes this matter extremely urgent is the fact that right now we are off-season. We are off-season and yet at Boston Center people are working forced overtime, 6 day weeks, and they are working with their radar scopes full. And, Mr. Speaker, as we approach the summer season, when we know that travel is going to increase substantially, controller after controller after controllers said, "Are we going to be able to handle the workload? How can we do it? We cannot do it now. How are we going to be able to do it then?"

I have relayed their concerns by letter as soon as I came back, to Administrator Admiral Engen, and so far I have not received a response. The fact is I do not expect to receive any miracle responses whatsoever.

The attitude of FAA is something bewildering. I have raised similar complaints for a number of years and yet the only response I have received from Admiral Engen and Secretary Elizabeth Dole is that the system is fine, the morale is fine and whatever problems exist in the system are being remedied. Since the strike occurred in 1981, we have come full circle; Morale is probably lower today than it was before the strike, staffing levels are much lower, while air traffic has dramatically increased. And, yes, a new union is in formation. We have read, I am sure, those of us interested in aviation, that the new union understandably and commendably has taken a new strike pledge. Additional wages is not one of their goals.

Why then have over 6,200 controllers petitioned for a new union? They have said they will not strike and they said they are not looking for money. There is only one answer. The answer is the work environment.

Unless FAA and the Department of Transportation recognize that there are serious problems in the system that need to be addressed now, we are heading for trouble. FAA and others may not like to hear it, but the system is indeed in crisis.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to read for the RECORD, several excerpts that I have received in letters from some of the controllers who were there at Boston Center. This controller—and I am not going to mention any controller's names, for obvious reasons, but because if I were to do so you can bet that each and every one of them would be in trouble tomorrow.

This controller talked about the serious problem that occurred last year when they transferred a very large and complex bit of airspace from New York Center to Boston Center. That

airspace was creating very serious problems for the controllers and others at New York Center. What did FAA do? They took the airspace and transferred it from New York Center over to Boston Center. That is their way of solving a problem. What happended? The problem that existed at New York Center disappeared, obviously, and then the problem appeared in Boston Center.

□ 1810

Here is what this controller said:

The relocation of this highly complex slice of this Nation's controlled air space to Boston ARTCC in the middle of the summer season is but a classic example of the FAA's Air Traffic Division's ignorance which bounders upon severe resentment toward all controllers and of the demands required to provide the services of safe, expeditious and orderly flow of air traffic into and out of the New York metropolitan area.

It is my sincere belief that the reason for the airspace transfer was to prevent you, Mr. MOLINARI, from forcing the FAA to rehire some of the "fired" controllers. The FAA's willingness to transfer this airspace, which I consider among the most complex in the Nation today, in the busiest traffic period of the year, with the shortest period of training, is proof positive of my theory that the FAA has done and will continue to do anything and I mean anything, to prevent the rehiring of those men and women, whose employment was terminated by President Reagan for participating in a illegal strike in August 1981.

Why would the agency, who is alleged to be the beacon and advocate of Aviation Safety in this great Nation, willingly participate in such a fraudulent activity against the very people they swear to protect, you ask? Because of pure and simple pride, that is in this case.

Mr. Speaker, I will jump down to a later portion of that same letter:

Today, for some strange reason, the workforce is complaining of the same workplace conditions, which were present and led to the strike of 1981. Who have not learned from the strike of 1981? The same managers who were equally responsible for the "job action." The euphoria of crushing those they resented, along with the pride of actually crushing them, have brought us to the point we are today. Namely, that the Air Traffic Division of the FAA will do anything to prevent those resented few from returning to the workplace. Sounds strangely like the conditions that prevailed at Morton Thialkol or in the NSA offices does it not?

With all this false pride and total "stonewalling" to never rehire, the money that the FAA has spent to replace the fired controllers has been outrageous. It is not difficult to understand why essential equipment has not been able to be maintained properly.

I jump now to another letter that I received, Mr. Speaker. It is a little technical and I will try to slowly explain it:

DEAR SIR: The following is a factual depiction of the events that occurred at the Boston Center on Wednesday April 1, 1987 beginning at 6:00 pm.

A DR (discrepancy report) was turned in by the controller at sector 5 which stated that the space bar on the Alphanumeric Key Board was sticking. AF (Airways Facilities) came to replace the keyboard but had to shut the PVD (Plan View Display [Radar Scope]) off. Traffic at the time was light to moderate and the Radar Controller was forced to look over the shoulder of the Radar Controller at Sector 6. After AF had replaced the ANK (Alphanumeric Keyboard) and turned the PVD back on, they found the RCRD (Radar Computer Readout Display) was now inoperative. AF then went down stairs and brought up another PVD (Radar Scope). The controller at Sector 5 is still looking over the shoulder of the Controller at Sector 6. This second Radar Scope that AF has just brought up is totally inoperative and a third Radar Scope is now brought up and put in place. Time now is 6:40 pm.

At 7:24 pm another DR is put in for the Radar Scope at Sector 5. This third Radar Scope's brightness intensity keeps changing and will not focus properly. A fourth Radar Scope is brought up and put in place. The Sector 5 Controller again looks over the shoulder of the Controller at Sector 6. After installation the fourth Radar Scope the Sector 5 Radar Controller reports that the RCRD is crooked but asked that nothing be done about it until the midnight shift when traffic is low, and says he can live with the problem.

At 8:50 pm Controller at Sector 5 reports Radar Scope Track Ball Home Key Cap is broken, another DR is turned in. Traffic at this time is moderate to heavy. Since this key is not a heavily used function key AF waits until traffic dies down to make repairs.

This is just what happened on one particular day with respect to the equipment at that center, and it shows the strain that exists, not only among the controllers who are there to try to protect the lives of the many thousands passing through, but also themselves. They are the ones who are faced with the problem.

Another letter, Mr. Speaker:

As a controller at the Boston Center I want you to know that I exceptionally appreciated your hectic visit last Friday. I realize that a Congressman's schedule is demanding.

Et cetera.

It is unfortunate that the situation at my facility was allowed to deteriorate to the point where a Congressman's intervention was required to bring together controllers and management.

That is rather shocking. Why should it take a Member of Congress to go to a facility to say to management, and the men and women in the trenches, let us get together and talk over your problems?

The GAO attitude survey was published over one year ago yet Messrs. Engen, Whittington, Lucas and Caudle have never once directly addressed the Boston Center controllers, or their grievances, even though we place dead last for morale. If nothing else your visit precipitated an opportunity for controllers to finally express their total frustration directly to top management.

This controller then took a rather dramatic step. He filed a UCR, an unsatisfactory condition report. That takes some courage because he is on record as claiming that the situation there with respect to training is inadequate and compromised matters at the facility.

Now, one last letter from a controller.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOLINARI: Thank you for visiting the Boston Air Traffic Control Center recently. Although met by skepticism initially, by some in the facility, it was quickly overcome after your opening remarks explaining your non-partisan stand on the issue of air safety in the air traffic control system.

The workforce appreciated you and your staff assistant, Mr. Dizard, sitting at the positions with headsets on, listening and watching the New York metropolitan area operation that Boston took over from New York Center last July 12.

I was impressed with the way my colleagues stated the issues with you, regarding Boston, using logic and without the histrionics frequently accompanying poor working conditions.

There are some major points that I would like, to key in on, Congressman MOLINARI, that highlight Boston Air Traffic Center's problems, which are serious, but more than that focus on the entire system and are straining the safety of the system, nationally.

"Boston Center's staffing level for controllers (full performance level and trainees) is just barely over 200, of which just over 150 are FPL. Our authorized compliment of controllers is just over 300."

At a center like that, where they were authorized to have 300, we are being told by this controller that they have but 200 working there, and of the 200, only 150 are full performance level.

We need 320 controllers to conduct routine business on a 5-day workweek in the control room, conduct staff business and to allow our Human Relations Committee and Facility Advisory Board members to make meetings regularly. This is not the case due to control room staffing requirements and all the members can't attend are frequently without a quorum for the participative management process.

This facility has been operating in a crisis management atmosphere for 5½ years; always working with minima or below minima, working sectors normally requiring 2 controllers per position but manned by one controller.

Overtime has always been used for the past 5½ years but has increased dramatically since July 12, 1986, when control sectors at New York were transferred to Boston.

We have retirements coming up which will further exacerbate the staffing problem.

Overtime is still required to run the operation but the fact remains that we need 100 more * * * full performance level controllers now.

□ 1820

On another question of controversy, Mr. Speaker, this gentleman recites as follows: "Boston Center has over 35 full performance level controllers rehired after the strike * * *."

These were people who claimed to have been on strike, and they were rehired. He says they were "working elbow to elbow with those who stayed

on during the strike and those who were hired afterward. It's business as usual and no abrasiveness of either side."

He said: "I totally support a selective rehiring of controllers. They would be able to recertify in a minimum time"—anywhere from 4 to 6 months—"as opposed to 2 to 4 years for a new hire."

"The time has come," this man says, "for compassion by the President and the Congress. People make mistakes including the President but neither side can be accused of not being fine citizens. Enough time has passed, the point has been made that striking cannot be tolerated. Our air traffic system is in crisis, needs immediate bolstering of low experienced levels by a selective rehire."

I am going to try to abbreviate the remainder of my statement, Mr. Speaker, because I know there is another gentleman wishing to speak.

This man talks briefly about delays and the fact that at Boston Center they are now being asked to put planes into the air and to put them in circles, to circle, because their destination is not ready to receive them.

This runs exactly contrary to what FAA has been telling us all along, that they have full control, meaning that they hold the planes on the ground if they are going to have a delay. It is safer, they told us, to keep them on the ground. When you send them into the skies, you will have no delays until they get to the point of destination.

Now, in order to reduce that number of delays that is ever increasing, what are they doing? They are shooting the planes up into the air and putting them into circles. Those of us who fly frequently, I am sure, have had the experience of knowing that for some reason in many cases—and in most cases we do not know why—we are circling and circling and circling. This is one of the reasons why we are doing that.

He said, "If you combine Boston with the others who are experiencing similar difficulties around the Nation, one can see that logic and the law of averages increases the chance of safety compromises."

Mr. Speaker, I could read excerpts from some more letters, but I would choose not to do so. The men and women at Boston Center have appealed for help. They have been appealing for help for 5½ years, and the appeal for help comes not only from those who stayed on after the strike but from the new hires, the new people there. They are doing a wonderful job. They are dedicated men and women, and they deserve a lot of credit and a lot of praise for what they are doing.

But there comes a point when the human system can only take so much, when you are working 6 days a week and you have some problems at home or you are not feeling well and your morale starts to suffer. You start to experience burnout and fatigue.

That is what concerns me because that is the time when the performance of that controller might be off.

And in addition, Mr. Speaker, we looked at all the midair collisions that we have had in the country. There is always a great deal of publicity on them. We had a couple of crashes yesterday. We hear the ugly news about the loss of life and that investigations have commenced, and invariably after the investigation is concluded there will be a report, and the report will say that the accident was due to the fault of the controller, or the report will say the accident was due to the fault of the pilot, or it will say that the accident was due to a lack of communication, or that the accident was due to weather conditions. Never once have we ever heard of an accident that has been described to the management of FAA, because they are the ones who make the determination.

I strongly suggest that if we in Congress sit back and allow this to continue, there will be accidents, and there will be losses of lives that we might be able to save, and that will be the fault of the FAA management in Washington.

The men and women out there at Boston Center and elsewhere are asking for our help. In some cases they are pleading for it. I think it is time we responded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS of New York addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DUCKS UNLIMITED 50TH YEAR COMMEMORATIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, today I and 224 of our colleagues have introduced a resolution to commemorate one of this country's most outstanding wetlands conservation organization, Ducks Unlimited [DU]. As a longtime member and sponsor of Ducks Unlimited, I am particularly pleased that we are able to pay tribute to DU in this manner.

In their own right, each of the Members who have signed on as a cosponsor should be recognized as an original sponsor because DU's success has resulted from the cumulative efforts of more than 600,000 individuals throughout the North American Continent.

Wetlands play an integral role in maintaining the quality of life through material contributions to our national economy, food supply, water quality and supply, flood control, and fish, wildlife, and plant resources and thus to the health, safety, recreation, and economic well-being of all citizens.

Our Federal Government, the governments of our 50 States, and the Governments of Canada and Mexico individually or collectively cannot adequately protect these valuable wetlands.

For more than 50 years, members, volunteers, and staff of Ducks Unlimited have given generously of their time, energy, and financial resources to conserve wetlands habitat.

With this resolution, we the Congress, would like to salute DU for their outstanding achievements and wish them every success in the years to come.

Mr. DAVIS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with more than half of my colleagues today in introducing a House concurrent resolution congratulating Ducks Unlimited, Inc., on its 50th anniversary.

Begun January 29, 1937, by sportsmen who recognized that waterfowl populations were being drastically impacted by the loss of important habitat, the organization is now one of the most successful private wetlands and waterfowl conservation groups in the world. They have raised nearly $400,000,000 and have conserved more than 4,000,000 acres of wetlands throughout North America. Their work continues today, through projects in important waterfowl areas throughout the United States and Canada, and through active participation with the Canadian and United States fish and wildlife agencies in the development and implementation of the North American waterfowl plan.

Ducks Unlimited, which has chapters in almost all of our districts, is a foremost example of a group of individuals banding together to effectively act to restore and rehabilitate an important natural resource. While most of the members are primarily, although not solely, interested in waterfowl hunting, benefits accrue to all of us through the preservation of our rapidly decreasing wetlands. In addition to providing waterfowl habitat, wetlands also make material contributions to our national economy, food supply, water quality and supply, and to the reduction of flood damage.

In recognition of this half a century of outstanding effort, we have introduced this concurrent resolution in hopes of passage prior to the Ducks Unlimited Annual Convention to be held in early May.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that the remainder of our colleagues will join with us in passing this worthwhile resolution.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the House concurrent resolution which was introduced today to recognize and congratulate Ducks Unlimited, Inc., on its 50th anniversary as one of the largest and most successful private wetlands and waterfowl conservation organizations in the world. It is a privilege to be an original cosponsor of this resolution which seeks to honor an organization which has exhibited such spirited, farsighted and disciplined commitment throughout the past 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1937, a unique group of U.S. conservationists, who had watched North America's waterfowl populations decrease rapidly during the drought of the early 1930's, banded together to ensure

the future of wild ducks and geese. Their mission was genuine and resolute: To raise money for developing, preserving, restoring, and maintaining the waterfowl habitat of the North American Continent. Today Ducks Unlimited [DU] stands as the world's most effective protector of wetlands for wildlife having raised nearly $400 million, conserved more than 4 million acres of wetlands habitat, constructed over 3,000 wetlands projects, and carved out more than 15,000 miles of nesting shoreline.

The list of milestone projects engineered by DU is impressive beginning in 1938 when the organization constructed two wooden dams on a 27,000-acre wetland known as Big Grass Marsh in south-central Manitoba. Since that time, the legacy and dedication of DU has remained steadfast. In 1970 DU established a Mexican affiliate; in 1975 DU began large-scale work on the 500,000-acre Cumberland Marsh; in 1984 DU launched its U.S. habitat improvement program which has since completed 54 wetlands projects in prime waterfowl production States with 14 more projects currently in the balance; and in 1985 the organization entered into a cooperative venture with NASA's Landsat V satellite inventory of some 60 million wetland acres. However, no one individual can be singled out for credit for the past accomplishments of DU. Rather, the successes of the organization are the collective result of some 600,000 members, volunteers, and staff who have generously given of their time, energy, and financial resources to achieve outstanding conservation objectives. I, along with many Members of Congress, am proud to number among those 600,000-plus members.

Mr. Speaker, the wetlands of the North American Continent play an integral role in maintaining the environmental quality of life through material contributions to our national economy, food supply, water quality and supply, flood control, and fish and wildlife resources. However, wetlands occupy only a small percentage of the land area of North America and that area is shrinking at the alarming rate of over 700,000 acres per year. To help conserve dwindling wetlands habitat, governments find themselves relying more and more on the human and financial resources of private conservation organizations. It is organizations like Ducks Unlimited which have answered this challenge and have worked diligently for the past 50 years to protect and enhance wetlands and waterfowl habitats.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my distinguished colleagues to join with me today in cosponsoring this resolution saluting the 50th anniversary of Ducks Unlimited and its pioneering leadership in waterfowl conservation programs both in this country and abroad. I look forward to their future presence in the field of conservation and their continued guidance to us in Congress in formulating policy decisions concerning the management of critical wetlands habitat.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with Congressman ARLAN STANGELAND and the other 223 cosponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 106, which commemorates Ducks Unlimited for their 50 years of wetland conservation efforts. As a member and sponsor of DU, this is truly a fitting tribute by which we can acknowledge their outstanding work.

On January 29, 1937, a group of conservation oriented sportsmen banded together, here in Washington, DC, to found what is now one of the Nation's premiere conservation organization.

The goal of this organization was to establish a continentwide waterfowl conservation program. At that time, though, I am sure that these individuals had little idea of how successful and important Ducks Unlimited would become in preserving wetlands habitat.

From a humble beginning, of but a handful of people, DU now has a membership of nearly 600,000. These 600,000 are volunteers who generously give their time, energy, and financial resources to achieve the outstanding conservation objectives of this exemplary organization.

Entering its 50th year, DU has raised and invested nearly $400 million to conserve more than 4 million acres of wetlands in the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

In addition, DU's pioneering leadership in scientific research and management practices have been adopted by public and private land and game managers throughout North America and in other parts of the world.

Governments alone cannot adequately protect valuable wetlands without help from private organizations. Ducks Unlimited has established and maintained a singleness of purpose for the protection and enhancement of wetlands and waterfowl habitats that is the standard of other similar organizations.

It gives me great pleasure to support this resolution. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we could make the passage of this resolution a top priority in the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. WYDEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. HUNTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

REPEAL OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, with its four core grantees, the National Endowment for Democracy is coming up for reauthorization very shortly. The four core grantees, I would remind my colleagues, consist of the AFL-CIO, the International Democrat and Republican Institute, respectively, and the chamber of commerce. They are very complicated-sounding names, which all leads to the reality that the National Endowment for Democracy, whatever it is, is operating globally in over 70 countries in the world, and its potential for good is far outweighed by the actual record that they have compiled over the last several years.

We are now going to evaluate whether there is a political and budgetary justification to continue the National Endowment for Democracy, whether on grounds of political and fiscal pragmatism this organization makes sense.

The National Endowment for Democracy in some circles is referred to as the Taxpayers' Funding for Foreign Elections Act. In other words, it allows at taxpayer expense for the United States through these organizations within the National Endowment for Democracy to meddle in other people's foreign elections. And it has meddled in several foreign elections to our disadvantage. It continues to engage in political advocacy, frequently embarrassing this Government and the State Department in the process. It is an indefensible use of the taxpayers' money, and is even more so in this era of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings.

Of course, the National Endowment for Democracy maintains that its activities are necessary to promote democratic institutions, and that it does not interfere with the political activities in other countries in which they are guests. But it has already secretly supported a political organization in France, one of the world's oldest democracies, by actively opposing there the governing party of President Mitterrand. President Mitterrand was not informed that the U.S. taxpayers had funded his political opponent's group, and that the group had publicized ties to at least one outlawed terrorist organization.

In another extraordinary activity, the National Endowment for Democracy was funding an organization advocating support of Contra funding in American newspaper advertisements.

□ 1830

Taxpayer money used to advise the Members of the House of Representatives how to vote on a Contra aid bill, advocating a pro-Contra position opposed overwhelmingly by a majority of Americans for the last several years. What a lesson in the ideals of democracy.

The organization known as Prodemca argued that none of the moneys went to the advertisements, but the arguments were unconvincing. Funds are fungible, as we all know and its as simple as that.

Prodemca also used National Endowment moneys to fund the Nicaraguan opposition newspaper, La Prensa in Nicaragua. In other words, here again

we are directly intervening into a political dispute with counterproductive results in terms of promoting democratic reform. This time it is in a war-torn land over which there is so much debate in this country.

NED's activities certainly did not enhance free speech in Nicaragua. Rather, the publicized National Endowment for Democracy connection and the ineptitude with which it was administered gave the Nicaraguan Government the excuse that it sorely needed to close the opposition newspaper. So, democracy lost there, it suffered a serious blow at the hands of the Endowment.

Other National Endowment for Democracy activities have included the support of a military-backed candidate in Panama in the Presidential election, the closest one ever. Yes, you heard me correctly, the National Endowment for Democracy, federally funded, was involved in supporting a military-backed candidate in 1984 in the nation of Panama provoking protests from the American Ambassador in Panama.

NED also supports the ADN Party in Bolivia. It supports the Conservative Party in Colombia. It has operations in democracies like Portugal. It has political action committees in El Salvador, and a wide range of international organizations with very ideological and political agendas.

The publication of the relationship of the National Endowment for Democracy and organizations it funds, has been, to put it mildly, very embarrassing over the last several years.

The GAO finding that the National Endowment for Democracy has been funding the National Political Party Institutes in violation of congressional law was disturbing and shocking to a number of congressional Members of both political parties in this country as was the revelation that the National Endowment appeared to support in the Philippines a labor union created by the former dictator there, the deposed President Ferdinand Marcos.

The list of travesties goes on and on. All activities being carried on to support democratic transitions to open closed societies covers the nature of the activities that this money is being used for. Federal money; taxpayers' money.

Ninety percent of the National Endowment funds incredibly go to organizations who are represented by members of the board. In other words, it is a highly incestuous relationship—more democractic idealism. The people on the board give the money to each of the organizations that they are related to.

Is this necessary, even assuming that these purposes are worthy? The fact of the matter is it is not because private citizens donate far more than is federally given to NED for many purposes of promoting democracy that are far less controversial. Private citizens have spent over $1.5 billion last year through various public and private organizations to promote democracy in organizations around the world, which is a perfectly valid right an activity to be encouraged and within the scope of this law provided there is no military support in any way. But what we have here is incredible meddling and politicizing through an organization funded through the taxpayers that further brings into question the Constitution and its provisions governing administration of American foreign policy. How and why it came into being is a matter for future consideration.

The National Endowment of Democracy has appealing euphemisms for meddling when they move into foreign countries. Countries are in crisis like France, for instance or they are trying to sustain democratic possibilities in Portugal for example, or they are supporting democratic transitions; in Panama maybe? They are attempting to strengthen these new democracies. They are encouraging workers to be in labor unions. The list of descriptions, all flattering and supportable on their face, goes on and on.

But the truth is that they are really foreign political intervention paid for by our taxpayers without appropriate congressional oversight. And just as frequently without serious congressional approval.

To me, the National Endowment for Democracy is suspect and questionable, exactly because they have funded organizations like Prodemca, Friends of the Democratic Center in Central America, which is one of Marine Colonel North's conduits to the Contras.

Founded by Contra leader Arturo Cruz and Penn Kemble, Prodemca is also funded by Carl Channell's National Endowment for the Preservation of Liberty, one of Oliver North's fundraising organizations for the Contras.

Mr. Kemble and his sister, Eugenia, who runs the Free Trade Union Institute, the AFL-CIO's national endowment grantee organization, were amount the early supporters of Project Democracy, another operation officially launched by President Reagan's National Security Directive numbered 77 that led directly to the National Security Council's covert activities that have frequently proved illegal in both Iran and Nicaragua.

In other words, so much has happened since the last time that the House funded the National Endowment for Democracy, that we will now have to very carefully go through the relationship of many of these support organizations, arms, cover organizations, conduits, for organizations funded by the National Endowment for Democracy. This is a whole new ball game. To that end, I have accepted the invitation of the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Honorable DAN MICA, to meet with him to see if we can sort out some of these activities and see if he is going to continue his commitment to come down hard on NED if they have violated their charter.

Those were the assurances that I got after last year's vote and still new revelations have been discovered since then, and so I look forward to meeting with the chairman of the subcommittee who has this jurisdiction.

□ 1840

Now, the amendment that I offered last year to abolish the National Endowment for Democracy received a very healthy vote. It carried before in fiscal year 1985. At that time the issue was the intervention of the National Endowment for Democracy in foreign election processes in Panama, and other activities involving, political parties and their affiliated organizations. Its relationship to the ADN Party in Bolivia, the Conservative Party in Colombia, the Center for Political Studies in Guatemala and others have all been also questioned.

The issue is still the U.S. Government's foreign policy being made and implemented by the National Endowment for Democracy, its surrogates, its overt and covert funding grantees and recipients of funds through a number of networks and mechanisms, and the Iran-Contra scandal should remind us of the danger of that. And the scope of the National Endowment for Democracy's foreign activities is much broader than tampering in foreign elections. This is the fourth year of its operation, and as far as I can tell from the information that has come to my attention, it has been 4 years too long.

The National Endowment for Democracy's mission characterized once by President Reagan as being bold and difficult, in reality should be classified as illegal and prone to misadventures and mischief, with the inevitable embarrassing international repercussions that have occurred.

I am confident that the Members of the House will be following very carefully with me the new information about the Contra-Iran connection that the National Endowment has had with the funding illegally and covertly of the Contras publicly and privately and other related matters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

[Mr. SPRATT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

APPOINTMENT AS ADDITIONAL MEMBER TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Without objection, and pursuant to section 103 of House Resolution 26 of the 100th Congress and the order of the House of January 22, 1987, the Chair appoints as an additional member to the Select Committee on Hunger the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROWN].

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1950

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois) at 7:55 p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent Resolution 103 providing for a conditional adjournment of the House from April 9 to April 21, 1987, and a conditional adjournment of the Senate from April 9, 10, or 11 to April 21, 1987.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MADIGAN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today between the hours of 12 noon and 3 p.m., on account of illness in the family.

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. SLAUGHTER of Virginia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STANGELAND, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. SUNDQUIST, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNTER, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. PASHAYAN, for 60 minutes, on April 23.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONTZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ECKART, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIXON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYDEN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. SPRATT, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HALL of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOLINARI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LUNGREN, for 5 minutes, on April 23.

Mr. LUNGREN, for 60 minutes, on April 28.

Mr. LUNGREN, for 60 minutes, on April 30.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. STOKES, and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $1,621.

Mr. KONNYU, in the Committee of the Whole today immediately preceding vote on House Concurrent Resolution 93.

Mr. WELDON, in the Committee of the Whole today immediately following vote on Dannemeyer amendment.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHUMWAY in three instances.

Mrs. ROUKEMA in four instances.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

Mr. BADHAM.

Mr. INHOFE.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. DEWINE.

Mr. DREIER of California.

Mr. KONNYU.

Mr. TAUKE in three instances.

Mr. GEKAS in two instances.

Mr. COATS.

Mr. HERGER.

Mr. KOLBE in two instances.

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut.

Mr. COBLE.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. PORTER.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONTZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. BEILENSON.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. TORRES in three instances.

Mr. MARTINEZ.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. LOWRY of Washington.

Mr. KOSTMAYER.

Mr. PANETTA in three instances.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. COELHO.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. CHAPPELL.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland.

Mr. MURTHA in two instances.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. FLORIO.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. STALLINGS.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York.

Mr. SMITH of Florida in two instances.

Mr. BONKER in two instances.

Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. STUDDS.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1783. An act to make technical corrections in certain defense-related laws.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 200. Joint resolution designating April 10, 1987, as "Education Day U.S.A."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 103 of the 100th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12 noon on Tuesday, April 21, 1987.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 103, the House adjourned until Tuesday, April 21, 1987, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1135. A letter from the Chief, Program Liaison Division, Office of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting notification that on April 10, 1987, the Department intends to file a Draft Environmental Impact Statement [DEIS] with the Environmental Protection Agency on the proposed final deployment of the Ground Wave Emergency Network [GWEN], pursuant to Public Law 99-145, section 209(c) (99 Stat. 610); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1136. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of final regulations for the Endowment Challenge Grant Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1137. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a listing of the defense articles and services provided to Chad by the Department of Defense as of April 3, 1987, under the authority of Presidential Determination 87-5, dated December 16, 1986 (Ex. Com. No. 88), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2318(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1138. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report of its activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1986, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1139. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report of its compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during calendar year 1986, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1140. A letter from the Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's annual report of its activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1986, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1141. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide an appropriate retirement system for certain judges and magistrates, and for other purposes; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

1142. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1988, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DIXON: Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. A report on the investigation of financial transactions participated in and gifts of transportation accepted by Representative Fernand J. St Germain (Rept. 100-46). Referred to the House calendar.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. A report on the violation of the Truth In Negotiations Act which give defense contractors millions in excess profits (Rept. 100-47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. A report on the armed services' tactical communication systems still cannot work together in joint operations (Rept. 100-48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 799. A bill to designate a segment of the Kings River in California as a wild and scenic river; with amendments (Rept. 100-49). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 1750. A bill to amend the Buy American Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 100-50, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1510. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, and the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, with respect to the use of inventions in outer space (Rept. 100-51, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

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. FLIPPO (for himself, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. ERDREICH, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 2025. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri (for himself, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. TALLON, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. ESPY, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LOTT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DAUB, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WEBER, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mr. WHITTAKER):

H.R. 2026. A bill to provide that the Department of Agriculture shall be known as the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, to transfer certain other programs within such Department to a newly established Rural Development Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2027. A bill to authorize the nine regional educational laboratories to receive funds from the Department of Education to develop and operate demonstration programs based in local educational agencies to provide rural secondary school students with information, assistance, and personal support related to the preparation, choice, and selection of postsecondary educational programs and institutions of higher education as well as career planning; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2028. A bill to provide guidance and oversight for programs for the development of rural businesses, and to implement the commitment of the Federal Government to the goal of encouraging greater economic opportunity for rural area enterpreneuers; to the Committee on Small Business.

H.R. 2029. A bill to amend the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act to provide for procurement set-aside targets for rural areas; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TAUKE (for himself, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. LOTT, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 2030. A bill to permit the Bell operating companies to provide information services and to manufacture telecommunications equipment, subject to regulation by the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and concurrently to the Committee on the Judiciary for a period ending not later than 30 calendar days following the date on which the Committee on Energy and Commerce files its report in the House.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, and Mr. KANJORSKI):

H.R. 2031. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require that all gasoline sold by refineries in the United States contain a certain percentage of ethanol or certain percentages of both ethanol and methanol; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for 8 years certain tax benefits for fuels containing alcohol; and to provide that revenues to the highway trust fund shall not be reduced by reason of such tax benefits; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 2032. A bill to authorize the conveyance of the Liberty ship *Protector*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 2033. A bill to extend the existing suspension of duty on certain diamond tool blanks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARCHER (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 2034. A bill to amend section 507 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide an allowance for detectable moisture and impurities in determining tare on imports of crude oil and petroleum products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ATKINS:

H.R. 2035. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for property acquisition, restoration, and development, and for transportation, educational, and cultural programs, relating to the Lowell National Historical Park; to continue the term of a member of the Lowell Historic Preservation Commission pending the appointment of a successor; to adjust a quorum of the Commission in the event of a vacancy; and to delay the termination of the Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATES (for himself, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. EDWARDS

of California, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. ECKART):

H.R. 2036. A bill to require the Environmental Protection Agency to take certain steps to protect the stratospheric ozone layer from depletion resulting from chlorofluorocarbons, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce; Science, Space, and Technology; Ways and Means; and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEILENSON (for himself, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah):

H.R. 2037. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the excise taxes on wine and beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 2038. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act to establish a grant program for foster care and adoption assistance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mrs. BENTLEY):

H.R. 2039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a tax deduction for expenses exceeding 5 percent of adjusted gross income incurred in care of certain elderly individuals, to allow physicians and registered professional nurses a tax deduction for the cost of certain goods and services donated by them to elderly individuals, to permit tax-free withdrawals from individual retirement accounts to pay certain long-term care expenses or purchase insurance to cover such expenses, and to allow employers to deduct contributions to employee pension plans for the purchase of long-term care insurance for employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 2040. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit smoking on domestic and international commercial aircraft flights; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BONKER (for himself, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KCKINNEY, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BATES, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MFUME, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. PERKINS):

H.R. 2041. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a taxpayer conscientiously opposed to participation in war may elect to have such taxpayer's income, estate, or gift tax payments spent for nonmilitary purposes; to create the U.S. Peace Tax Fund to receive such tax payments; to establish a U.S. Peace Tax Fund Board of Trustees; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONKER (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. PEPPER):

H.R. 2042. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to strengthen and improve the provisions relating to State long-term care ombudsman programs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRAIG:

H.R. 2043. A bill to prohibit the importation of certain products of Australia and New Zealand; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DARDEN (for himself, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. LEHMAN of California):

H.R. 2044. A bill entitled the "Nevada Wilderness Protection Act of 1987"; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA (for himself, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. COELHO, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. OLIN, Mr. PENNY, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, MR. CAMPBELL, Mr. ESPY, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRANT, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. OBEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SLATTERY, MRS. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. WEBER):

H.R. 2045. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to permit the prepayment of Federal financing bank loans made to rural electrification and telephone systems; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA (for himself and Mr. BUSTAMANTE):

H.R. 2046. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to conclude agreements with the appropriate representative of the Government of Mexico to correct pollution of the Rio Grande; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DICKS:

H.R. 2047. A bill to establish a Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Agency in order to provide for increased standards of safety with respect to radioactive emissions resulting from activities carried out at nuclear facilities of the Department of Energy; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DIOGUARDI:

H.R. 2048. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit domestic air carriers from providing alcoholic beverages on domestic and international flights to persons under 21 years of age; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 2049. A bill to amend section 312(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to research and development, to require the Secretary of Transportation to assure the development of a collision avoidance system for use on all civil and military aircraft of the United States in the interest of air safety; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DOWNEY of New York (for himself, Mr. COELHO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. CARR, and Mr. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 2050. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove certain limitations on charitable contributions of certain items; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DREIER of California:

H.R. 2051. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a credit against income tax for the purchase and installation of locks and other security devices on residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MCEWEN, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. TRAXLER):

H.R. 2052. A bill to enhance the energy security of the United States, improve the environment, and expand markets for agricultural commodities by providing for the increased use of motor fuel blended with ethanol; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 2053. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to increase from $25 to $50 a month the amount of the personal allowance which is presently provided for eligible individuals and eligible spouses who are in medical institutions, with subsequent annual increases in the amount of such allowance to reflect changes in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2054. A bill to provide that the availability of extended unemployment benefits shall be determined by using the total unemployment rate and that such benefits may be made available on an area basis within a State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.R. 2055. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to limit the penalty for late enrollment under the medicare program to 10 percent and twice the period of no enrollment; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio (for himself and Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN):

H.R. 2056. A bill requiring the development of hazardous materials emergency response procedures, prohibiting the transportation of hazardous materials in certain obsolete railroad tank cars, and requiring a study of railroad tank car design procedures; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILTON (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. ROBERT, Mr. SABO, Mr. MFUME, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. JONTZ, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. EVANS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. COURTER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida):

H.R. 2057. A bill to amend section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, relating to the President's budget to require it to separately set forth the annual budget of the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 2058. A bill to amend titles XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to provider appeals of adverse determinations by peer review organizations; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JONTZ (for himself, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. COELHO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COATS, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HILER Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. SHARP, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ESPY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PENNY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. OLIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. WISE, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. GRANT, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri):

H.R. 2059. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the sale of assets required by section 1001 of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1986 by offering to sell notes and other obligations issued by public bodies to the issuer before offering to sell them to the public; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KOLBE (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. STUMP, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. KYL):

H.R. 2060. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to divest certain utility properties in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 2061. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to the contruction and operation of certain treatment works which are subject to regulation under international treaties; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. TRAFICANT):

H.R. 2062. A bill to reduce unfair practices and provide for orderly trade in certain carbon, alloy, and stainless steel mill products, to reduce unemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL (by request):

H.R. 2063. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to increase premium revenue for the single-employer pension plan termination insurance program and to provide a more equitable distribution of single-employer pension plan premium costs; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means.

By Mr. OXLEY:

H.R. 2064. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to increase the amount of benefits payable with respect to the death of public safety officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 2065. A bill to equalize the retired pay of persons who served during World War II as Philippine Scouts with the retired pay of other members of the Armed Forces of the United States of corresponding grades and length of service; to the Committee on Armed Service.

H.R. 2066. A bill to amend 9311 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986 to delay for 1 year implementation of the restrictions on use of the periodic interim payment system under Medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. TALLON, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SHAW, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. SABO, Mr. COELHO, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. DYSON, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah):

H.R. 2067. A bill to designate the square dance as the American folk dance of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RITTER (for himself, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GLICKMAN, and Mr. MORRISON of Washington):

H.R. 2068. A bill to establish the National Bureau of Standards and Industrial Competitiveness, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RITTER (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. VALENTINE):

H.R. 2069. A bill to create a National Commission on Commercial and National Defense Applications of Superconductors to study methods of developing improved superconductors and expanding the commercial and strategic use of superconductors; jointly, to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA:

H.R. 2070. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to provision of home health services on a daily basis and to continuation of such services for the safety and maintenance of the individual; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHUMWAY:

H.R. 2071. A bill to assure protection of certain historic abandoned shipwrecks by requiring responsible salvage, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Ms. SNOWE:

H.R. 2072. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to require State agencies and area agencies on aging to develop information and coordinate volunteer services, to assist older individuals in evaluating the provisions of medical insurance policies available to supplement Medicare, and to require the Administration on Aging to provide related technical assistance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2073. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to increase the minimum amount required to be expended for services to older individuals residing in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2074. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 and the Older American Community Service Employment Act to provide for volunteer and employment projects to provide day care services for children and adults, and respite services for families of older individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. BIAGGI):

H.R. 2075. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to require area agencies on aging to coordinate their services with the activities of community-based organizations established for the benefit of victims of Alzheimer's disease and their families; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2076. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to require the Commissioner on Aging to conduct a study regarding transportation services provided under such act, and to submit to the Congress a report summarizing the results of such study and containing recommendations with respect to providing such services; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2077. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to require uniform telephone listing of area agencies on aging; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2078. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to require the Commissioner on Aging to conduct a study regarding caregiver referral; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2079. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to require area agencies on aging to coordinate with community health centers certain programs relating to mental health services for older individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 2080. A bill to suspend for 3 years the duty on Rosachloride Lumps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STALLINGS:

H.R. 2081. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a fee on the importation of silver bullion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWIFT (for himself and Mr. MORRISON of Washington):

H.R. 2082. A bill to amend the Price-Anderson provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to establish liability and indemnification for nuclear incidents arising out of the storage, disposal, and transportation of radioactive waste to which the United States holds title; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SWINDALL:

H.R. 2083. A bill to impose travel restrictions on the personnel of certain foreign missions and foreign organizations in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2084. A bill to require the Secretary of State to include the amount and type of foreign assistance in the report on policies pursued by other countries in international organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TALLON:

H.R. 2085. A bill to name the post-baccalaureate achievement program under subpart 4 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as the "Ronald E. McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement Program"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TAUKE:

H.R. 2086. A bill to extend and amend programs under the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TAUKE (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. WORTLEY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. SCHUETTE):

H.R. 2087. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for a Beneficiary Ombudsman in the Social Security Administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 2088. A bill to amend the Bilingual Education Act to authorize the inclusion under family English Literacy programs of courses designed to enable aliens who are otherwise eligible for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act to achieve a minimal understanding of ordinary English and a knowledge and understanding of the history and government of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. GEPHARDT):

H.R. 2089. A bill to amend the effective date of the provision contained in the Tax Reform Act of 1986 dealing with allocation of indebtedness as payment on installment obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2090. A bill to designate certain National Forest System lands in the State of Montana for release to the forest planning process, protection of recreation value, and inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 2091. A bill to improve the pay and management of employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYDEN:

H.R. 2092. A bill to regulate recruitment and treatment of certain door-to-door sales agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 2093. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to limit the dispensing of certain drugs by practitioners; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 2094. A bill to amend section 2314 of title 18, United States Code, relating to transportation of stolen goods, securities, moneys, fraudulent State tax stamps, or articles used in counterfeiting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2095. A bill relating to requirements for insurance for recreational events on federally owned lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to designate October 1987 as "Phobia Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H.J. Res. 242. Joint resolution designating September 1987 as "Southern Gospel Music Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.J. Res. 243. Joint resolution authorizing the Philippine Scouts and U.S. Veterans Association of America to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor the Philippine Scouts and to honor Filipino veterans who served in the U.S. Army during World War II; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.J. Res. 244. Joint resolution designating the month of May 1988 as "Better Hearing and Speech Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STANGELAND:

H.J. Res. 245. Joint resolution designating the week of May 10, 1987, through May 16, 1987, as "Handicapped Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VALENTINE (for himself, Mrs. LLOYD, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FISH, Mr. FROST, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JENKINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SHUMWAY, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. WEISS):

H.J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to designate September 13-19, 1987, as "National Women's Health Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BONIOR of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House from April 9 to April 21, 1987, and a conditional adjournment of the Senate from April 9, 10, or 11 to April 21, 1987.

By Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. DYSON, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. YATRON, Mr. RITTER, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WELDON, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. GOODLING):

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution recognizing the success of professional basketball and congratulating Julius Erving on the occasion of his retirement from professional basketball; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHUMWAY (for himself, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. PENNY, Mr. GALLO, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. LIVINGSTON):

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the goals and objectives in international trade of the Member Nations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STANGELAND (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BATES, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BONKER, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COELHO, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYSON, Mr. ECKART, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. ESPY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. GRANT, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HILER, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARLENEE, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. SABO, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VOLKMER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WELDON, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WISE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution to recognize and congratulate Ducks Unlimited in honor of its 50th anniversary; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution urging the full funding of certain student financial assistance programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORD of Michigan:

H. Res. 142. Resolution expressing the sense of the House congratulating the people of Berlin on the occasion of the city's 750th anniversary in the year 1987, commending the people of Berlin for their centuries of great tradition and continuing courage in the face of historical adversity and recognized the deep and lasting relations they have with the people of the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BADHAM:

H. Res. 143. Resolution calling on the House of Representatives to resist all attempts to deny the home mortgage interest deduction to any taxpayer whose home is a boat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H. Res. 144. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should condemn nations which continue to flagrantly violate the United Nations arms embargo of South Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself and Mr. MRAZEK):

H. Res. 145. Resolution expressing the support of Congress for the World Health Organization in its efforts to combat the spread of AIDS; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VALENTINE (for himself, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. CARR, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DAUB, Mr. FRANK, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. ROE, Mr. YATRON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROSE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. BONKER, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. WEISS):

H. Res. 146. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the 1988 budget should provide adequate funding for vocational education programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

28. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the establishment of a training center for persons who respond to emergencies, particularly those involving hazardous materials; to the Committee on Armed Services.

29. Also, memorial of the legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the deactivation of the 474th Tactical Fighter Wing at Nellis Air Force Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

30. Also, memorial of the senate of the State of New Hampshire, relative to a high frontier defense system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

31. Also, memorial of the legislature of the State of California, relative to California exporters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

32. Also, memorial of the legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Federal liability for any accident which might occur if a nuclear waste repository is situated in Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

33. Also, memorial of the senate of the State of Wyoming, relative to speed limits; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

34. Also, memorial of the senate of the State of Wyoming, relative to oil import fees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

35. Also, memorial of the senate of the State of Wyoming, relative to feeder lamb imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

36. Also, memorial of the senate of the State of Wyoming; relative to power marketing agencies; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works and Transportation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CALLAHAN:

H.R. 2096. A bill for the relief of Joseph W. Newman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWRY of Washington:

H.R. 2097. A bill for the relief of Frederick Paul and Aileen Paul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2098. A bill for the relief of Frederick Paul of Seattle, WA; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 2099. A bill for the relief of Nolan Sharp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWRY of Washington:

H. Res. 147. Resolution referring the bill (H.R. 2098) for the relief of Frederick Paul of Seattle, WA, to the chief judge of the United States Claims Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 17: Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.R. 39: Mr. CLARKE, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. ATKINS..

H.R. 44: Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.R. 47: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. BIAGGIO.

H.R. 52: Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MOODY, and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 74: Mr. HOYER, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. DE LA GARZA.

H.R. 130: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 140: Mr. RAY and Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 186: Mr. ROBINSON.

H.R. 338: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 339: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 344: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 345: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 347: Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WYDEN.

H.R. 358: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 432: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. YATES, and Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.R. 442: Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 459: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 461: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 486: Mr. PEASE, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 543: Mr. HORTON and Mr. MCEWEN.

H.R. 567: Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. LOTT, Mr. RAY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. SHAW, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DELAY, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. PARRIS, and Mr. KONNYU.

H.R. 603: Mr. GRANDY and Mr. LENT.

H.R. 618: Mr. SOLARZ and Mr. HAWKINS.

H.R. 637: Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HENRY, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 639: Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. MANTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WELDON, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 693: Mr. RITTER and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 721: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FISH, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. RIDGE.

H.R. 728: Mr. BOEHLERT and Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

H.R. 729: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 789: Mr. BAKER and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 792: Mr. HOWARD, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. BADHAM.

H.R. 911: Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FUSTER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 920: Mr. DELLUMS and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 951: Mr. WEBER.

H.R. 965: Mr. DAUB, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SABO, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.R. 975: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MILLER of Washington, and Mr. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1008: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. HANSEN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1018: Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 1036: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SYNAR, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1082: Mr. BADHAM, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. MACK, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1120: Mr. HALL of Ohio and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 1140: Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HENRY, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. BAKER, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. KASICH, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. UPTON, Mr. DAUB, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr.

SMITH of New Hampshire, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

H.R. 1144: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MRAZEK, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 1148: Mr. MAVROULES

H.R. 1200: Mr. TORRES

H.R. 1213: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 1240: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1259: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia. Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. OLIN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BATES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. TALLON, Mr. LOTT, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 1325: Mr. HOYER, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. RITTER, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 1342: Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 1346: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MCEWEN, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 1367: Mr. SWINDALL and Mr. GRANDY.

H.R. 1396: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 1397: Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. HOWARD, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 1398: Mr. FORD of Tennessee and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1436: Mr. EVANS and Mr. CARR.

H.R. 1451: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. PEASE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 1452: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1481: Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 1517: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. BEILENSON, and Mr. WHITTAKER.

H.R. 1531: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. SYNAR and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1536: Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 1546: Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 1558: Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1566: Mr. NEAL, Mr. RIDGE, and Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 1588: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. STOKES, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1604: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1609: Mr. WYDEN.

H.R. 1614: Mr. INHOFE and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1617: Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1633: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. DORNAN of California, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 1635: Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. MOODY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. COELHO, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. UPTON, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 1641: Mr. BOLAND, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. CONTE, and Miss SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1642: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. WILSON, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1659: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. SABO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. FUSTER.

H.R. 1663: Mr. HATCHER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. OLIN, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. GLICKMAN, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 1678: Mr. DIOGUARDI and Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

H.R. 1693: Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. REGULA, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1701: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 1707: Mr. SISISKY, Miss SCHNEIDER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ROE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. GARCIA, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. WISE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. TALLON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1711: Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 1713: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1722: Mr. BATEMAN and Mr. DYSON.

H.R. 1723: Mr. BATEMAN and Mr. DYSON.

H.R. 1724: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HILER, and Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut.

H.R. 1732: Mr. FASCELL, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 1750: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. GRANT, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SYNAR, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. SAWYER.

H.R. 1752: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1754: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1769: Mr. DIXON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 1770: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1778: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KASTENMEIER, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1782: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RIDGE, and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1800: Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 1802: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. UDALL.

H.R. 1809: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. PEASE, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1819: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 1820: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 1821: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 1829: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 1830: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 1832: Mr. PORTER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1913: Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. GRANDY.

H.R. 1931: Mr. HUGHES and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1960: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. INHOFE.

H.R. 1973: Mr. LIGHTFOOT and Mr. ROBERTS.

H.J. Res. 16: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.J. Res. 32: Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. KASTENMEIER, LANTOS, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. MANTON, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Ms. OAKAR, and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.J. Res. 62: Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.J. Res. 67: Mrs. MORELLA and Mr. WYDEN.

H.J. Res. 90: Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BRUCE, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.J. Res. 91: Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. CHAPPELL, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.J. Res. 100: Mr. SCHUETTE.

H.J. Res. 111: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.J. Res. 132: Mr. KONNYU, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.J. Res. 140: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. TALLON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. GUARINI, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 143: Mr. BAKER and Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 161: Mr. CARPER.

H.J. Res. 163: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SABO, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MANTON, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROE, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LELAND, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. HOPKINS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 171: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. BATES, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 189: Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. NAGLE, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. DENNY

SMITH, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WYDEN.

H.J. Res. 190: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. MINETA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TORRES, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DYMALLY, and Mr. LEACH of Iowa.

H.J. Res. 194: Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BATES, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARR, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Mr. ROE.

H.J. Res. 201: Mr. ROEMER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MANTON, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DYSON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. COURTER, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. SCHAEFER.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. CRAIG.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. HORTON, and Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. COELHO, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. BATES, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. PASHAYAN, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. COOPER, Mr. COATS, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. HENRY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. SOLARZ.

H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. RHODES.

H. Res. 18: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H. Res. 118: Mr. ENGLISH.

H. Res. 131: Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MFUME, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. EDWARDS of California, and Mr. FRANK.

H. Res. 137: Mr. WEBER, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. DAUB, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. OLIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. UPTON.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 782: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1049: Mr. MCDADE and Mr. BRUCE.